

at which the international officers of NSA will be presented by U.S. Senators from their home States and by representatives of the New Zealand and Canadian Embassies. The U.S. legislators include the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. Had I been able to attend, it would have been my honor to present the international president of the National Secretaries Association, Mrs. Hazel A. Kellar, of Portland, Oreg.

The business part of the convention will start on Wednesday morning, July 8, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, with the official theme of "Knowledge: Passport to Understanding." Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, will deliver the first invocation; and Dr. Albert Burke, scientist, economist, world affairs and TV lecturer, will deliver the keynote address, entitled "Education for What?" Approximately 1,500 delegates, alternates, and members of the NASA will attend the convention.

Once more, I express my disappointment at not being able to attend the convention. I wish the NSA the greatest success with its convention.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate took an adjournment until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 1, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 30, 1964:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

John A. Schnittker, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Arlon E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years, from August 29, 1964. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by Senate, June 30, 1964:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Dorwin W. Suttle, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 34: 3: O magnify the Lord with me and let us exalt His name together.

Almighty God, whose inspiration and help are the supreme needs of our life, grant that we may be conscious of Thy all-pervading presence and sustaining power as we encounter the bewildering problems of each new day.

We pray that Thou wilt expand and enlighten our minds and hearts that they may be large enough to understand and comprehend Thy will and Thy love.

Guide the Members of this legislative body by Thy spirit as they take counsel together for the common good of all mankind and may we mobilize every moral and spiritual resource in behalf of a finer civilization.

Inspire us to believe in a social order in which men everywhere shall join hearts and hands in a great cooperative effort to establish peace and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 9, 1964:

H.R. 1382. An act for the relief of John Gatzopl Overbeck and Mary Gatzopoulos Overbeck; and

H.R. 11201. An act making deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

On June 11, 1964:

H.R. 6876. An act for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gellinas, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7757. An act for the relief of Jesse I. Ellington;

H.R. 8222. An act for the relief of Edward J. Maurus;

H.R. 8348. An act for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez;

H.R. 8532. An act for the relief of Ivan D. Beran;

H.R. 8828. An act for the relief of John T. Cox;

H.R. 8936. An act for the relief of Leonard M. Dalton;

H.R. 9475. An act for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others; and

H.R. 10078. An act for the relief of Philip N. Shepherdson.

On June 12, 1964:

H.R. 1727. An act for the relief of Richard G. Green, Jr.;

H.R. 5305. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imlie;

H.R. 5571. An act for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith;

H.R. 10774. An act for authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of cadmium from the

national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.J. Res. 889. Joint resolution commemorating the golden anniversary of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., and authorizing the design and manufacture of a galvano in commemoration of this significant event.

On June 13, 1964:

H.R. 7332. An act granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes.

On June 24, 1964:

H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Chang In Wu; and

H.R. 8964. An act for the relief of Diedre Regina Shore.

On June 25, 1964:

H.R. 9934. An act to authorize the construction of a dam on the St. Louis River, Minn.; and

H.R. 10465. An act to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

On June 29, 1964:

H.R. 2818. An act for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne;

H.R. 9220. An act for the relief of Elisabete Maria Fonseca;

H.R. 9720. An act authorizing a study of dust control measures at Lon Island, Port Isabel, Tex.;

H.R. 9964. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 10463. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1965, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 10537. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite;

H.R. 11375. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; and

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study; and

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10433) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendments to amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 46 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 388. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska Mid-State division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; and

S. 1186. An act to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands.

The message also announced that Mr. JORDAN of Idaho had been appointed a conferee on the bill (S. 2) entitled "An act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities; to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence; and to promote a more adequate national program of water research" in place of Mr. ALLOTT, excused.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 171]

Abele	Hoffman	Pillion
Arends	Kee	Powell
Ashley	Kilburn	Purcell
Avery	King, Calif.	Rains
Bass	Kluczynski	Robison
Bennett, Mich.	Lankford	Roudebush
Buckley	Lesinski	St Germain
Celler	Lloyd	Senner
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Sheppard
Derwinski	Macdonald	Snyder
Dingell	Michel	Staggers
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Thompson, La.
Fascell	Morton	Thompson, N.J.
Glenn	Murphy, N.Y.	Toll
Gray	Nelsen	Tuten
Gubser	Norblad	Whitten
Healey	Patman	Wilson, Bob
Hébert	Pilcher	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXCISE-TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report to accompany H.R. 11376, to provide a 1-year extension of

certain excise-tax rates, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1523)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a one-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. LOSSES ARISING FROM CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

"(a) TREATMENT OF LOSSES.—Section 165 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain property confiscated by Cuba) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) CERTAIN PROPERTY CONFISCATED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA.—

"(1) TREATMENT AS SUBSECTION (C) (3) LOSS.—For purposes of this chapter, in the case of an individual who was a citizen of the United States, or a resident alien, on December 31, 1958, any loss of property which—

"(A) was sustained by reason of the expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking of the property, before January 1, 1964, by the government of Cuba, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing, and

"(B) was not a loss described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c),

shall be treated as a loss to which paragraph (3) of subsection (c) applies. In the case of tangible property, the preceding sentence shall not apply unless the property was held by the taxpayer, and was located in Cuba, on December 31, 1958.

"(2) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(A) For purposes of subsection (a), any loss described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as having been sustained on October 14, 1960, unless it is established that the loss was sustained on some other day.

"(B) For purposes of subsection (a), the fair market value of property held by the taxpayer on December 31, 1958, to which paragraph (1) applies, on the day on which the loss of such property was sustained, shall be its fair market value on December 31, 1958.

"(C) For purposes of section 172, a loss described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an expropriation loss within the meaning of section 172(k).

"(D) For purposes of section 6601, the amount of any tax imposed by this title shall not be reduced by virtue of this subsection for any period prior to February 26, 1964.

"(3) REFUNDS OR CREDITS.—Notwithstanding any law or rule of law, refund or credit of any overpayment attributable to the application of paragraph (1) may be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1965. No interest shall be allowed with respect to any such refund or credit for any period prior to February 26, 1964."

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in respect of losses sustained in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide a one-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes."

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
JOHN WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment adds a new section 3 to the bill, relating to retailers excise taxes.

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 would amend sections 4001 (relating to imposition of tax on jewelry and related items) and 4011 (relating to imposition of tax on furs) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Under existing law the tax imposed by these sections is equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which the articles are sold at retail. Under the amendment the tax would be equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold, to the extent such price exceeds \$100.

Subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 would repeal subchapters C (relating to tax on toilet preparations) and D (relating to tax on luggage, handbags, etc.) of chapter 31 of the 1954 code.

Subsection (e) of section 3 would make technical amendments to reflect the changes made in the code by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d).

Under subsection (f), the amendments made by section 3 would apply with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Section 165(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides for income tax purposes that any loss of tangible property, if such loss arises from expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking by the government of Cuba, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing, shall be treated as a loss from a casualty within the meaning of section 165(c)(3) of the code. Section 165(1) was added to the 1954 code by section 238 of the Revenue Act of 1964, approved February 26, 1964, and as so added was prospective in application only.

In general, the effect of Senate amendment No. 2 would be to revise section 165 (1) of the 1964 code to limit its application to individuals who were citizens or residents of the United States on December 31, 1958, to extend its application to intangible property, and to provide that it apply only to losses before January 1, 1964, of property held by the taxpayer and located in Cuba on December 31, 1958. In addition, under the amendment (1) a loss is required to be

treated as having been sustained on October 14, 1960, unless it is established that it was sustained on some other day, (2) the amount of any loss is not to exceed the fair market value of the property on December 31, 1958, and (3) for purposes of the net operating loss deduction under section 172 of the code, a loss would be taken into account under the 3-year carryback and 5-year carryover rules rather than under the special 10-year carryover rules for expropriation losses as defined in section 172(k) of the code. Claims for refund or credit of any overpayment attributable to the application of the amendment may be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1965, notwithstanding any law or rule of law. No interest is to be allowed on any overpayment for any period before January 1, 1965. For purposes of computing interest on underpayments of tax, the amount of tax is not to be reduced by virtue of the amendment for any period before February 26, 1964.

The amendment applies in respect of losses sustained in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958.

The House recedes with an amendment which makes technical and clarifying changes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which would repeal the manufacturers excise tax on pens and mechanical pencils sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer thereof on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which would repeal the manufacturers excise tax on lacrosse balls and sticks and on tennis and table tennis equipment sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer thereof on or after July 1, 1964.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment adds a new section to the bill which would provide an exemption from the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments in the case of any musical instrument sold to a student in an educational institution if the instrument is to be used by the student in an orchestra, band, or similar organization sponsored by, or in a course of instruction offered by, such institution. The amendment would apply to sales of musical instruments made after the date of enactment of the bill to students of an educational institution.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 6: Section 4231(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 imposes a tax equivalent to 10 percent of all amounts paid for admission, refreshment, service, or merchandise, at any roof garden, cabaret, or other similar place furnishing a public performance for profit, by or for any patron or guest who is entitled to be present during any portion of such performance. Under Senate amendment No. 6 the rate of tax would be reduced from 10 percent to 3 percent effective at 10 o'clock ante meridian on July 1, 1964.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Section 4231(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides the general rule for the tax on admissions. Under this section there is imposed a tax of 1 cent for each 10 cents or major fraction thereof of the amount in excess of \$1 paid for admission to any place. In the case of a season ticket or subscription for admission, the tax is computed on the excess of \$1 multiplied by the number of admissions provided by the season ticket or subscription. Under Senate amendment No. 7, there would be imposed (in lieu of the existing tax) a tax equivalent to 5 percent in respect of any admission to a live dramatic or musical perform-

ance presented in a theater, or presented in any other place if the presentation of such performance is the principal activity being conducted in such place at the time of such admission. The amendment would apply only with respect to amounts paid, on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of the bill, for admissions on or after such first day.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House). Mr. Speaker, I think we can save some time if the House will agree to dispense with further reading of the statement, with the understanding that the gentleman from Wisconsin and I will explain the conference report fully.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has agreed to the House version of the Excise-Tax Rate Extension Act with one minor exception. Thus, the conference agreement which your House conferees bring back is the House passed bill with this one minor, non-excise tax, amendment which has a negligible effect on revenue. The House conferees succeeded in prevailing upon the Senate conferees to eliminate all of the amendments of the other body which would have provided for excise-tax reductions this year. The includes their amendments relating to retailers' taxes as well as the various manufacturers' excise taxes which they would have reduced or eliminated. This will give us time to study all our excise taxes and reach an appropriate and considered judgment on them after hearings and careful study. As you know, we presently are engaged in excise-tax hearings. We have received about 200 requests to be heard and we plan to hear witnesses on our whole Federal excise-tax structure.

The one Senate amendment which the conferees on the part of the House accepted relates to certain expropriation losses in Cuba.

Before the passage of the Revenue Act of 1964, the law provided that in the case of an individual, no loss deduction could be taken for an expropriation or similar taking of property by a foreign government unless the property was used in a trade or business or in the production of income.

The other body in its consideration of the Revenue Act of 1964, however, added a provision which would have made a loss deduction available in the case of the expropriation by Cuba of nonbusiness tangible property. Unfortunately, however, through an oversight, an appropriate effective date was not provided for this provision. As a result, the provision agreed to by the conferees on the Revenue Act of 1964 of necessity could

have only prospective application. This, of course, does not cover the period at issue when Cuba was seizing property of Americans in Cuba.

In the floor statement on the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1964, I indicated that in future legislation we would be glad to consider an amendment applying this provision to the period which gave rise to this provision—namely, when Cuba was seizing American property in Cuba.

The amendment which your House conferees bring back does just that. It overcomes this effective-date problem as well as providing other improvements in the original amendment. This provision applies to losses sustained in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958. In addition, it provides that the expropriation or similar taking of property must have occurred before January 1, 1964.

The provision applies only to U.S. citizens or residents who had that status on December 31, 1958. For purposes of valuing the losses, the amendment also provides that generally the fair market value of the property is to be determined as of December 31, 1958. In addition, the loss in most cases is to be treated as sustained on October 14, 1960. This is the date the so-called urban reform law was adopted in Cuba, the law which permitted the nationalization of residential property. Taxpayers may still treat a loss as sustained on another date, however, if they can establish when the property was nationalized.

In order primarily to cover bank accounts, the provision applies to intangible as well as tangible property. No interest is granted on refunds for periods before February 26, 1964, nor will losses be treated as incurred before that time for purposes of the interest provisions.

Your conferees accepted this Senate provision with minor technical modifications.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is accurate to state that every Member of the House has just as much interest in excise-tax reduction and revision as does the other body and the public generally. I think that such reduction and revision should be on the basis of an orderly and complete review wherein each of our present excise taxes can be included and analyzed. Then we will be in a position to make recommendations to the House based on our considered judgment as to the changes that should be made.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again impress on the House that there is \$1.9 billion in revenue involved in this legislation. Since the legislation involves a continuation for another year, effective at midnight tonight, of the specified excise taxes, it is necessary that it be signed into law by midnight tonight. I would also like to point out that continuation of these rates has been taken into account in the budget figures for fiscal year 1965 as well as in setting the debt ceiling for the next fiscal year.

I urge adoption of the conference report which is largely a product of the House since it is in keeping with the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the general explanation of the conference action as made by the chairman of our committee. As he reported, this bill is really the same bill that passed the House, with one rather minor technical amendment.

Under those circumstances, of course, I had no alternative except to sign the report of the committee of conference. It is the House bill. The extension of some of the taxes that are involved in this bill is certainly essential at this time. I think that the conference report should be adopted by this House. We have no alternative.

I would like to express, however, Mr. Speaker, a certain degree of regret that the majority members of the House conferees were so adamant in upholding the House position. It seems to me here, as in many other cases, we should be willing to compromise at least a bit in order to maintain proper comity and relationship with the other body. I would have hoped also that in addition to making a concession to the Senate, we might make a concession to the taxpayers of this country by doing something at this time about the retail excise taxes.

You will recall when this bill was before the House, I presented an amendment to phase out and repeal the retail excise taxes. The vote in the House was 185 for the amendment and 207 against, and it failed. But that is how close that vote was.

In the other body, however, an amendment for the outright repeal of these same retail excise taxes passed that body by a vote of 48 to 38.

Now why did we have to be so adamant about doing anything about these taxes that stand out as a sore thumb of inequity; and, that stand out as a sore thumb as far as the administrative problems created by them are concerned.

I do not think we had to be so adamant. Yet the majority membership of the House conference committee was adamant, and the Senate finally yielded on the basis that the House conferees had to file their report by last night in order that we could take up the general extension bill today and have it enacted before July 1.

What is the reason for our position? Why is it that we could not yield at all? Is it the \$450 million of revenue that is involved? I hate to think, Mr. Speaker, that this country is going to rise or fall on the basis of this \$450 million.

Is it the matter that these particular excise taxes, the taxes on jewelry, furs, cosmetics, luggage and ladies' handbags, have to be studied some more to find out how inequitable they are? Of course not; we know they are all inequitable.

But let me just point out one little thing in addition to what I told the House when we had this matter before us before. These retail taxes place an impossible burden on the small retail merchants in addition to the burden they place on the ladies of our Nation. Talk to any of your retailers handling any of these items. Talk to your druggists or anybody else who sells toilet articles.

Talk to your local jeweler and ask them how much it costs to keep track of these items to find out each day which item is taxable and which item is not taxable, and in collecting the taxes and keeping the records and making quarterly reports and all the rest of it. They will tell you, I am sure, that the cost to them is in excess of a dollar a day to do that work. How many of these retailers are there in this country? There are at least about 1½ million of these people who have the burden imposed on them of collecting these taxes and keeping track of all these items.

At a cost of \$1 a day for 300 days a year, that comes to \$300 for each retailer. If we multiply that by 1½ million, we find that the expense of collecting this tax is as much as the \$450 million involved in revenue in the Senate amendment. In fact, we could save these people more money than the Government collects in tax. In addition, this would relieve our ladies of the payment of at least \$400 million on cost of things they buy on which we have put this discriminatory tax. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the House very well could have made some concession in this area and could have moved down the road toward eliminating these obnoxious taxes.

Certainly I am going to vote for the conference report. I had hoped the House would make a start, by adopting an amendment to get rid of these retail excise taxes. After the Senate adopted the amendment, I had hoped our conferees might make some concession to the Senate and to our taxpayers. But they did not. So today we have no alternative, though it seems to me unfortunate. We must go along with the conference report. But I cannot go along with the conference report without at least expressing real disappointment that when we had the opportunity we did nothing.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is an interesting development. The House passed this bill and it went to the other body, where by a 10-vote margin—48 to 38—it adopted an amendment or amendments to the bill to strike out most of the wartime-levied excise taxes. Then Members of the other body went to conference and yielded that position, apparently without too much difficulty. I cannot help but wonder whether the other body is trying to get some political mileage out of this, whether the Members of the other body will now say, "Well, we tried to eliminate these obnoxious taxes, but when we got into conference our action on the floor did not prevail."

I am confused about this. I do not understand why conferees from the other body wilted so rapidly from the position they took toward repeal, and outright repeal. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and support him in his efforts to eliminate these war-levied excises.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that I cannot speak for any of the Senate conferees. I believe it will be interesting to read the

debate which will take place in the other body in connection with the presentation of this conference report to the membership of the other body.

I will say, as to the position of the House managers, those members of the majority who were members of that conference were adamant. They insisted that they could not accept the Senate amendments with respect to repeal or reduction of the excise taxes. There is no question that that did take place. The chairman of the committee has expressed his reasons why. I differ with him. I do not believe that the reasons given sufficiently outweigh the benefits which would accrue if we had made some concessions to the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the tax treatment in the conference report, dealing with the expropriation of American held property, is this to be limited strictly to property which was expropriated in Cuba, or will it relate to property which may have been expropriated in some country in South America? Will it be limited strictly to Cuba?

Mr. MILLS. The amendment is limited to properties expropriated in Cuba by the Government of Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. And it is retroactive in its effect to 1958. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 456(o)) is amended to read as follows:

"(o) Except during the period of a war or a national emergency declared by the Congress after the date of the enactment of the 1964 amendment to this subsection, where the father or one or more sons or daughters of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this title unless he volunteers for induction."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have one question. Is this amendment or are the amendments adopted to this bill germane to the bill as it passed the House of Representatives?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under the law today, a sole surviving son of a family in which one or more sons or daughters died while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States is exempt from induction. The existing law does not exempt a sole surviving son whose father died in service.

The bill, H.R. 2664, provides exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

The Senate agreed to the House bill insofar as extending the exemption to the sole surviving son of a father who died in service is concerned, but amended the bill to provide that all exemptions for sole surviving sons would not be applicable during a period of war or national emergency declared by Congress after the proposed legislation becomes law.

The net effect of the Senate amendment is that sole surviving sons will not be drafted in times of peace or during an emergency declared by the President, but sole surviving sons will be liable for induction in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress after the proposed legislation becomes law.

AMEND MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "1964" and insert "1965".

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the same question I asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], namely, are all of the

amendments to this bill germane to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. I will explain the amendment to you. It is merely that the subsidy provision expires tonight. This amendment changes the House bill from extending the subsidy 2 years to the Senate provision which extends it 1 year. So we agreed with the Senate and it will be an extension of 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A PROPOSED NEW AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE FOR COOPERATION IN THE EXCHANGE OF ATOMIC INFORMATION WITH THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND ITS MEMBER NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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, and without objection was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 16, 1964, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, jointly recommended to me, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, a proposed new agreement to provide for cooperation in the exchange of atomic information with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations.

The new agreement will supersede an existing agreement executed in 1955, and will do two things:

(a) It will extend the types of information which we can exchange with NATO. This expanded area of information is needed to enable our Allies to make effective use of nuclear delivery systems being provided them by the United States under bilateral procedures and agreements following creation of NATO atomic stockpiles in 1957.

(b) It will permit NATO member countries to share in information which the United States has hitherto been exchanging only with the NATO organization itself under the 1955 agreement. This will make these countries' role in alliance planning in the nuclear field more effective.

This new agreement thus represents a logical and useful step in our continuing and varied efforts to ensure wider Allied participation in NATO nuclear defense. Such wider participation is necessary on both military and political grounds. It is needed to enhance the effectiveness of NATO defense. On political grounds, it is needed to reinforce NATO cohesion by meeting our Allies' legitimate desire to make a constructive contribution to nuclear defense.

Therefore, I have authorized the Secretary of State to execute this new agreement between the Government of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations to provide for the cooperation relevant to the exchange of atomic information for NATO planning purposes.

In accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, together with a letter from the Secretary of State, a copy of the joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of the agreement, and a copy of my approval memorandum.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1964.

ANNUAL REPORT OF ALIEN PROPERTY OFFICE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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, and without objection was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1964.

THE CARNATION AS OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my Colorado colleagues of the House and I have today introduced legislation to authorize the selection of the carnation as our national flower.

Undoubtedly, this vast Nation has been endowed with many natural beauties which could readily lay claim to such a title, but the carnation, with its history, growth, and development seems to symbolize the character of America.

The heritage of America included the inheritance of the fragrant, herbaceous perennial known to us all as the carnation. Technically a native of southern Europe known as the *Dianthus caryophyllus*, the carnation is a simple garden flower which has flourished as well in a wild state in England.

Universally recognized for its simplistic beauty and fragrance, the fringed blossom of the carnation may be solid or striped or laced with color. Sometimes known as the colorful gillyflower, it has been acclaimed by Chaucer, Spen-

ser, and Shakespeare. It was, indeed, the latter who dubbed these fragrant beauties: "The fairest flowers o' the season."

Others, of course, will advance their own fair beauties, and I could take no exception; however, if our national floral emblem is to be a symbol representative of America, it should be kept in mind that:

The carnation, a perennial, knows no season and is available always in all areas of the Nation.

The carnation, a floral beauty with no thorns or thistles, is as distinctive as it is democratic—it fits equally well in the setting of the family mantle and a state dinner at the White House—it is equally acceptable for wear by both men and women, it is adaptable to all occasions from wedding banquets to floral remembrances.

The carnation, as a truly national flower, would be a natural choice of the distinctive American character.

Mr. Speaker, although my native State, Ohio, has chosen the carnation as its State flower, no nation has yet named it as its floral emblem. If this Nation is to be so represented, it could wisely select this beautiful blossom as its national flower.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my colleague from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN].

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, many flowers have been proposed as the official national flower. The spectrum of suggestions runs from the rose to the corn tassel. Each flower has its strong advocates and compelling arguments that support its claim to the honor of being the national flower.

The national flower, however, should reflect the many moods and facets of the American people. It should be both ornamental and utilitarian. It should not be confined to a single season or a single area. As a national flower it should represent the Nation.

The national flower should be dignified, yet bright; colorful to fit the most joyful occasion and somber to fit the most solemn. It should be the symbol of joy and happiness; of commemoration and remembrance.

In cool, colorful Colorado we specialize in the cultivation, growth and perfection of the crisp, cheerful carnation. This beautiful flower is equally at home in the winter corsage, worn at the Christmas ball; in the summer bouquet, decorating the Sunday evening table; as the groom's boutonniere and the bride's nosegay; and as the commemorative flower on Mother's Day.

We are a people of many moods. We are sometimes gay and carefree; we are sometimes solemn and contemplative. We are aware of history's lessons of the past and we are eager to walk into tomorrow.

The carnation fits each and all of these moods. I respectfully suggest it is the perfect choice as the national flower and have today introduced a bill with my colleague from Colorado on this subject.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. CHENOWETH] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to join my colleagues from Colorado in urging that the carnation be designated as our national flower. I have today introduced a bill that would give the carnation this distinction, and national recognition.

The carnation is a lovely flower and is a favorite everywhere in this country. We are very proud of the fact that Colorado grows the finest carnations in the Nation. These carnations are shipped to every part of the country and Colorado carnations are always in great demand.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the bills my colleagues from Colorado and I have introduced today will receive favorable consideration. I am sure there would be general approval if Congress should pass this legislation making the carnation our national flower.

We are indebted to the carnation growers of Colorado for the lovely flowers you are wearing today. I am pleased that you could enjoy these carnations and observe their great beauty. I hope you are now fully convinced that the carnation should be our national flower.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I announced that testimony from the executive agencies on pending immigration legislation would begin on Wednesday, July 1, with the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, as our opening witness. A change has been made in the date for the appearance of Secretary Rusk to Thursday, July 2, due to an engagement of Secretary Rusk with the President of Costa Rica on the prior date.

Testimony from interested Members will be concluded today and the record of hearings will be open for the next 10 calendar days so that Members who have not appeared before the subcommittee may file statements to be included in the first part of our record of hearings, which, as previously announced, was set aside for Members of Congress to testify or present statements for inclusion in the record of hearings.

In the event that Members may wish to testify this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if it is anticipated that we will hold hearings during the week beginning July 6?

Mr. FEIGHAN. No, I have not made any decision, because I am waiting to find out whether or not we shall have a recess beginning on the second.

Mr. POFF. Then, do I understand if the House stands in recess during the week of July 6, we will not hold hearings during that week or the week beginning July 13?

Mr. FEIGHAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I feel it would be highly inadvisable to hold hearings at that time because of the inability of the members of the subcommittee to be present.

Mr. POFF. I am afraid that the answer of the gentleman is not quite responsive to my question. We should have some definite assurance that there will not be hearings scheduled during the week of July 6 or the week of July 13. I am awaiting the answer to that question.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the first instance, I believe the gentleman will agree that whenever hearings have been held before, they have been held with the mutual understanding and consent of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. That is true, and I am grateful for the cooperation that has been shown me. Yet I must ask for a positive response to my question concerning the week of July 6 and the week of July 13.

Assuming that the House stands in recess during those 2 weeks, is my understanding correct that we will not hold hearings?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, July 1, 1964, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

THE 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST PERMANENT SETTLEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BENNETT 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. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 400 years ago today, June 30, 1564, the permanent settlement of our country began. It began with the saying of prayers of thanksgiving and the digging of earth in what is now northeast Florida.

Yes, 1564 not only saw the birth of Shakespeare in England, the death of Michelangelo in Italy and the death of Calvin in Switzerland. It was not only an age and a year unparalleled in literature, in art and in religion, but it was also the year of our beginning.

The 16th century has justly been called the golden age of discovery. As such, it was the product of the development of the science of navigation and the courage of its great navigators, who opened up the New World for settlement. For us Americans, 1564 was indeed a banner year for it marked the very beginning of the permanent settlement of what is now the United States.

It was Rene de Goulaine de Laudonniere, a French Huguenot sea captain who pulled off this event. He headed the Fort Caroline Colony for France's Queen Mother Catherine de Medici, discovered gold for the royal treasury in the Appalachian Mountains and experienced starvation with his colony when the promised aid from France did not come about. His critics said of him that he was more of a pilot than a Governor. He thwarted repeated efforts to stab him, to cudgel him, and to blow him to bits. In the colony's starving times he allowed no one to touch a feather of the colony's hundred chickens, saved to populate the farmyards of posterity. He observed:

It was necessary for a Governor to make himself known and obeyed lest everyone would become the master.

Against Laudonniere's northeast Florida colony, Fort Caroline, Spain's King Phillip II sent Pedro Menendez de Aviles, admiral of the Spanish Armada and a crafty and firm man who drove Laudonniere from Fort Caroline and established St. Augustine as the oldest continuous settlement in what is now the United States. Mendoza, the priest companion of Menendez sums up the reason for the Spaniard's success by the comment that "he was a friend of his own opinion." He was truly persistent and of unshakable self-confidence.

The conquering of the French in Florida was marked by the martyrdom of Capt. Jean Ribault, a late arrival at Fort Caroline and an erstwhile friend of Queen Elizabeth of England. He met his death at the hand of Menendez when he refused to recant his independent religious beliefs to save himself from execution.

This settlement of Florida 400 years ago was not only significant because it began our permanent settlement, but also because it was the first settlement of men and women to come to our country for religious freedom. Mr. Speaker, these little-known facts of our ancient past should inspire us in our day to do better. It is a time for forbearance.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest civil rights bill ever written for all our people is the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. The civil rights bill now being rushed through the Congress subverts the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights guarantees trial by jury, property rights, peaceful assembly, and protects our homes and business from unwarranted search and seizure. This so-called civil rights bill would limit and curtail the Bill of Rights. This bill is the opposite of the Bill of Rights.

The passage of this civil rights bill will whet the appetite of the power-mad pressure groups for more such legislation. It will create more violence, demonstrations, and disrespect for law and order. It will sponsor invasions and phony crusades in some States and sections of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope by some miracle political expediency will be postponed and constitutional government preserved by this civil rights bill being rejected.

COMMENTS ON MINORITY VIEWS OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to enter into the annual debate over the foreign aid program and the appropriations which are so essential to the strength of this Nation and our humanitarian commitments around the world, I would like to call some relevant material to the attention of my distinguished colleagues.

I refer to a series of statements made in the form of a rebuttal to the minority views, as contained in the committee report.

These statements should be read by every Member of the House. They offer convincing proof that there are a great many misconceptions regarding the tone and content of the foreign assistance program.

The rebuttals show, for example, the actual number of foreign aid projects being financed, the number of the people on the foreign aid payroll, and a number of other precise facts. These rebuttals indicate that many who oppose the program do so on the basis of hearsay.

The material will be included in the course of my speech this afternoon, and I hope and trust that every Member of the House will consider these facts. I am certain that the rebuttals to the minority views, together with the material presented during the debate by the supporters of this program, will prove sufficient momentum to pass the bill. I look

forward to that debate and the prospect of passage of the appropriations without further cuts.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 172]

Arends	Kee	Powell
Ashley	Kilburn	Purcell
Avery	Landrum	Rains
Bass	Lankford	Rivers, S.C.
Bennett, Mich.	Lesinski	Roberts, Tex.
Brown, Calif.	Lloyd	Robison
Buckley	Long, La.	Rogers, Tex.
Celler	McDowell	Senner
Dent	Macdonald	Sheppard
Derwinski	Madden	Staggers
Dingell	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Evins	Michel	Thompson, La.
Glenn	Miller, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Gray	Morrison	Toll
Gubser	Morton	Tollefson
Hansen	Murphy, N.Y.	Tuten
Harding	Nelsen	Van Deerlin
Harsha	Norblad	Wallhauser
Healey	O'Hara, Mich.	Wilson, Bob
Hébert	Patman	Wilson,
Hoffman	Pepper	Charles H.
Hosmer	Pilcher	
Jones, Ala.	Pirnie	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 793 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11812), making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I took this time and asked for this procedure in order that I might advise the House about what is going on in the House Rules Committee today. I think that the House is entitled to know what is going on there, and I think the House is entitled to know what is being done to the House and to the orderly procedure of the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, civil rights bills have been around this Capitol for several years. This particular bill has been around here for about a year. After the bill was railroaded—and I know of no better term—out of the House Committee on the Judiciary, passed the House and went over to the other body, it was kept over there for some 3 months. There that bill was almost completely rewritten. It came back here with some 80 or 90 amendments. Whereupon the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], arose in this House and asked unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table this rewritten bill with some 80 or 90 changes and pass it without any debate or consideration. Objection was made and the bill went to the Committee on Rules, whereupon the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] then filed a resolution that was referred to the Committee on Rules designed to do what he had failed to do, and which I circumvented him from doing in the House, and that is to take the bill from the Speaker's table and pass it without any amendments and with only 1 hour of consideration.

Now, follow me, if you will. What they propose to do is to get a rule to take this bill from the Speaker's table and bring it down here to the floor of the House in the next few days, without even a member of the Committee on the Judiciary or even one of the great liberals who has teamed up as a coalition to pass this bill, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], will not have an opportunity to discuss or explain this bill in that limited time, unless it be through the graciousness of whoever happens to be handling the 30 minutes on the Democratic side and the 30 minutes on the Republican side.

Mr. Speaker, I make the statement here now, and no one can successfully challenge it, that there is not one-half of 1 percent of this great legislative body, the House of Representatives, who knows what is in that bill now that we are asked to report a rule out here and to ram it down their throats; and they will not know what is in it when they are called upon to vote on it, possibly tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, if that is orderly procedure, if that is good legislature process, all right, go ahead and handle it that way. However, I imagine some of the Members of the House when they get back home are going to be asked what is in that bill. I wonder if they are going to be able to answer that question.

Why, Mr. Speaker, one of the members of the Committee on Rules who was so anxious to get this bill out to the floor said this morning:

Why, it has been in the press. There have been all kinds of stories written about what the Senate did.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, he said we should legislate based upon what the reporters in the Press Gallery say about this bill. Is that the way to legislate or is it not?

All right, the skids are greased. They propose to bring this bill out of the Com-

mittee on Rules today and then make you take it.

The question was asked this morning when we were in session up there of both these able leaders of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] and the great leader from New York [Mr. CELLER]:

Would you object to lengthening the time a little bit here, say, for another hour or 2 hours?

Why, I understand we are going to debate this foreign aid appropriation bill here for 6 hours. Yet we are told that we cannot debate this bill, the so-called civil rights bill, with all of these changes, for more than an hour.

Both of them said no, they would not agree to any extension of time.

I ask you, why the rush? The leadership on both sides, as well as the White House, the NAACP and everybody that is back of this thing, says that we have to pass it, we are going to pass it. All right. Assume that to be true. Then why not give it decent consideration?

Apparently there is some politics involved in this thing. Some people have even been so brutal as to say it is political. I want to talk in language that maybe the membership understands. I think there are some things that ought to be said. A lot of people in both parties who think they are going to make political hay out of this thing are going to be disappointed. There are some people over on my left, my good Republican friends who think there is still some hay to be harvested from this political monstrosity. Frankly, I am interested in that. I want to see a strong Republican Party in this country, I want to see a strong opposition party. I believe that it is in the interest of the country to have a strong opposition party. But I want to say to my friends you have been going down the line chasing this elusive rainbow of the minority colored bloc vote for some time; and in every election you have been losing more, more and more. There is a process of erosion going on, and you are not going to get anything out of this either.

I wonder how many of my Republican friends saw the headline the other day when the NAACP had its convention down here? They came out with a resolution which they adopted unanimously opposing the nomination of the man whom all of the press said is going to be the Republican nominee, Senator GOLDWATER. They went on record unanimously as opposed to his election. Yet there are some Republicans who think there is some political hay in this thing for them.

As one who usually calls his shots as he sees them, let me say this to my Republican friends: Take it or leave it, or take it for what it is. You have one chance, and one chance alone, to come back into power, and be a major political factor in these United States, and that is to follow the leadership of your front runner, the man who all agree is going to be nominated, make an issue of conservatism and liberalism, and give the people a choice. I know some of you would like to applaud that, but it would not be a smart thing to do at this time.

How many votes are you going to get out of the minority bloc vote as a result of the passage of this, the greatest of all legislative evils and assaults upon the Constitution of the United States? How many are you going to get?

Do you really believe that this legislative rape of the Constitution is going to be as popular in November as it was in June?

Do you really believe, after all of these demonstrations and violations of State laws, that Republican votes are going to be enhanced? You are not going to get any, and you know it if you are realistic. So why not meet the issue? Why not vote against this thing when it comes down here? Oh, there are so many grounds you could vote against it on. You could vote against it like your leader Senator GOLDWATER—a man for whom I have a great admiration—upon principle. You could vote against it because you resent, as you rightly should, the leadership movement, the combined leadership movement to ram this thing down your throat without knowing what is in it. I prefer to vote against it on principle.

Let me say to you the people of this country are entitled to a choice. If the so-called moderates in your party have their way they are not going to get it, and you know that is true.

So much for my good friends over there on the Republican side. I want to appeal to my friends on the Democratic side. I admit that the politics in this is on your side; there is no question about that. You are the ones who are going to reap the profit, if there be any profit, as the result of the passage of this iniquitous piece of legislation. But you know, I am not so sure that you are going to profit as much as you think you are.

When a "carpetbagger"—and I use the word advisedly—can go north into some of your districts, carpetbag in reverse, and get some 30- to 40-odd percent of the votes, with the combined opposition of all of the leaders of the parties and the misguided people, and so forth, with all the forces of the White House lined against them, I tell you it is significant, is it not? Does it not mean something that under all of those odds this fine, crusading young Governor of Alabama could go up there in that role and get that kind of vote?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I have to yield to my friend because I referred to his Governor.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I am sure my friend did not intimate that my Governor is a carpetbagger. To get the record straight, he is a great American, and he has done a wonderful job fighting for the cause of constitutional government. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me when I make that statement.

Mr. COLMER. I am so sorry that my friend from Alabama finds it necessary or even advisable to raise the question whether I cast any aspersions upon the great Governor of Alabama. I certainly did not. I certainly had no such intention. I repeat, I am a great admirer of this crusading young man from Alabama,

as the gentleman from Alabama himself is. I merely say that he was cast in the role of a carpetbagger in reverse, and under those odds received that kind of vote.

If I have to explain that any further, let me say this: Suppose the gentleman from New York, Mr. JAVITS, would come down into Alabama or into any other Southern State, crusading for this civil rights bill.

Do you think he could get 33 1/3 or 40 percent of the vote? Certainly not.

Now what I am trying to say to you is that I think if I were you, I would give a little consideration to this matter. I would give some consideration to it on the question of its merit. I would give some consideration to it from the political standpoint. Because it may not be as popular as you think it is.

You are going to have an opportunity here to pass on this question again. I hope you will vote against the bill this time.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman, a great and distinguished legislator and former Governor of the magnificent State of Virginia.

Mr. TUCK. I have not been a Member of the House of Representatives long enough, although I have served here a little more than 11 years, to join in any criticism of the leadership of either party in the House of Representatives. But I do want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I was in the Committee on Rules this morning and like himself I deplore the situation which exists with reference to this bill and I regret that this body composed of Representatives of the people from all the States of the Union cannot find time to give study to this bill and to the new amendments that have been added to it in the U.S. Senate.

I wondered this morning as I sat there, really disturbed and really shocked at the complacency with which my distinguished colleagues could discuss such a horrendous piece of legislation so destructive of the rights of people everywhere. I wondered why there was such haste. Finally, someone mentioned that the reason for the haste was that they wanted to sign this bill into law on the 4th day of July. Well, I certainly hope that if we should pass this bill between now and then that no one will consider it advisable to desecrate our freedom day, our liberty day, by signing such a piece of legislation into law on the 4th day of July. It would serve to demean and denigrate the memory of that great Virginian and American, Thomas Jefferson, who believed in the diffusion of power among the States and among the localities and among the people and who was opposed to the strong centralization of power in Washington. I am certain that if such a thing were done on that day which meant so much to him that it would detract from that memory of him amongst our people to which he is so richly entitled.

I do not claim to be a historian. I have only a superficial knowledge of history, even of the history of this great

country. But I have read and studied something about Thomas Jefferson because of the fact that he was a native of Virginia and served as the second Governor of our Commonwealth. I have read the books on Jefferson in power by that great Indiana historian, Claude G. Bowers. I have also read Jefferson and Hamilton by the same distinguished and learned author. I have read about Jefferson in many other treatises, and certainly the impression I have gotten from such reading and study would be that Jefferson would be opposed to this centralization of power in Washington which is contained in this monstrous piece of legislation which is about to be foisted upon the people of the country today. I can say too, in conclusion, that Jefferson, after he had served as ambassador plenipotentiary to several of the larger countries in the world and had served as Vice President of the United States and for 8 years as President of the United States and had guided the destiny of this Nation for 16 additional years, before he died, wrote his own epitaph.

The first thing he wished to be remembered for was that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence, which was signed on the 4th day of July. Another thing was that he was the author of the Virginia statute of religious freedom. Another was that he was the founder of the University of Virginia, an institution of learning.

I hope that someone somewhere, if this monstrous bill should be enacted into law between now and the 4th of July, will have the good taste to select some other day for it to be signed into law. God knows I cannot think of any appropriate day, but I know that the 4th of July is not a good day for such a purpose. I certainly hope it will not be done on the 4th of July.

In my declining years, as comes to those of us who pass threescore years and ten, as we walk wearily under the burden of years, I want my conscience to be soothed by the knowledge that I have protested vigorously and I have done everything within my feeble power to prevent the enactment of such legislation as this. I resent the enactment into law of such a bill as this on July 4, a patriotic day.

I thank you, sir.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my good friend for his splendid contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I took this time because, although I am a member of the Rules Committee, I recognized this would be the only opportunity I would have. It is the only opportunity all Members will have to hear someone explain the procedure through which it is proposed to ram this bill down the throats of the people of the country. I merely wanted those of you who will not have the opportunity to speak to know what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1963, when the late President Kennedy sent the civil rights message to the Congress, I issued a statement on what might be expected. Although more than a year has elapsed since that statement was issued, I think it was pertinent then and I think it applies today. I also think that it will

prove to be prophetic. For that reason I have submitted it herewith for the record and for future events to disclose whether or not it was prophetic.

I am confident that most Members of both the North and the South, Democrats and Republicans, would prefer to have no part of it. But the power of the Presidency, the Justice Department, and the Negro bloc-vote appeal are powerful weapons.

The administration has created a "Frankenstein" and is now hollering "wolf." In fact, those responsible for the present racial unrest are even appealing to their pet whipping-boy, the South, and their traditional enemy, the Republicans, to ball them out.

We are told that we are faced with a revolution. What politicians, do-gooders and radical Negro leaders refuse to recognize is that the racial problem is one of evolution and not of revolution.

The Negro race has made the greatest progress in this country that any race has ever made in a similar period of time. This has been accomplished under the guiding and helping hand of his white brother, particularly his southern white brother. He cannot be brought up overnight on a plane with the white race which has had the benefit of civilization, Christianity and education for more than 2,000 years. He must trod the same slow path which has characterized the advancement of the white race.

There are already ample and adequate laws on the books to protect the rights of all minority groups. No amount of appeasement, no law or no court decree can or will solve the problem.

The President's proposals are more far reaching than his stated objective of equal rights for Negroes. The racial angle is but one facet of the evils proposed. These new civil wrongs advocated by the administration strike at the very foundation stones of our system of constitutional government.

The enactment of the President's recommendations can only result in:

1. The further tragic breakdown of good relations between the races.
2. A step-up in more and more demands by the Negro agitators.
3. More regimentation of the American people by a strong centralized Federal Government, with the resultant deprivations of the liberties of all American citizens.
4. A further significant, if not fatal, assault upon the free enterprise system and the death-knell of State sovereignty.
5. The end of the one-party system in the South.

These unwise and unconstitutional requests, with all of their dangerous implications, should be recognized by all Americans for what they are. They are purely political and should be treated as such. They are reminiscent of Reconstruction days when the prostrated people of the South were governed by the carpetbaggers and the bayonet.

"While this is a national problem, our southern representatives in both the House and the Senate should take the lead in opposing these new and drastic assaults upon constitutional government as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Because of recent incidents in other sections of the country, it is possible that help may come from these sources. The South is historically the defender of States rights and sovereignty. It is also the greatest potential political minority in the country. Its representatives in the Congress must make this final effort to close the ranks and, oblivious to party alinement and self-aggrandizement, say like the Spartans of old 'They shall not pass.'"

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are actually at this time considering House Resolution 793, which resolution, from the Rules Committee, relates to the foreign aid appropriation bill and would waive all points of order in regard to H.R. 11812, the foreign aid appropriation bill.

I wish to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I personally am opposed to this particular rule, even though I am presenting it for the minority side of the House.

This is the third time this year the Rules Committee has been asked to waive points of order. As to each of the previous bills, I was in agreement with the waiver of points of order for the reasons stated at those particular times. I believe the bills were the military construction bill and the public works bill.

This is the last appropriation bill, I believe the 12th, and it is the desire of all of us to pass the appropriation bills and get them over to the other side of the Capitol.

When this measure was presented to the Rules Committee it was my understanding that a request was made of our committee to waive points of order due to the fact that the foreign aid authorization bill had not been signed into law. None of us had any objection to waiving points of order so far as that particular reason was concerned. As a matter of fact, when we first went into executive session the decision of the Rules Committee was that we would waive points of order regarding the authorization, so that the appropriation bill could be considered legally by the House of Representatives.

The chairman of the committee, the honorable gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] agreed to prepare, with the Parliamentarian, the necessary rule.

Later in the day we were informed that apparently this could not be done, so we walked up the hill and we walked down again, and we went back into the committee at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and waived all points of order.

It is my understanding that there is some language in this bill which is subject to a point of order.

If we are to have rules, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we should abide by them.

I have no objection whatsoever—neither do the five Members on the minority side—to waiving the point of order on the authorization, so that the appropriation bill can be considered.

I will say, too, that all five of us on the minority side oppose waiving completely all points of order on a bill as important as this foreign aid bill is.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I wish to indicate my support for his position. As a matter of fact, I would have preferred that no rule be granted, but if we were to have a rule, we should have had the kind of rule described by the gentleman from California. We should not have gone as far as we have in the rule before us.

Mr. SMITH of California. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does not the gentleman realize that because of the fact that there is no law authorizing these appropriations at the present time, this rule waiving points of order is merely a gimmick and used in order to get you folks to the Republican Convention so that you can nominate BARRY GOLDWATER?

Mr. SMITH of California. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that that is not my understanding. We were here last year until Christmas, I will say to the gentleman, and I was up in the Rules Committee until 3:30 in the morning on this foreign aid appropriation bill. I do not think the way this rule is passed has anything to do with the convention. We are perfectly willing, as I say, to go ahead and expedite waiving the authorization, but there is language in here that I do not think the gentleman from New York would agree we should waive points of order on. I know you have never asked us to do that on any of your appropriation bills.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. So far as I know, there is absolutely nothing new in this bill that would be subject to a point of order with the exception of one paragraph. I do not believe that the House would object to waiving a point of order on that paragraph. If the gentleman will permit me, I will just read that paragraph.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from California will yield for that purpose, I will cite to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] the paragraph in the bill. It is on page 4, beginning on line 5.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is right. It reads:

Of the foregoing amounts for economic assistance, \$300,000,000 shall be available for obligation only through the apportionment review and approval procedure prescribed by law in such amounts and at such times as may be determined by the President in the national interest that funds otherwise available for the purposes of programs under this title are insufficient to meet the cost of additional authorized projects.

All that language does is to reserve \$300 million of the amount in this bill which can only be used if the President certifies that it is in the national interest. The purpose of the section is to save money, and to put this amount aside and not permit it to be apportioned as the law requires the rest of the bill to be apportioned. This is an effort to save some of the money in this bill, and so far as I know, that is the only item in this entire bill subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of California. My understanding is that was one of the points of language subject to a point of order. Although I only know what I am told on matters presented, I was informed the language might be questionable and subject to a point of order in some regard to the United Nations language in the bill. That is what I was told.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if the gentleman believes that only the language he has read is subject to a point of order, why did he not ask for a rule that would exempt that specific language? Why did you insist upon a rule that waives points of order on the entire bill? The gentleman knows, and I am sure he knows, that there are other items in this bill subject to a point of order. If he does not know that, he had better study his own bill.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield for just a moment—

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman in the well of the House has the time.

Mr. GARY. I have not admitted that the language is subject to a point of order, and I do not think it is, but I said, so far as I know, it is the only provision against which a point of order might lie.

I am told that there are one or two other provisions that might be subject to a point of order but the paragraph under discussion is the only new language that was put in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. You need no waiver of points of order if you do not have language in the bill that is subject to a point of order; the gentleman knows that. You were before the Rules Committee and asked for a waiver of points of order on the entire bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], in the statement he has made in opposition to the rule. I, too, appeared before the Committee on Rules, as the gentleman well knows, and appealed to the committee to present a rule waiving points of order only on the basis of the authorization bill, providing the right to call up this bill. All other language in the bill then would have been subject to a point of order. That was fair. Presumably that was what members of the Appropriations Committee wanted when they went to the Committee on Rules, which thereupon held two meetings. They marched up the hill shortly after noon and by 5 o'clock in the afternoon they marched down the hill again, apparently appeasing the Democrat leadership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, is it becoming fashionable around here to go to the Committee on Rules to set aside the rules of the House? Is this to be the fashion in the future? If it is, then some of us around here will have to resort to every known device to throw roadblocks in the way of the leadership. That is what we will have to do if this is what we are going to have to contend with in appropriation bills, giving the right to the Committee on Appropriations to write legislation. And that is what you will do if you adopt this rule.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and, I might add, also with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa

[Mr. Gross]. This action today seems to be part of the basic theory expressed by the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], previously this year, at the time the rules of the House were waived, when he said that the majority has the right to work its will. I made the point that the majority has the right to work its will only through following procedures which enable this body to be a deliberative body.

If it is simply a matter of having the majority work its will then, of course, you can do by majority vote what you wish on this rule, or any rule waiving in effect the rules of the House which have been carefully devised over a period of many years so that the subject can be orderly debated. The rules of procedure are the base for representative government.

I suggest that this continuing use on the part of the majority, or abuse I would say, by majority vote to disregard the rules that have been written for the Congress for a specific purpose, and have proved themselves over a period of years to be necessary in order that this may be a deliberative body, should be halted. The rules of the House are being disregarded. The majority is, in effect, eating at the very basis of representative government.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I respect the views of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. But the only reason we have a Committee on Rules is to bring out special rules instead of using the general rules of the House. And that is a complete answer to what he has said, in my opinion.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 162, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—222

Addabbo	Beckworth	Brooks
Albert	Bennett, Fla.	Broomfield
Andrews, Ala.	Blatnik	Brown, Calif.
Ashley	Boggs	Burke
Aspinall	Boland	Burkhalter
Ayres	Bolling	Burleson
Bates	Brademas	Burton, Calif.

Byrne, Pa.	Hechler
Cahill	Herlong
Cameron	Hollifield
Carey	Holland
Casey	Horton
Chelf	Hosmer
Clark	Huddleston
Cochelan	Hull
Conte	Jarman
Cooley	Jennings
Corman	Joelson
Daddario	Johnson, Wis.
Daniels	Jones, Mo.
Davis, Ga.	Karsten
Davis, Tenn.	Karth
Dawson	Kastenmeier
Delaney	Keith
Dent	Kelly
Denton	Keogh
Diggs	Kilgore
Donohue	King, Calif.
Downing	Kirwan
Dulski	Kluczynski
Duncan	Kornegay
Dwyer	Landrum
Edmondson	Leggett
Edwards	Libonati
Elliott	Lindsay
Everett	Long, Md.
Fallon	McDowell
Farbstein	McFall
Fascell	Madden
Feighan	Mahon
Finnegan	Mailliard
Fino	Marsh
Flood	Martin, Mass.
Flynt	Mathias
Fogarty	Matsunaga
Fountain	Matthews
Fraser	Meader
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.
Friedel	Mills
Fulton, Pa.	Minish
Fulton, Tenn.	Monagan
Fuqua	Montoya
Gallagher	Moorhead
Garmatz	Morgan
Gary	Morris
Glaimo	Morrison
Gibbons	Morse
Gilbert	Morton
Gill	Mosher
Gonzalez	Multer
Grabowski	Murphy, Ill.
Green, Ore.	Natcher
Green, Pa.	Nedzi
Griffiths	Nix
Hagen, Calif.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Halleck	O'Hara, Ill.
Halpern	O'Hara, Mich.
Hanna	Olsen, Mont.
Hansen	Olson, Minn.
Harding	O'Neill
Harvey, Mich.	Osmers
Hawkins	Patman
Hays	Patten
Healey	Pepper

NAYS—162

Abbutt	Byrnes, Wis.
Abele	Cederberg
Abernethy	Chamberlain
Adair	Chenoweth
Alger	Clancy
Anderson	Clausen,
Andrews,	Don H.
N. Dak.	Clawson, Del
Ashbrook	Cleveland
Ashmore	Collier
Baker	Colmer
Baldwin	Corbett
Baring	Cramer
Battin	Cunningham
Becker	Curtin
Beermann	Curtis
Belcher	Dague
Bell	Derounian
Berry	Devine
Betts	Dole
Bolton,	Dorn
Frances P.	Dowdy
Bolton,	Ellsworth
Oliver P.	Findley
Bonner	Fisher
Bow	Ford
Bray	Foreman
Brock	Gathings
Bromwell	Goodell
Brotzman	Gooding
Brown, Ohio	Griffin
Broyhill, N.C.	Gross
Broyhill, Va.	Grover
Bruce	Gubser
Burton, Utah	Gurney

Perkins	Phillips
Philbin	Pickle
Pike	Pirnie
Poage	Poff
Huddleston	Price
Pucinski	Randall
Reid, N.Y.	Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.	Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska	Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.	Rodino
Rogers, Colo.	Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.	Roosevelt
Rosenthal	Rostenkowski
Roush	Roybal
Ryan, Mich.	Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain	St. Onge
Schwengel	Selden
Shipley	Sibal
Sickles	Sikes
Sisk	Slack
Smith, Iowa	Springer
Staabler	Stafford
Steed	Stephens
Stratton	Stubblefield
Sullivan	Teague, Tex.
Thomas	Thompson, Tex.
Trimble	Tupper
Udall	Ullman
Van Deerlin	Vank
Vinson	Wallhauser
Watts	Weltner
White	Whitten
Wickersham	Widnall
Wright	Young
Zablocki	

Milliken	Rumsfeld
Minshall	St. George
Moore	Saylor
Murray	Schadeberg
Norblad	Schenck
O'Konski	Schneebeli
Ostertag	Schweiker
Passman	Scott
Pelly	Secrest
Pillion	Short
Pool	Shriver
Quie	Siler
Quillen	Skubitz
Reid, Ill.	Smith, Calif.
Reifel	Smith, Va.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Snyder
Rich	Stinson
Rivers, S.C.	Taft
Rogers, Fla.	Talcott
Rogers, Tex.	Taylor
Roudebush	Teague, Calif.

NOT VOTING—47

Arends	Hardy	Nelsen
Auchincloss	Hébert	Pilcher
Avery	Hoffman	Powell
Barrett	Johnson, Calif.	Purcell
Barry	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Bass	Kee	Robison
Bennett, Mich.	Kilburn	Senner
Buckley	Lankford	Sheppard
Celler	Lesinski	Staggers
Derwinski	Lloyd	Thompson, La.
Dingell	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Evins	Macdonald	Toll
Forrester	Michel	Tuten
Glenn	Miller, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Grant	Moss	Wilson,
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Charles H.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
 Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
 Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Michel against.
 Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
 Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Nelsen against.
 Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Derwinski against.
 Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Avery.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Kee.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Bass with Mr. Forrester.
 Mr. Evins with Mr. Grant.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Staggers.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Rains.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Tuten with Mr. Pilcher.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Moss.

Messrs. QUIE, GUBSER, and WHARTON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GARY. 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 (H.R. 11812) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 6 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and one-half by myself

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11812, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] will be recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], will be recognized for 3 hours.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the very outset that I am performing this task not by choice. We have a situation in which it fell to my lot to present this bill. The majority of the subcommittee did not agree with the recommendations of the chairman of the subcommittee and after the majority of the subcommittee had spoken the chairman said that he was not in accord with their action and he therefore withdrew from the further handling of the bill.

Under the rules of the House as the next ranking member of the subcommittee it became my duty to handle the bill. And here I am.

But may I say that I certainly cannot be considered a novice in the handling of the bill. It so happens that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and I have had the privilege of serving on this subcommittee longer than any other person in the entire Congress. It fell my lot to become its first chairman back in 1948 when it was created. I served as chairman for about 6 years. During that time I had two chairmanships. I was the chairman of the Subcommittee for Treasury and Post Office Appropriations and also for Foreign Aid. The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid was a special committee. Then the chairman decided to make a regular subcommittee out of it, and under committee rules, a member could not hold the chairmanship of two regular committees. I chose the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office and willingly retired as the chairman of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee. I have, however, continued to serve on the subcommittee since that time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I favor the foreign aid program. I have been in favor of the program since its very inception. I consider it an essential part of our foreign policy as well as our national defense.

Oh, I know that there has been a lot of criticism of it. We talk about waste, inefficiency, and mistakes that have been made. Certainly, no one has striven harder than I to eliminate the waste, the inefficiency, and the mistakes in the program. However, in a program of this magnitude it is almost inevitable that

there will be some errors made because it extends all over the world. We have the difficulty of selecting able men to conduct such an extensive program. When we get good men, we get a good program. When we get inefficient people, we get an inefficient program. Yet I do believe that in the last few years this program has been greatly improved.

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the inefficiency of the program, let us also consider the other side of the ledger. In my judgment the foreign aid program has saved the world from communism. I say this without hesitation.

My mind goes back to the year 1947. I was in Europe that year. I came back and I told my people in numerous speeches that one thing that impressed me more than anything else was the fact that regardless of where we traveled, regardless of what country we were in, there was unmistakable evidence of the fact that the rulers of Soviet Russia had determined upon a course of world domination and that nothing short of that would satisfy them. Certainly nothing has happened since that time to change my opinion.

I will remember that just about that time Russia had taken over Yugoslavia; they had taken over Hungary; they had taken over Czechoslovakia, without firing a single shot. Italy was having an election at that time and we were desperately afraid that the Communists would win the election.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, suggested what eventually became known as the Marshall plan. He suggested that we go to the aid of these weak countries in Europe. They had been overrun during the war, they were devastated, and they had lost hope. So, we started with the Marshall plan. What happened? Immediately the march of Russia was stopped. Italy voted against communism and eventually Europe was saved.

It was estimated that the Marshall plan would be a 5-year plan and would cost \$15 billion. Instead it was completed in 4 years and cost \$12 billion. It accomplished its purpose. I do not ask the members of the committee to take my word alone for this. In 1952 I was again in Europe, this time as a member of the so-called Richards committee. We were briefed by General Eisenhower, who was then the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.

The question was asked him in this briefing:

General, in your opinion what would have happened had we not had the Marshall plan?

He said:

In my judgment if it were not for that program, with the possible exception of Spain, every country in Europe would be Communist today.

I think he was right.

When we stopped them there, what did they do? They blockaded Berlin, and we had to put forth that tremendous effort in the Berlin airlift. All of you will remember what a magnificent, outstanding job our military forces did in supporting Berlin from the air.

Then when they saw they were blocked there, they started to use force in Korea,

and it was necessary for us then to meet force with force. This we did. We stopped communism again in Korea, at a great cost, I admit, but we stopped them. We found then that our allies were not prepared to render material military assistance in case of war, and we were convinced that Russia was going to continue to use force unless we opposed force with force.

So what happened? We started the military assistance program to aid our allies, and this we have continued along with the economic program to strengthen the free nations militarily and economically so that they could retain their freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could tell you that the fight or the threat is over. The threat still exists. Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara came before our committee and told us that it was essential that we continue this program. We need it today as much as we have ever needed it.

Let us look for a few moments at the budget request. In the budget that was presented last year for funds for the fiscal year 1964 the first request was for \$4.9 billion—approximately \$5 billion. You will recall that President Kennedy at that time appointed an impartial committee headed by General Lucius Clay to make a study of this program. After the Clay Committee reported, the President himself voluntarily reduced the program to \$4.5 billion. The Congress authorized only \$3.6 billion in the authorization bill. Then the request was further cut in the appropriation bill to a final figure of \$3 billion, plus a carryover of \$399 million of unobligated balances from 1963.

What happened this year? We have a new President. President Johnson, as all of you know, promised to present a reduced budget. He wanted a tax cut, as did the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States. The President felt that unless the expenditures were reduced the chances of getting a tax cut were very slim. The initial budget presented to him was for \$104 billion.

He worked over it night and day for weeks, until he finally brought in a budget of \$97.5 billion.

In doing that the estimates for foreign aid had to be reduced. He said:

Surely the Congress cannot object to giving me the same amount this year that they gave my predecessor last year.

So he cut the requests for the foreign aid program \$1 billion, until he got it down to the figure of last year, \$3,391,700,000, which is the amount appropriated last year plus the carryover that we voted for the program. That was the figure that he submitted to the Congress.

Then we had additional difficulties in Vietnam. The President sent the Secretary of Defense and David Bell to Vietnam to investigate. When Mr. McNamara and Mr. Bell returned from Vietnam and made their report to the President, he decided that it was impossible for him to conduct a proper program in Vietnam with the funds he had requested. He then came to Congress with another request for \$125

million for use in South Vietnam, \$55 million for military assistance and \$70 million for economic support. That made a total request of \$3,516,572,400.

Mind you, even with that increase this was the smallest amount that had been requested, except for 3 years, since the inception of the program in 1948. What is more, I have a very interesting table here going back to 1956, showing the budget request for each year, the appropriations for each year, the unobligated carryover, and the transfers and reimbursements and the recoveries. What does this table show? It shows that the funds available for new programs in 1965 under the bill that our subcommittee is presenting to the House today is the smallest since 1956. In other words, the aid program will have less funds available for next year than they have had at any time since 1956.

Moreover, there has been a lot of talk about the unexpended dollars, ranging around \$7 billion. But the unexpended balance, or the pipeline, for next year will be \$400 million less than for the current fiscal year.

What did our officials who are administering this program say about it? Secretary Rusk told our subcommittee the request is a bare minimum, and pointed out that the program costs us less than 4 cents out of every tax dollar. Secretary McNamara called the program essential to our continued security as a leader of the free world, and said the military assistance fund should be \$400 million more than the President's request. He added that it makes no sense to spend \$50 billion a year on defense and then refuse to spend a mere 2 percent of that amount to support our allies in the collective defense of the free world.

Both Secretary McNamara and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, testified before our committee that the military assistance program should be \$1,400 million rather than the \$1 billion that was requested. They said that the request for military assistance is not sufficient, and I also do not think it is. I did not think it was sufficient when we appropriated that amount last year. The only way they got by was by transferring money from the contingency fund to the military assistance program.

I will grant that we have not cut the military assistance estimate in this bill one single dime, but frankly I do not think the President asked for enough money insofar as military assistance is concerned.

But let me say this. I have gone along with the chairman and members of our subcommittee from year to year in cutting this program. I think this budget which has been presented this year is a tribute to our committee. I think we have won a great victory. We have been cutting the budget each year trying to eliminate the waste, and in recognition of that fact, the President this year accepted our figures of last year. So I think we have won a victory, and I, for one, am not for snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

There is one other item I would like to discuss briefly, and that is the question of personnel.

We are told that the personnel in this program increased 7,000 during the past year. Now that just is not correct. I invite your attention to the table appearing on page 121 of our hearings. That table shows that instead of having 71,000 employees as claimed, the actual employees, that is, the direct-hire personnel, is only 28,569; and that is a reduction of 3,647 over the past year.

As to the persons participating in the program other than direct hire, which includes contractor employees and man-year equivalent of reimbursable support services of other agencies, they had 9,493 last year. This year the figure is 9,635. That is up by 142.

Now here is where the 71,000 figure comes from. There are participants in the program, the foreign nationals that we are training in the program. We do not pay them any salary. We do not pay them any wages. It is true we do pay in some instances for their subsistence and for their tuition in training programs. That figure is 33,212 in 1964 compared to 28,503 in 1963, and is the major factor in the total increase from 70,212 to 71,416.

In other words, they have reduced the number of regular employees, and they have increased the number of participants, which is proper.

Even then, if we include all these individuals, instead of an increase of 7,000 the increase is only 1,204.

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

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. In the hearings for fiscal year 1964, part 3, page 189, a table was included in the record by the AID personnel which shows that the grand total of U.S. employees and foreign national trainees was 64,536 as of April of 1963. In addition, if the gentleman will turn to page 893 of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, for fiscal year 1965, part 2, he will find a colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and Mr. Tennant, Mr. Tennant, as the gentleman knows, is the Controller for AID. In that colloquy Mr. Tennant appears to agree that the figure a year before was 64,000 and the figure in 1964 was 71,000.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will look at page 121 of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations for 1965, he will find a table furnished by AID, which is a later table than the one to which he refers. There it is shown that the total for 1964 was 70,212. Those are not employees, but a combination of employees and participants. Twenty-eight thousand of them are participants and they are not employees in any sense of the word.

The participants ought not to be included in any tabulation of the number of employees, since they are not employees of the U.S. Government. Even taking those figures, it was 70,212 as compared with 71,416 in 1964, which is an increase of 1,204.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will yield further, the colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and Mr. Tennant took place 1 month later than the chart to which the gentleman has referred. Mr. Tennant, the Controller for AID, apparently was disagreeing with the table which was inserted in the RECORD earlier. He was probably using more up-to-date information.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Tennant was not disagreeing with the table, because Mr. Tennant prepared the table. It may be that he did not have the table before him at the time.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The record should show clearly, so that it will not be muddled and confused, that the direct-hire personnel in the AID program in 1963 were 32,216, and by March 31, 1964, the number had dropped to 28,569, a drop of about 4,000 in direct-hire personnel. What increased was the military assistance personnel, the people in the program.

Mr. GARY. That is as it should be. They are training foreign nationals and substituting them overseas for U.S. employees. The number of U.S. employees has gone down. The number of foreign nationals participating in the program has gone up, and if they carry out the purposes of the program, that is the way it should be.

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

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. What particular difference does it make whether they are employed by the Federal Government or not? They are still eating at the taxpayers' trough, regardless.

Mr. GARY. They are not being paid salaries. They are being trained, and they are getting certain aid in order to enable them to complete their training, but they are not employees. We are training these people so that they can go out to serve their own nations. That is one of the purposes of this program.

Mr. HALEY. They are still on the taxpayers' backs.

Mr. GARY. They do get some funds from the foreign aid program, if that is what the gentleman means.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. It should be noted that on page 121, footnote 4 states, in part:

Foreign nationals receiving training are not paid wages or salaries from foreign assistance funds; they are in no sense employees of the U.S. Government.

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct.

As I said, this is a minimum program that has been presented to us.

Everything points to that fact. What did our subcommittee do? The chairman of our subcommittee recommended a cut of \$514.9 million. The majority

of the members of our subcommittee felt that cut was too much, but we still felt that the bill could stand some trimming. We did not agree with our chairman. Neither did we agree entirely with the President of the United States. The President said he had offered the bare minimum request and he did not want it cut a dime, but nevertheless our committee voted to cut it \$200 million.

This was the work of our subcommittee, but when we came to the full committee, on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], an amendment to our bill was adopted which reads, as follows:

Of the foregoing amounts for economic assistance, \$300,000,000 shall be available for obligation only through the apportionment review and approval procedure prescribed by law in such amounts and at such times as may be determined by the President in the national interest that funds otherwise available for the purposes of programs under this title are insufficient to meet the cost of additional authorized projects.

Now, there is a law which says that funds can be set aside as a reserve to be drawn on only in the case they are actually needed. Under the antideficiency law, agencies are required to apportion their expenditures in advance on a quarterly or periodic basis so that at the end of the year they will not incur a deficiency. That bill, which, in my judgment, has saved our taxpayers millions of dollars, was drafted by Mr. Cannon, the late former chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. John Taber, than whom there are none "whomer." Those gentlemen were responsible for that antideficiency law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill we have used that procedure to put into reserve an additional \$300 million. In addition to the regular reviews required under the law, these funds can be used only if the President determines that it is in the national interest.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. MAHON. Would the gentleman be willing to insert at this point in the RECORD that section of the statute which makes reference to the procedures to be followed in cases of this kind?

Mr. GARY. I would very much like to have it inserted.

Mr. MAHON. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time now, but I think it is well, in view of the point he has made, that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TITLE 31, SECTION 665

(c) Apportionment of appropriations; reserves; distribution; review.

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for

such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term "appropriation" means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

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

Mr. GARY. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Apropos of our colloquy a few minutes ago, I think it is well to put in the RECORD at this point the total cost of all personnel, both the direct hire and other than direct hire, and the participant costs in fiscal 1964.

Mr. GARY. You mean the 28,000 who are not U.S. personnel?

Mr. FORD. I will read to you what it shows on page 132 of the hearings. For fiscal year 1964, as shown in part 2 of the hearings, it shows that direct hire, both economic and military, had a total cost of \$214.9 million. Other than direct hire, for economic and military, had a total cost of \$87.3 million. Participant costs, both economic and military, were \$93.3 million, for a total cost for all categories of \$395.5 million.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's inserting that information in the RECORD, but I do want to make it perfectly plain that when he is talking of participants, he is not talking about employees of the U.S. Government.

Our committee recommends, as I stated, an actual cut in the figures submitted by the President of \$200 million; and in addition to that putting aside this reserve of \$300 million, which means that we are calling into question practically the entire amount that our subcommittee chairman urged us to cut.

As I stated at the very beginning this program is a vital part of our national defense. I have never spoken to a military man who did not say that the pe-

riphery of islands beginning in the Aleutians, over to Japan, then over to Korea, over to Okinawa, over to Formosa and then on to the Philippines, were not a necessary part of our national defense. They are necessary for two reasons. As a matter of fact, that whole area is necessary for our defense. We call it the forward defense area. And why? Because as long as they remain in friendly hands we can use them as bases in the event of war, for an attack on the enemy.

On the other hand, if they are in Communist hands, they can be used as bases for an attack on our own country. They are therefore absolutely essential to our defense.

In this connection, let me present to you a table in volume 1, page 462 of the hearings. We have two means of protecting those islands. One is to let the natives themselves defend them or to send our troops over to defend them.

In Korea they have ample manpower. When I was in Korea during the Korean war, General Van Fleet, the then commanding general, told me personally that the Koreans made excellent soldiers, and he said, "Do not let anybody tell you to the contrary." They needed training. They needed equipment. They had nothing to fight with. They needed supplies.

The same is true of Formosa. They have the troops. I have also been to Formosa. But they did not have the equipment. We had the choice of equipping their forces or sending our own forces over to defend the islands. I requested the military authorities to prepare the table which appears on page 462 which shows that in Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam, that forward area of defense, they have 1,923,359 men under arms and the total cost of maintaining those forces is \$822,823,062.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we were to supplant those men with our own troops, it would cost us a vastly greater amount. The military can give you the cost per man for maintaining our own troops on those islands. To maintain the same number of troops would cost us in military expenditures \$7,583,537,000. You might say, "Well, we would not need as many of our men because we have better soldiers." For the sake of argument let us cut the number in half. It would still cost more money just for those areas than the President has requested for the entire foreign aid program all over the world. He has only requested \$3.5 billion. It would cost us over \$3.5 billion just to maintain our own troops in those areas and, besides, it would mean that our boys in the United States who now can go ahead with their studies and prepare themselves for future life would have to spend a part of their time in these faraway places.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Europe should be protected by Europeans. I believe that Asia should be protected by Asiatics. I believe that those islands should be protected by their natives, and they are willing to do it. But they cannot do it without aid from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the aim of this program is to provide them with the equipment that is so essential for that purpose.

Friends, let me say this. This program has always been a nonpartisan program. One of my proud possessions is a letter that I received from President Eisenhower in July of 1953 which reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1953.

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VAUGHAN: In view of your previous leadership in the MSA program, I must admit that it was not a great surprise to me to find that you are still providing support for and having a positive impact on this effort. I do want you to know, however, that I greatly appreciate the help and assistance you have given this critically important national undertaking.

My compliments and congratulations to you for the fine contribution you have made to the Nation's security efforts.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of this committee at that time and I did assist President Eisenhower throughout his entire administration in supporting this program. I believe in it. I ask no credit for it. But again I say this is not a partisan program.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 174]

Arends	Harsha	Robison
Avery	Healey	Rogers, Tex.
Baring	Hébert	St Germain
Bass	Hoffman	Senner
Becker	Kee	Sheppard
Bennett, Mich.	Kilburn	Staggers
Buckley	Lankford	Steed
Celler	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Corman	Lloyd	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	Long, La.	Toll
Dingell	Long, Md.	Tuten
Evins	Martin, Calif.	Vinson
Fisher	Miller, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Frelinghuysen	Nelsen	Wilson,
Glenn	Norblad	Charles H.
Griffin	Pilcher	
Hanna	Powell	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 11812, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 383 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. GARY. At the time of the quorum call I was explaining that this has never been a partisan issue. I hope it will not become one now, and certainly there is no reason why it should. I would like to read a recent telegram which was sent by ex-President Eisenhower.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree that at least as long as I can remember this program has not been a partisan program. It has been supported by Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents. As a matter of fact I recall back in 1961 when we were considering the fiscal year 1962 appropriation for the foreign aid program I offered an amendment on the floor to add \$300 million to the military assistance program. This was necessary because the subcommittee and the full committee had made very substantial reductions in the program.

At that time the chairman of the subcommittee was the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. He opposed my amendment, and I should like to state for the record that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] opposed my amendment.

Mr. GARY. I beg the gentleman's pardon; if I am not mistaken I supported the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Virginia did in another year but not in 1961. As a matter of fact the rollcall shows that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] voted against the increase in the funds that I requested. Some of the other members of the subcommittee voted with me on that occasion.

Mr. GARY. I remember on one occasion I succeeded in bringing about a compromise in the full committee—

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. On an amendment that the gentleman offered increasing the amount in the bill.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman was right. I think the net result was for the good of the country. But over the years there have been honest differences of opinion. In 1961 the gentleman from Virginia and Mr. PASSMAN were on the same side. I wanted to increase military assistance and I was supporting at that time the budget request submitted by the late President Kennedy. The subcommittee was opposed to the increase.

All I am trying to say is that each of us in any one year has had to exercise his own best judgment and that is the responsibility of the Legislative branch.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

I want to read this telegram from former President Eisenhower which was sent to Congressman HALLECK and Senator DIRKSEN. He said:

I have long been convinced that continuation of a well conducted program of mutual security is necessary to the best interests of the Nation. During my years in the Presidency, in spite of much opposition and my realization that errors, duplications and even stupidity had often plagued the program, I consistently urged its adequate support by the Congress. While I believe that the Government should seek to eliminate waste and so improve the program that efficiency and sound long-range planning will result, I believe also that simultaneously the necessary financial support must be forthcoming. All of us of course recognize that the Congress has the final and independent responsibility for scrutinizing proposed expenditures and providing the appropriations for this pro-

gram. And I am sure it will strive to fulfill that responsibility with good judgment and without partisanship.

But as a private citizen I voice my personal belief that the sum of \$3.5 billion represents a level of mutual assistance that cannot be drastically reduced without damaging the vital interests of the United States.

With great respect,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this is a highly controversial program. I realize that the taxpayers of the United States would like to get rid of it. They have had it for a long, long time. It is a sacrifice; I will admit it is a sacrifice. But, friends, it is a sacrifice in dollars and not in lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with conditions all over the world today, particularly in those areas on the perimeter of Soviet Russia and Communist China and all I am asking the members of the Committee to do—we have a new President, he is faced with a prodigious job—is to stand by our President, the new chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, and the majority of our subcommittee who believe that the amount that we have recommended in our bill is the reasonable and proper amount for this Congress to appropriate for this vital program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members of this House to go along with us. If this amount is too much, it will not be spent. But if it is too little, it might be serious.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the members of the Committee for their attention.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, before discussing any of the details of the bill, I would like to make several factual statements that I believe will help to clear the air.

First, we are not considering a \$3.5 billion budget request for the foreign aid program for fiscal year 1965. The facts are that President Johnson has submitted to the Congress a budget request for new obligation authority under titles I and II of \$3,958,377,000. Unfortunately, based upon some of the discussion that has taken place here today, the impression has been created that the President only asked for \$3.5 billion. In reality, he has requested \$3.5 billion in round figures, plus \$441,677,000. This comes about when there is included both titles I and II. In addition, in title III he has asked for the necessary operating expenses for the Export-Import Bank.

Certainly, the impression has been created that the budget request for new obligation authority in fiscal year 1965 is a very bare-bones request. The facts are that the \$3,958 million requested in new obligation authority by President Johnson is \$694 million more than what the Congress gave to the executive branch of the Government in fiscal year 1964. The final congressional new obligation figure for fiscal year 1964 as contained in titles I and II was \$3,264 million.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is important because it shows that the budget request for the next fiscal year is over a half billion dollars more in new obligational authority than what the Congress gave to the executive branch for the current fiscal year.

I think it is well to take a look at some of the precise figures on the one hand comparing the final new obligation authority which was granted in the fiscal year 1964 and the budget request for the fiscal year 1965 in new obligation authority. There are six areas in dispute between those who signed the majority report and those who signed the minority report. I will analyze these on the basis of the request for new obligation authority and the amount of new obligation authority which was made available in the fiscal year 1964.

In the first account we have development grants. The Congress in fiscal 1964 made available \$155 million in new obligational authority. President Johnson when he submitted his budget request for the development grants program for new obligational authority asked for \$224 million, a \$69 million increase over what was made available in the fiscal year 1964.

International organizations is the next account. The Congress in the final version of the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964 made available \$116 million. President Johnson, in his January budget request for new obligational authority asked for \$134,400,000, an increase of \$18,400,000 over the current fiscal year.

The next account is supporting assistance. The Congress in its wisdom in the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill for the AID program appropriated \$330 million in new obligational authority. President Johnson in his budget submission requested new obligational authority for supporting assistance in the amount of \$405 million, \$75 million more than what Congress gave him for the current fiscal year.

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

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

Mr. GARY. Is the gentleman including in those figures the carryover amount of unobligated balances from the previous year?

Mr. FORD. I am comparing obligational authority made available in 1964 with the President's budget request for new obligational authority in 1965. I am leaving it in that context.

Mr. GARY. I would appreciate the gentleman answering the question. Is he including the carryover funds, because that was a part of our appropriation last year. We appropriated \$3 billion plus \$399 million in unobligated funds which were carried over.

Mr. FORD. That is right; and in the appropriation bill we are considering today you are going to do the same thing. You cannot be very precise how much you are going to actually appropriate in this regard. One day they say it is \$53 million, but I will wager my good friend from Virginia when the final chips are down it will be almost \$100 million in the fiscal year.

Mr. GARY. I think the gentleman is wrong. It will not go anywhere near \$100 million. The best estimate now is around \$50 million.

Mr. FORD. I think that is irrelevant. I have been very precise, and have used new obligational authority in both cases.

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

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Virginia realize it is impossible to tell how much of a carryover there will be for any fiscal year until about October of the next fiscal year. We have testimony to that effect. So the carryover at this time is always an estimate. But I can state for the benefit of the Committee, and particularly the gentleman from Virginia, that the estimate we get at this time varies rather widely from the final figure.

The estimate is always lower than the final figure, within my memory, at least. For instance, as of June 30, 1963, the original estimate for the carryover was \$243,198,000. The final figure which we got in October was \$402,443,000.

Mr. FORD. Almost 100 percent increase.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. So even if the figures which the gentleman from Virginia has given as to the estimate now are accurate, and I imagine they would be a little bit on the full side, still the carryover would be something in excess of \$110 million.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I think it well states the fact that there is a high degree of uncertainty in this program as to the amount of unobligated balance which turns up at the end of the year, as well as the amount of deobligations, and the amount of reobligations. For that reason, I have strictly limited myself to a discussion of the new obligational authority requested. This is precise. There cannot be any uncertainty about it. This is the way we ought to discuss the bill.

In discussing the supporting assistance area, the President's budget is \$75 million more than what Congress gave him last year.

In the area of the contingency fund, the President's request for new obligational authority was for \$150 million. Congress, in the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill, gave to the executive branch \$50 million. The net result is that the President's budget request on this item alone is \$100 million more than Congress gave last year.

Let us take the Alliance for Progress development loan.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the contingency fund?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely right. We appropriated last year \$50 million in new money. We also gave the President unobligated funds there of about \$127 million.

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

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

Mr. GARY. I have some figures here on the contingency fund that were sent up to me just today. I wanted to get the latest figures. Last year they had new obligational authority of \$179,499,000. To that was added \$5,264,000 in deobligations, which made a total available for the contingency fund of \$184,763,000. Of that amount, \$75 million was transferred to military assistance, \$47.4 million was used in the Far East, \$53.6 million was used in Latin America, and \$6.8 million was used for nonregional purposes which leaves an estimated balance of unobligated funds at the end of 1964 of \$384,000.

Mr. FORD. Of course, the recitation of figures by the gentleman from Virginia does not relate to the point I have been making from the outset, where I have been comparing new obligational authorities that the President asked for in January and new obligational authority that the Congress made available in fiscal year 1964.

Mr. GARY. The question is, what is available for expenditures?

Mr. FORD. Now let us turn to the Alliance for Progress development loan.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I might further clarify the situation which the gentleman from Massachusetts was addressing himself to. On page 79 of the hearings dealing with the contingency fund, the following colloquy took place:

Mr. PASSMAN. What was the amount of the unobligated funds that you did not previously request?

Mr. BELL. \$127 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. What was the total that you had available for the contingency fund?

Mr. BELL. After the appropriation—the Congress appropriated \$50 million of new money, and allowed us to use—or reappropriated, I guess is the technical phrase, the \$127 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. Giving you a total of \$177 million?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

So the amount of money available last year in the contingency fund was \$177 million. But I think the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me when we consider the use which has been made of the contingency fund last year, we should bear in mind that the administration used \$75 million for military—which is a completely unauthorized use of contingency funds.

Mr. FORD. It might be well for the gentleman from Arizona to tell how it was an unauthorized use and how it actually took place. It would be an interesting story.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Michigan knows that according to the law the contingency fund is only for economic assistance. But by transferring funds from the contingency fund over to another category of economic assistance, the administration is able to use the 10-percent transferability feature from each of these categories and in that way actually siphon money indirectly from the contingency fund over into military. This was done. This was

an unauthorized act. There is a contingency fund of \$300 million which is available for the military but which the administration did not choose to use at all. So when you consider what happened to that \$177 million of contingency funds last year, I think in all due fairness you should deduct \$75 million for military and say that at the very most the amount of \$102 million was expended as Congress intended it to be expended and as the gentleman knows the minority will offer an amendment to appropriate the amount of \$100 million for the contingency fund next year which will be almost the same as the amount that was spent properly last year.

Mr. FORD. I might add to the comment of the gentleman from Arizona. He mentioned there is a contingency fund under the authorization act for military assistance. I think it is section 510. Under section 510, if there is a need for additional military stocks over and above the funds made available in the appropriation bill for the foreign aid program, the President, the Secretary of Defense, can dip into our own military stocks up to the limit of \$300 million. This is supposed to be the military assistance contingency fund. Subsequent to the utilization of this fund, of course, the administration, the President, has to come back and get a replenishment in order to rebuild our own Army, Navy, and Air Force stocks. But this would have been by far the more clean cut—the more legal way in which to help and assist the military assistance.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Just to bolster the argument we are making, that the use of contingency funds for the military was illegal or at least against the sense of the Congress, let me read from page 382 of the hearings from a colloquy between Mr. Bundy, one of the assistant secretaries of defense at that time, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. BUNDY. A proposal was made about May or June last year to transfer an amount from the economic to the military side under section 610—

Which, I say parenthetically, is the transferability section—

As to whether that could have come from the contingency fund, frankly, prior to the legislative history of the fiscal 1964 legislation, which on the floor of the Senate particularly did make clear that the contingency fund was available on the military side, it was the unanimous judgment of the lawyers in every corner I could find that it was not proper to transfer from the contingency fund for the military aid appropriation.

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

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

Mr. GARY. I merely wish to say to the gentleman that if the President borrows from the military appropriation under section 510, he has to pay the military appropriation back. The testimony shows that he has never used that authority for that reason.

Mr. FORD. They used \$75 million of it.

Mr. GARY. Not the military contingency fund; not under section 510.

Mr. FORD. They used the regular economic contingency fund to the extent of \$75 million.

Mr. GARY. They used the regular contingency fund to that extent. The contingency fund was available. Mr. Bundy said:

A proposal was made about May or June last year to transfer an amount from the economic to the military side under section 610. As to whether that could have come from the contingency fund, frankly, prior to the legislative history of the fiscal 1964 legislation, which on the floor of the Senate particularly did make clear that the contingency fund was available on the military side, it was the unanimous judgment of the lawyers in every corner I could find that it was not proper to transfer from the contingency fund for the military aid appropriation.

He says that the contingency fund was available.

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

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Bundy was relying on a rather weak reed, if I may argue that point a little, because the legislation which set this up had already been adopted. He was using the debate on a later bill to try to determine what Congress meant at an earlier time. I do not mind saying, so far as one Member of Congress is concerned, I have never voted for that contingency fund in the expectation that it would be used for anything but economic assistance, and I do not believe other Members did.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to finish my presentation.

I had started to mention that under the heading of "Alliance for Progress development loans," President Johnson in January made a budget request for new obligational authority of \$465 million. Congress last year, in the consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill, made available in new obligational authority for this item \$375 million. In other words, President Johnson's budget submission in January was \$90 million more in the Alliance for Progress development loan program.

Turning to development loans as a whole, in 1963 Congress appropriated new obligation authority of \$687,300,000. That is new obligational authority. President Johnson in January of this year asked for \$922,200,000 in new obligational authority, or an increase over what Congress gave him for the current fiscal year of \$234,900,000.

I do not believe the record shows that this budget request for the foreign aid program is a "bare bones" request. It is not a request that is lower than Congress made available in new obligational authority in fiscal year 1964. In fact, it is substantially more.

Let us take another basis of comparison. If you will take the figure those of us who signed the minority report submitted—about a \$510 million reduction—that will still leave available in

new obligational authority for the administration \$3,006,672,400 for fiscal year 1965. This would be more than \$200 million above what the House of Representatives gave at the time we considered the bill last year.

It is more money than the Congress as a whole made available in new obligational authority for fiscal year 1964. So, with a half-a-billion-dollar cut, we still would be doing more than the Congress as a whole did last year.

Now, there have been some comments made earlier about the fact that this was the lowest budget request in a number of years. I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] said it was the lowest request in 9 years. My distinguished chairman and good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], I guess wrote us all a letter, or at least he wrote me a letter, telling me, and I quote:

Funds available for obligation are lower than for the current year, lower than at any time in the last 9 years, and \$200 million below the new appropriation request.

I think it is rather interesting that they only went back 9 years, that is, the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Texas, because if they had gone back 1 more year, they would have found it was not the lowest request in 10 years. I have before me several charts provided by the Agency itself which indicate categorically that if they had just gone back 1 more year, even under your criteria, the request for fiscal 1965 was not the lowest.

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

Mr. FORD. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think it would be well to go back and supply the figures since the very beginning of the program, but for the purposes of showing the total available funds for obligation in fiscal 1965, I thought we did a good job. The total available for obligation for the forthcoming year in this bill is \$3.567 billion. Last year it was \$3.623 billion. The year before that it was a billion dollars more, \$4.573 billion. The year before that it was \$4.972 billion.

My point is, if anyone finds it possible in his heart to follow the recommendations of the President and believes that the President needs a foreign aid program and that it is an important instrument in defense and foreign policy, then I believe he could reasonably support the pending bill, the lowest figure in 9 years.

Mr. FORD. The figures you just recited are the most helpful argument I have for the reduction we are proposing. The mere fact that they have had such large unobligated balances and such large amounts of deobligations proves one thing; that is, they have asked for and been given far too much money in each of the years the gentleman read the figures for.

Mr. MAHON. But here is a bill which is a billion dollars and a billion and a half dollars below the figures of fiscal years 1963 and 1962 respectively.

Mr. FORD. That just proves my point.

Mr. MAHON. So, if we believe this is an important instrument in foreign policy and national defense, if we have

the lowest figure in 9 years in the pending bill, and if we believe in it at all in this critical stage in the history of the world, why should we not support it? This runs contrary to the gentleman's position when he signed the minority report in 1961, because the committee cut the bill, he thought, too much and he said he did not think that such a reduction could be defended. Yet that bill called for more obligational authority than this bill does today. I do not understand my friend's position now.

Mr. FORD. I find myself in a very desirable position because I have traditionally supported the program and have voted every year for the authorization. I have supported the appropriation bill every year. I supported President Kennedy when the gentleman from Virginia and a number of others opposed an increase that we tried to get for military assistance. I signed the minority report in 1960 when we were considering the fiscal year 1961 appropriation bill because the bill was too low. But when, I say, in 1964 some of my friends want to be rubberstamps for the executive branch of the Government, want to accept, as was done with the authorization bill without changing a figure, I rebel because they cannot justify their position on the facts.

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

Mr. FORD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall the word "rubberstamp." There has been no rubberstamp here. Over \$200 million has been cut from the bill and \$300 million of the request has been put on the shelf and cannot be released except under special circumstances.

Mr. FORD. My good friend from Texas knows better than to bring up that phony argument.

Mr. MAHON. The \$300 million has been put on the shelf, so to speak, and \$200 million has been cut out of the President's budget. The President himself reduced the request by \$1 billion. In its action on the foreign assistance program last year the Congress said in effect, "Mr. President, we think the foreign aid budget request is too high; we think about \$3.5 billion is enough." And we approved a total sum of approximately \$3.6 billion last year. So who is the "rubberstamp," if there is one? The executive branch has apparently said, "Well, Congress, you may be right; Congress, we will agree with you; Congress, we will ask for the forthcoming year your figure of last year."

So if anybody has acquiesced it has been the Executive acquiescing in the will of the Congress. The Congress has not been a rubberstamp in any sense of the word.

Mr. FORD. Does my good friend from Texas think that we ought to appropriate this much every year just because we did it last year or just because we are doing it this year? Do you not think we ought to exercise a little independent judgment next year as we have in the past?

Mr. MAHON. That is the reason we made reductions. But when the Presi-

dent is trying to prevent war between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus, when the President is trying to prevent the loss of half a continent in the instance of the country of Brazil, when we have problems in South Vietnam, and when the Communists are threatening us in many ways, in many areas, why not give the President not everything he asked for but generally what he has asked for?

The President is the man who operates the program. We in Congress do not have to sit down and negotiate with foreign countries. We do not have to try to put out brush fires. The President says he needs this as a tool, as an instrument, to promote peace, to strengthen our defenses. We are, in the bill before us, giving him the lowest figure in 9 years. I am going to give a new President, for the first full year of his service, generally, the amount of money he has asked for in this dangerous area and hold him strictly accountable for it.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman makes a very persuasive argument, but I never heard him make that argument in the past.

Mr. MAHON. I have not had a chance to do so in 9 years because this is the lowest bill we have had.

Mr. FORD. No, I cannot agree with the gentleman, and I shall bring the figures to the gentleman's attention; and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, because I know he has something important to say. But the facts are these. Let us go back to the fiscal year 1955. The President then asked for \$3.4 billion. The Congress cut \$700 million from that program and left new obligational authority of \$2.7 billion. I did not hear the gentleman from Texas make this very strong and vigorous plea then. In 1956, in that fiscal year, the President asked for \$3.2 billion. Congress cut that half a billion dollars and made available \$2.7 billion. I did not hear this very impassioned plea then by the gentleman from Texas.

In fiscal year 1958 the President asked for \$3.3 billion. Congress cut \$600 million out of it, leaving a total of \$2.7 billion.

The circumstances in those years were serious, were dire; they are today. The Congress in those years exercised its own independent judgment. It did not kowtow, it did not rubberstamp all of the requests of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman knows that we are not rubberstamping what the executive branch has asked for. We have gone back 9 years. If you go back 10 or 12 years, you have different situations and you have to realize the then existing conditions, what the facts and circumstances were as they existed at that time. I have done my home work on the last 9 years of the program. I am sorry I have not gone back further, but I believe 9 years is a pretty good stretch of time to give consideration to here.

I am quite surprised that my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, has ignored the \$1 billion cut that the President himself made in order to get this program down to a lower figure. Then,

we cut it \$200 million and we put \$300 million more on the shelf.

My friend is more or less out of character. He is not typical of the JERRY FORD who has stood up and defended this program in the past when he now insists on a total cut of \$500 million, below the reduced figure which the President sent to Congress.

Mr. FORD. The President has not cut anything. It is his budget. All he did was cut the request of the bureaucrats in the Department. That is his responsibility as head of the executive branch of Government. The only thing we have before us is the request that says he wants \$3.9 billion. And, when you include titles I and II, he has not cut anything. He is submitting a budget of that figure. If he had to beat some heads together over in AID, that is his job. That is what he is there for. He did not cut anything. Our job is to examine the program before us.

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

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I wanted to abolish the Committee on Appropriations I believe I would have ample evidence to do so by quoting the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], based upon the statement which he has just made, and he made it in the full committee. The statement was about like this: "You do not know enough to mark up this bill, you do not know enough to mark up this bill," pointing to various members of the committee, "but the President does. The President has all the information at his fingertips. Therefore, I am going to give him everything he asks for."

If this is true of the foreign aid bill, it probably is true of many other appropriation bills also.

I wonder too, if this is the situation I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, why do we bother to have hearings? Why do we not take the word of the people downtown and abolish the Committee on Appropriations and write a bunch of blank checks? I, personally, do not believe that we should do this.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, since my name has been mentioned, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly, I believe that we should have the Committee on Appropriations and that we should make reductions and changes and modifications in executive estimates. We have done that to the extent of a half billion dollars in this bill. I believe that answers that part of the statement.

As to who is the best judge of the value of the foreign aid program, I say that the people who have had to operate that program—I would say President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson, because they are the ones who have sat at the conference table and have tried to put out brush fires all over the world and have tried to negotiate with nations,

not Mr. FORD or Mr. MAHON or Mr. RHODES of Arizona. We are not the ones who have used this instrument. We have had no opportunity to use it. We have either approved it or disapproved it, but they are the ones who have operated it. If you have a manager down on a farm, the manager knows more about the operations of that farm than the banker, because the manager is out there running it.

I realize that there are members of the committee who know a great deal about the details of the individual projects, and more so than many representatives in the executive branch of the Government, but it is the President himself who is our spokesman in foreign affairs and who is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. He is the best man to make these decisions affecting national policy in these areas.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman from Texas feels incapable of marking up an appropriation bill, let him speak for himself. I, personally, do not. I feel just as capable of marking up this bill after going through the hearings and hearing the facts as anyone else.

Mr. MAHON. We marked it up and we cut it.

Mr. FORD. I said a very unkind thing, but I think personally it is accurate. I will give the gentleman an opportunity to reply.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman feels that way, I take no exception to his using his own description. I think this type of approach has worked very well in another subcommittee.

Let me describe what this does mean. It means that in the item in the bill for economic assistance if this section stays in the act, they will pull out of those items \$300 million and set it aside. Then the remaining amount they will allocate under section 665, of title 31, United States Code, wherein it is provided that the remaining funds will be allocated on a monthly or quarterly basis.

If that section is carried out by the President, or by him through the Bureau of the Budget, it means that this amount the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Louisiana and everybody else has complained about is put in the pocket before the first of July. They have it in a separate item, and if the provisions of this amendment are carried out there will have to be two determinations, one of them being that for the new projects for which they use this \$300 million, under my amendment, they must show that there is a need, and so certify, and second, they also must show that there is not enough money in these other activities to meet that need. To my knowledge, in over 5 years, this will be the first time there will be any requirement in here requiring a review by the executive branch before the money is spent. I say that this is the first step to improve the situation that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Louisiana have complained about

year after year. I want the record to be clear. I have not gone along with the billions that have been appropriated in times past. I do not think that is a sound foreign policy. I believe we are involved in the affairs of foreign countries too much. But if the gentleman will read the provision, and if it is carried out as it is intended, it will likely save \$300 million.

Mr. FORD. May I say to my good friend from Mississippi, I have grave doubt that it will be very helpful in achieving economy. On the other hand, I hope it will. I will guarantee the gentleman from Mississippi, if this provision stays in the bill, and if I am back and a member of the subcommittee in 1965, I will pursue the method by which the executive branch of the Government executes the amendment which he has sponsored, and I hope that they will be able to prove to me that your amendment saved \$300 million. I will pursue it to the end to be sure that they explain what they do.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I hope he will. Furthermore, it will do what I say if we can count on those administering it in the executive branch discharging the requirements of the provision. I just say it is a step forward, and 12 months from now we will have an opportunity to see how they discharge their responsibilities under the section.

Mr. FORD. If I am a conferee, I will fight to keep the amendment as is, because I want to see how it works, and I will expect the executive branch of the Government to execute it in bona fide good faith, to the "t," and we will get a report from them next year.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, because the provision provides what I said. It will work if properly carried out. If it is not properly carried out, nothing will work.

Mr. FORD. In conclusion, I would like to say, although the President submitted a request in January for \$3,900-some million, when we include both titles 1 and 2, that is not the full amount of funds available to the executive branch of the Government.

In the first place, according to a letter I have received from Mr. David Bell, head of AID, they expect to utilize in 1965, \$1.5 billion of Public Law 480 funds, which, incidentally, is almost a half-billion dollars more than they used in the fiscal year 1958.

So they got \$3.9 billion in new obligational authority. They anticipate spending through Public Law 480 another \$1.5 billion. In addition, they have substantial amounts of local currency availability. They have both country-owned and United States-owned local currency availability. As a matter of fact, according to their own justification books, under the country-owned program they expect to have available \$328.5 million. They expect to have in fiscal 1965 under local currencies United States-owned \$1,192 million. This is a total of local currency availability in fiscal 1965 of over \$1,500 million.

For some years we have been hearing that some of our allies whom we very

generously supported in the days following World War II would make a greater and greater contribution to the foreign aid program to help underdeveloped countries throughout the world. Some of the allies whom we helped in the post-war period have been increasing their contribution. Go back to 1956. Countries like Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom made available in long-term financial resources about \$1 billion. They have gradually increased this to about \$2 billion, maybe a little more, when you go up to 1962. But the facts are they have not made as big a contribution as they should, and the facts are we have not been tailoring down our own foreign aid program. It seems to me it is high time that our allies take a greater share of the burden, get a more equitable distribution of the responsibility for the help of underdeveloped countries throughout the world.

May I conclude with this comment. I think if you believe in the integrity of the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, its judgment, its prerogatives, and its responsibility, then I think you can honestly support the recommendations made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the recommendations of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], and the recommendations proposed by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], and myself.

If you believe that the two other coordinate branches of the Federal Government, the executive and the judicial branches, are assuming legislative prerogatives and responsibilities, then you should support our recommendations.

If you believe the Supreme Court and the executive branch of the Government are seeking to engulf the legislative responsibilities of the Congress, then you ought to support the recommendations for reduction that we in the minority are supporting. These additional reductions of approximately \$300 million are fully justified on the facts.

If you vote against the reductions, the additional cuts that we are proposing, you are in effect acquiescing in the usurpation of power and authority of the legislative by the executive branch of the Government. We have a responsibility to carry out our own independent judgment and not be a rubberstamp for the executive.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, we are assembled here today to go through our annual ritual of deciding how many billions of the American taxpayers' dollars will be made available in the new fiscal year for distribution in our largely unsuccessful effort to buy the friendship of foreign nations.

I call this a ritual because, in the first place, there is no question at all that we are going to vote to spend another 3 billion-plus of the taxpayers' dollars and, in the second place, because we are going to do this when everyone of us knows that friendship is not a commod-

ity, and therefore is not something which can be bought by the highest bidder.

But before we do approve this new—and in my opinion unconstitutional—disbursement of the taxpayers' dollars for the benefit of foreign nations, I do believe that we should give some real consideration to what we are doing. And thus I believe that we should give serious consideration to adoption of the amendment to further reduce the scope of this bill, which I am informed will be offered by our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

We should remember, in the first place, that what we are going to do when we pass this bill will be done not only without the consent of the taxpayers, but over the objections of what I believe to be a majority of them. I dare to say that not one of the proponents of this bill—in either this Congress or in the executive branch—would be willing to let the voters decide, in a national referendum, whether we should continue this program at all.

But in the second place, we should—indeed, I think we must—give deeply thoughtful and sincere consideration to the amendment to be offered by the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. I would urge that this consideration be given not merely because I agree with our distinguished colleague—nor on the basis of whether we like him as a friend and a colleague. To the contrary, I would urge that we look at the intended amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana solely on the basis of his past and proven record of deep insight into the methods by which foreign aid proponents have consistently, and sometimes deceitfully, padded their budgetary needs, and his equally proven record of eliminating these "falsies" and thereby saving the taxpayers billions of dollars in the past few years.

I say to you in all sincerity that the cut recommended by the Appropriations Committee is in itself a vindication of the past performance of our diligent colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. It is true that the committee cut of "only" 6 percent in the administration's budget request has been hailed as a defeat for him and for those who oppose foreign aid. But the cold fact is that year after year, we have been presented with inflated foreign aid budgets, and then beleaguered and harassed to approve them at those inflated levels.

To our credit, we have refused to do so—last year, for instance, we cut 38 percent from a foreign aid budget its proponents said could not be cut without destroying the program. We made this cut because the foreign aid appropriations subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana, proved conclusively that the inflated budget could be cut—and could be cut with no detriment whatsoever to whatever merit the foreign aid program may have.

The new administration, I must admit, has not been slow to recognize the keen insight of the gentleman from Louisiana—and as a result, it sent up, probably for the first time in the history of foreign aid, a budget which was not deliberately and badly swollen. The

evidence is that the administration believed sincerely the \$3.5 billion it is asking was the lowest workable figure.

So now where do we stand? Well, it is obvious that our able colleagues of the Appropriations Committee did not quite agree with the administration's estimate. Even they have seen to cut this so-called barebones budget by \$200 million. This action, in itself, was an admission that some fat still remained in the budget request. And I ask you—can we be certain that there still is not a bit of fat? I will remind you that 21 of our able colleagues on the Appropriations Committee agreed with the gentleman from Louisiana that another \$300 million worth of fat still remains which should be eliminated. True, 26 members of the committee thought differently—under considerable pressure from the executive branch, I am told. But with this narrow majority against the half-billion cut, must we not consider, seriously, that there is a possibility that in this case the majority of the committee could have been wrong?

I think we must. For myself, I will support the greater cut in this appropriation which will be proposed by our colleague from Louisiana—who has proven he puts principle above rank—and I would hope that a majority of the House, in its wisdom would agree to trim out the fat which still remains in this bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, last spring, a neighbor of mine planted a young willow on the edge of his lawn.

He was looking forward, he said, to the time—7 or 10 years hence—when his children could play in the cool bower made by the graceful boughs.

For a time, the willow did not do well. Some of its leaves yellowed; some of its streamers turned brittle and brown. The sun beat upon it, and the grass choked at it.

My neighbor continued his patient work of watering the willow.

I saw the tree the other day, after an absence of some time.

A few of the leaves were still yellow; the same streamers are still brittle and brown. But the tree, nevertheless, has a healthy look. Its roots are taking hold; it is beginning to thrive.

Gentlemen, this is the case with the Alliance for Progress.

After 3 years, when the doubtful said it could not thrive in such soil; when the cynical said the water would be insufficient; when the vicious stripped and broke its limbs; when the climate dealt it cruel blows; after 3 years, the Alliance has grown—measurably, significantly.

It is not yet, gentlemen, a tree under which we, or our children, can rest. But it has begun, surely, the slow climb to maturity, and to the fulfillment of all of our hopes for it.

I say that by our action here today we can assure that tree another year of growth. I say that we must do so—for the sake of ourselves, our children and our friends. I say that we must continue its achievement.

These achievements, despite the shortness of the time of the Alliance in both our own national life and in the life of Latin America, are many.

Most striking to me, gentlemen, is the change in the mood of Latin America—a change in the mood of individual nations with themselves, and toward us.

Four years ago, we were the rich outsiders who held aloof from any involvement in the demand of millions of Latin Americans for a better life. We were disliked, feared, hated.

This has changed. We now are working with these same Latin Americans to help them achieve this better life. Our money, our knowledge, and our sweat show that we are truly partners in their program.

Four years ago, there was immense resistance to change in Latin America. The ways of life which had endured for 400 years were still judged good. If change were to come, it should be only token change.

Today, throughout Latin America, you will find a general commitment to the idea of change—of rapid change, of deep change. The Alliance for Progress has focused on change, shown that it was peaceful and probable.

Four years ago, the currents of Castroism and communism were running strongly. Only by the Cuban example, or the Russian example, the Latin Americans were told, could progress come.

Today, the currents have died. Latin Americans, looking at Cuba, see ruin and retrogression, violence and servitude. They see no progress, no dignity and no peace.

But also striking are the changes that have been accomplished in only a few years, changes in the critical area of institutions.

Four years ago, only three nations had land reform laws or programs—of vital importance to an area where 10 percent of people own 90 percent of cultivable land.

Now, 12 nations have agrarian reform legislation and have created new land reform institutions. The emphasis is not solely on dividing up land, but on the equally difficult problems of improving productivity and marketing. There is movement, persuasive movement in land reform.

Four years ago, tax laws and tax administration in Latin America were regressive and chaotic. The laws bore heaviest on the poorest segments of the population. The rich evaded the taxes they owed.

Within the past year alone, 16 countries have brought about improvement in tax legislation and administration. The increase in revenues is truly startling, up to 128 percent on an unweighted basis. Government deficits are not yet eliminated, but they are being reduced, and Latin Americans are providing more of the funds that they need for development.

Four years ago, there were few credit unions or savings and loan institutions in Latin America. The institutions which could attract savings were weak or non-existent.

Now, with U.S. assistance 400 credit unions already have been created,

against an ultimate goal of 4,500. Seventy savings and loan associations have been established in five countries alone, and nine countries have enacted savings and loan legislation.

Four years ago, only three nations had begun the work of establishing priorities for development—work which we designate as national planning. There was a shortage of the technicians who could prepare such plans.

But today, every nation has a planning group of some variety. Eight nations have submitted their plans to the Organization of American States, and the technicians are growing daily in their experience and their effectiveness. The "development men" are moving toward the highest councils of government, and striking, too, in the physical change that has come with U.S. assistance under the Alliance.

Four years ago we of the United States had only begun to consider credits which would provide homes, schools, and water systems for the millions of Latin Americans without such necessities. We drew a sharp distinction between economic programs and social programs.

Today, we are much more aware that the two are a seamless web. Our credits have helped Latin Americans to build 222,000 homes, 23,400 schoolrooms, over 1,000 well and water systems. They also have helped publish nearly 7 million schoolbooks, and make over 200,000 agricultural credit loans.

By this time next year, gentlemen, the Alliance for Progress—if our action today is positive in support of it—will have benefited 24 million people with pure water systems, nearly 9 million with health care, and over 22 million more with food, under the food-for-peace program.

The circle of events, from the decision taken almost 3 years ago at Punta del Este, is ever widening. The Latin Americans have only begun to feel its effects; we, too, just now are beginning to have a fuller understanding of the vital program which the late President John F. Kennedy launched, and which President Lyndon B. Johnson has committed himself to carry on.

Gentlemen, we are engaged, truly, in the most historic undertaking of our time.

We are seeking, in the short space of 10 years, to bring much closer to its full and powerful potential, an enormous region of 220 million people. We are seeking to bring the 19 nations there much closer to the levels of self-sustaining growth, within the framework of democratic choice.

We are seeking, by our action, to assure that the world of tomorrow will be a world which shares, to the fullest degree possible, our own ideals of human dignity and representative democracy.

We are finding, to an intense degree, that Latin America's commitment to these same ideals, and the will in Latin America to maintain them, are being supported with devotion, dedication, and sacrifice, with self-help and with sweeping reform.

Already, much has been accomplished. I say that we must continue with the task so nobly begun. I say that we must

put aside partisan cares, and honor our commitments to our Latin American friends, knowing that in so doing, we honor ourselves, our tradition and our history.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about this bill asking only for a rock bottom, absolutely minimal appropriation for continuation of our foreign aid program. Because we have already given away so many billions of dollars, \$3.3 billion may not represent a substantial outlay to some, but I believe it is more than we can afford to appropriate at this time for this purpose. Accordingly, I intend to vote against H.R. 11812 and will support any attempts to decrease the appropriation.

For a long time I have thought unrealistic the theory that the United States can create politically mature and sound governments and raise living standards in underdeveloped countries merely by giving them money. I believe the fallacy of this theory has been amply demonstrated.

Despite our good intentions and our humanitarian motives, foreign aid as a means to world peace has failed to stop the advancement of communism. At the same time, it has not necessarily won friends, converts, and allies to the democratic cause.

I think the United States has undertaken too big a job; it is too much to hope to make the world over in our image. Despite our wealth and strength, we cannot continue indefinitely to assist almost every country in the world. Our heavy foreign commitments, added to our domestic ones, are draining our resources. Our soaring national debt and dwindling gold reserves attest to this fact.

Unfortunately, our aid has often been poorly conceived and has not been sufficiently selective to insure that the recipient country is able to use it effectively. It has always been my belief that technical assistance programs are preferable to direct financial grants. And I am strongly opposed to rendering any assistance whatsoever to Communist bloc nations.

Despite the appropriation cuts made by Congress, the various foreign aid agencies over the years have had more than adequate funds to spend, and there has always been a multibillion dollar balance of unexpended foreign aid funds available at the end of the fiscal year.

As the subcommittee chairman has pointed out, more than \$7.1 billion remain unexpended at the end of this fiscal year from prior year appropriations. This would indicate that year after year we are authorizing foreign aid expenditures which are far in excess of the actual needs of a soundly executed program.

Furthermore, huge sums have been wasted for both military and economic projects. This waste in foreign aid funds has been documented time and again in many investigations by congressional

committees and by the General Accounting Office.

The taxpayers have wearied of carrying this financial burden since the end of World War II. A recent poll of my constituents indicates that 83 percent of them favor reducing our foreign aid in scope or amount or discontinuing the program altogether.

The lack of value received for our tremendous outlays on this program through the years, the numerous cases of gross mismanagement and lax administration, and the urgent need to improve our domestic fiscal affairs and international balance-of-payments position convince me that this bill should be defeated.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks and would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the courageous chairman of my Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee. The Honorable OTTO PASSMAN is a Democrat of great personal honor and integrity who refuses to be led down the rose garden path, who refuses to sacrifice principle to anyone's selfish motivations and ambitions. I admire him for his strength of purpose, his steadfastness, and his courage.

Those of us who know that the foreign aid bill reported by a bare majority of the Appropriations Committee is a deceptive and wasteful bill, salute the gentleman from Louisiana for the brave and valiant battle he is waging for our country. Since becoming chairman of the subcommittee 10 years ago, he has been directly responsible for saving American taxpayers \$8 billion which otherwise would have gone down the foreign aid drain.

It rests on his shoulders, and on the shoulders of those of us who joined him in signing the minority report, to make our case for a reduction of some \$325 million in the bill before us.

The President and his supporters call this a "barebones" bill.

I do not question their right to call it that, but I do question whether they really believe it themselves. Let us look at the majority report.

In the report I call the attention of the House to paragraph 4 on page 2 and I quote:

As a part of his effort to reduce the total Federal budget, the President requested \$1,008,625,000 less for the foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1965 than was requested for the previous fiscal year. If this action had not been taken, the committee would in all probability have felt it necessary to repeat its action of last year and recommend a larger reduction in the funds provided.

They are saying that if the tumor had been bigger the surgeon would have removed it all. But it was a smaller tumor than expected, so only a portion was taken out.

In other words, if the President had asked for more money than President Kennedy did last year, the committee would have cut the foreign aid request literally to the bone. Since he asked for less, his reward is more money than he actually needs to operate an effective aid program.

That is what the majority report says. It is very clear. The words are those of

the men who are telling you today that this is a "barebones" bill.

This bill calls for \$526 million more than Congress appropriated last year. The reduction in this year's foreign aid budget is the smallest ever made by the House Appropriations Committee in the entire 18-year life of the foreign aid program.

I am not unrealistic; I am well aware of the importance, in many instances, of our aid program. Without it, much of the world would still be in ruins. Assistance still is essential in many areas of the globe to preserve our own security, to serve as a bulwark against Communist encroachment, and to fulfill a moral obligation. But, my votes against foreign aid are a protest against the manner in which the aid program is administered, all too often with complete disregard for the needs of the recipient country or the goals of good will and national security of the United States. My votes are against extravagance, waste, inefficiency and occasional corruption in the program. All too frequently our tax money has gone to further ideologies completely alien to our concept of the freedom of man and antagonistic to our Nation itself.

Since the inception of the aid program in 1956, a total of \$50 billion has been eliminated by Congress from presidential budget requests. It has not hurt the program. The record will show that even more billions should have been eliminated. I protest the fantastic abuse of the aid money we hand over to the Executive year in and year out. When a country tells us to take our aid money and get out, it is baffling to me that the White House insists on sending the money anyway. But we are shipping more funds to Cambodia, Burma, and Indonesia, all of whom have categorically rejected our help.

It is baffling to appropriate \$3.3 billion in the face of more than \$7 billion in unexpended funds from prior years still on hand. We gave Tunisia \$10 million in 1962, \$15 million in 1963, we are asked to give them another \$10 million this year, despite the fact that Tunisia still has \$2 million of the \$10 million in 1962 funds; \$2 million still in the till from an appropriation of over 3 years ago.

Weeks of testimony before my subcommittee have convinced me that these programs are being requested with inadequate justification.

There is looseness in control and application of funds and programs. Only after the money is spent and gone do we learn of bungling, mismanagement, and waste.

Had Congress not signed a blank check in the past we could have perhaps avoided such absurd blunders as the \$2 million Peruvian highway which serves nobody, carries no traffic, goes nowhere; the Peruvian irrigation project which is waterless after an expenditure of \$125,000; \$3 million worth of hayrakes rusted out in Iran because there is no hay grown in that country; \$400,000 worth of TV sets for remote African jungle villages; \$5.6 million for an Indonesian road leading to an athletic stadium. The list is endless. I have protested for years against this sort of abuse of tax money. Tax-

payers are weary of it. Our economy will buckle if it continues. Our national security is not served by it.

The bill today opens the door for future blunders of this magnitude. It is not a "barebones" bill. A genuine "barebones" bill would follow the minority report.

We would cut development grants \$49 million under the reported bill; international organizations and programs by \$20 million; supporting assistance, \$51 million; the contingency fund, \$50 million; Alliance for Progress development grants, \$50 million; administrative expenses for the Department of State, \$94.9 million; the Peace Corps, \$10 million.

We would cut an additional \$325 million from this budget, and perhaps could cut more, and we would not injure one major project of merit, disrupt one worthwhile program, or jeopardize the cause of peace.

The printed hearings of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee reveal a number of examples justifying this reduction. Countless more can be found in the unpublished, classified transcripts. Once again censorship pencils have been busy in the State Department and the Pentagon, eliminating politically unpalatable facts from the public record.

This abuse of the top secret stamp is a grave disservice to the check and balance system of our government. With a phony security gag silencing Congress, the executive branch shows its contempt for the committee system and for the Congress itself.

This is not the first time I have taken the floor to protest this kind of censorship. I saw the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee subjected to it this year. The same tactics were repeated by the same State Department and Pentagon people who appeared before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

On the facts as I heard them from witnesses testifying behind locked doors, from the facts available from past records and even from the current printed hearings, it is obvious that there is too big a price tag on the bill before us.

It is folly to call it a "barebones" bill. It is not.

I again call your attention to the minority report and I respectfully urge your support of it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] down to his last speaker? Does the gentleman from Virginia have any additional speakers?

Mr. GARY. Yes, I do, but I would be glad for the gentleman from Arizona to proceed at the present time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How does the time stand, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Each side has remaining 2 hours and 2 minutes.

If there are no further requests for time—

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In a situation like this is it not the turn of the majority to yield time?

The CHAIRMAN. The majority has the right to close debate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman from Virginia has only one speaker left, then I would be glad to yield time on this side.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman from Arizona is ready to close debate now, I would be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The majority has the prerogative to close debate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, with reference to my parliamentary inquiry I do not believe my chairman has answered my question.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who is the author of the amendment that was adopted in the full committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently opposed the foreign aid bill for many years. Not only has it been wasteful beyond description but in my opinion in addition has now become an instrument of real danger to us because through foreign aid we have injected ourselves into the internal affairs of just about every country which would accept our money. Actually it was shown last year that some of the countries we aided were buying our gold. I have urged repeatedly that we review our foreign policy, end this costly and dangerous program.

In the appropriations bill which I have the honor to handle we pointed out this year in our report the following:

OVERSEAS PRODUCTION ENCOURAGED BY
UNITED STATES

To further complicate this situation, our Government has been providing funds and technical assistance to enable competitors (Americans and foreigners) to increase their production overseas—both in quantity and quality—and to take over much of our traditional world markets with commodities produced with cheap labor, land and materials. It is extremely difficult for the American farmer to compete with foreign producers—although efficiency of production and superior quality has enabled him to retain some of his foreign markets despite this disadvantage.

The most serious situation facing the American farmer in this regard, however, is the current program of the U.S. Government which provides loans and investment guarantees to encourage American producers with American know-how to move their activities abroad to take advantage of cheap labor, land, and materials and to realize the benefits of certain tax advantages on overseas earnings.

Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, American agricultural producers and other businessmen are being encouraged to go into business in foreign countries. In a brochure distributed to business interests throughout the country by the Agency of International Development (AID), entitled "Aids to Business—Overseas Investment," Americans who wish to move their interests abroad are given the following attractive inducements:

1. Investment surveys: AID will pay up to 50 percent of the cost of a trip to "explore the feasibility" of private investment abroad.

2. Dollar loans: AID will make dollar loans to encourage American investors to go into business abroad. The Export-Import Bank, International Finance Corporation, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank are also available for this purpose.

3. Local currency loans: AID will make local currency loans to Americans from foreign currencies generated under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, to undertake oversea production.

4. Investment guarantees: AID will guarantee the American investor against inconvertibility of currency, expropriation, confiscation, and other political risks and will guarantee against certain normal business risks inherent in all business ventures.

It should be noted, also, that the President's latest foreign aid message dated March 19, 1964 (H. Doc. 250) proposes even more liberal tax credit for American investment in less developed countries. Amendments recommended for enactment during the current session of Congress propose an additional tax credit of 30 percent on amounts invested by U.S. concerns abroad.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee is having an investigation made now. Several times in the past I have tried to get the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid to investigate these programs, since those of us opposed to the bill have been unable to defeat the appropriation.

I offered in the committee a few years ago a motion to determine what companies had been organized for the purpose of handling foreign aid only to lose. My purpose was to show who got the money as a start.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding our efforts against foreign aid, it has continued to pass the Congress and in the last 9 years more than \$31 billion has been appropriated. Repeatedly members of this subcommittee have pointed out that there was virtually no review of the aid groups actions, that they obligated practically everything just before the new fiscal year, only to deobligate and use for a different purpose thereafter.

With that background, Mr. Chairman, I offered, in the Appropriations Committee the following provision which appears in the bill as the second paragraph on page 4:

Of the foregoing amounts for economic assistance, \$300,000,000 shall be available for obligation only through the apportionment review and approval procedure prescribed by law in such amounts and at such times as may be determined by the President in the national interest that funds otherwise available for the purposes of programs under this title are insufficient to meet the cost of additional authorized projects.

This provision when taken in connection with section 665, of title 31 of the United States Code, would call for the executive branch to withdraw \$300 million from the items which appear theretofore in that title and place it on the shelf.

Then under section 665, the remaining funds would be budgeted or prorated on a quarterly basis to prevent running up a deficiency but this \$300 million would not be allocated until and unless and then in such amounts as the President, doubtless through the Bureau of the Budget, determined was necessary to be spent in the national interest, and that funds otherwise available were inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, in effect the foreign aid people would have to empty their pockets, lay the money on the table to the

Bureau of the Budget, and show there was insufficient money to meet the new need if this section is properly carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to continuing foreign aid, but I truly believe this provision if properly carried out can help to bring order out of chaos, should perhaps result in saving this \$300 million, and I know give at least an additional review to that which has had very little, if any, review in the executive department.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, we meet again in these Chambers to decide an issue of major consequence. At stake is the purpose and policy of the U.S. Government face to face with world communism and their increasing efforts to engulf and destroy the liberties and dignities of free men.

It is my personal belief and testament that our foreign economic and military assistance program—as a vital arm of the U.S. foreign policy—is the single most powerful weapon we have in this never-ending battle against the forces that would swallow our liberties. I have often been criticized for giving my full support to this program. I have often been criticized for fighting to insure a strong bipartisan base of support for foreign assistance. And yet overwhelming evidence indicates that from the outset of the modern foreign aid program, there has been strong and dedicated Republican backing for the foreign aid program. Republicans gave support to the Marshall plan, to the Truman doctrine and other major mutual security developments, most recently through the passage of the International Development Agency legislation.

I do not enjoy the prospect of voting against my colleagues on this issue. I do not like to put myself into the position of opposing some of my finest friends. If I were to change my position in deference to my friends, however, I would not be able to live with myself. Those who have consistently opposed the program from the beginning will plead to the effect that they cannot change while they are in midstream. By the same token, I cannot chart a different course at this time. That would be unthinkable, for this program requires continued strength and vitality.

One matter is peculiar. Certain of my friends who fought for a strong bipartisan program during the Eisenhower years are not now deeply committed to the program. I cannot understand this. I have said often in the past that it would be a tragedy if the foreign aid program were made a partisan issue.

Mr. Chairman, the world situation today requires unity in every respect. We find ourselves split asunder on all accounts. As a leader in the free world's aspirations for liberty and dignity among all men, we must fill the gaps created by our enemies. We have found that in spite of difficulties, the foreign aid program has greatly improved in recent years.

A number of reforms have been made in concept and organization of the program. The foreign aid program is highly selective and concentrated. Only key countries with real potential for development or significant security interest are being assisted to any appreciable extent. It would be unwise to turn our backs at this point of major improvement.

We are, whether we have willed it or not, the leader in the march of the world's millions toward a new destiny. It is a leadership due not simply to our great economic structure and our military posture, but rather a leadership based on the strength of our ideas, our tradition of independence, and our respect for individual dignity.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, we need unity at this perilous juncture in world history. As the standard bearer of free men throughout the world, we have the responsibility of proving by deeds—and not pious words—our justification and our leadership.

We know that much is expected of us. More importantly, we know we have been given a great deal—and woe to any man or nation who does not share what has been given.

Our program, in realistic terms, is a program of self-interest and self-preservation. No one can "go it alone" at this time, and we need our allies in every respect. Foreign aid can be compared to a two-edged sword. On one edge of the sword is the very practical aspect of working with our friends to make NATO, SEATO, CENTO, and the OAS—strong and powerful. Our self interest is involved. The practical, realistic application of the program is in keeping with these interests. Our security is involved. Is the Congress of the United States willing to lessen the security precautions that this program entails? Are we going to weaken ourselves vis-a-vis a world Communist design? Can we appropriate billions and billions for a moon program that may be the most impractical gesture ever made in the history of civilization and forget the nameable, countable human beings throughout the world who are embedded in the good earth and who cry out for our assistance?

On the other edge of the sword we have strong humanitarian traditions to uphold. In this regard I would like to say that foreign aid will not solve—and could never solve—all of the problems the United States faces in an increasingly complex world. It will not solve territorial or ideological disputes. It may not win us bosom friends. But let us not vent our feelings by slashing a program that asks a minimum amount of money which will be used to the fullest extent possible.

The program is consistent with our responsibility as Americans, and consistent with our long history of freedom. I urge all those who believe in the greatness of America to support foreign assistance at this time. Such support will continue to keep America strong and free at home, and resilient and powerful abroad.

When the record of the 20th century is written, foreign aid will stand out

as one of the greatest achievements of our time. Milton said, "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." There have been great victories in the 20th century, in peace as well as in war, but the greatest of all victories will be the securing of the freedom won at such great cost by war.

We live perhaps too close to events of the moment to comprehend their lasting significance. Yet we can see clearly enough to see that this is a turning point in history. From all of our experience, and from all we know about the world and its needs, it is clear that an enlightened program of assistance to less-developed countries is in the interest of all free men. President Eisenhower stated the case cogently in his last message on foreign aid when he said:

Foreign aid is not only grounded in our deepest self-interest but springs from the idealism of the American people which is the true foundation of our greatness. It rests upon five fundamental propositions; one, that peace is a matter of concern to all mankind; two, that to keep the peace, the free world must remain defensively strong; three, that the achievement of a peace which is just depends upon promoting a rate of economic progress * * * which will inspire hope; four, that * * * help to the less-developed nations * * * is a common responsibility of the free world community; and five, that the United States cannot shirk its responsibility to cooperate * * * in this regard.

The overwhelming support of the vast majority of our citizens leads us inexorably to foreign aid as a fixed national policy.

Equally with military security, economic development is a common necessity and a common responsibility. An investment in the development of one part of the free world is an investment in the development of it all. Our welfare, and the welfare of all free men, cannot be divided * * * we are dependent one on the other.

Just the other day President Eisenhower reiterated his deep belief in the foreign aid program, and urged Congress to support President Johnson's request for the funds necessary to operate an effective program during the next year.

FOREIGN AID IS THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION IN ACTION

As President Eisenhower himself recognizes so well, nothing better symbolizes America's role of world leadership than foreign aid. Of all of the great acts of American statesmanship, foreign aid is the most outstanding, and, I might add, the most in keeping with our own history and traditions.

The United States of America was the first new nation. Ours was the first modern, democratic revolution. We were the first colony to win our freedom. We were the first newly independent people to face the wilderness. The word "bootstrap" is an American word. Americans know what it takes to lift yourself by your own bootstraps, because America was created by the determination and hard work of its people.

Americans were political pioneers as well. We were the first people in history to establish a new government in a new land. Ours was a political revolution, which, once it succeeded, left us without adequate government. This is why we understand the problems in beginning with a revolution and building a nation.

We know how difficult it is, once freedom is gained, to unify the people of a country, to create one from many, to establish a government which can govern. The words, "E Pluribus Unum," describe our unfinished task, a task we have in common with every other country of the world which, having gained independence, is trying to build one nation.

We understand—because it has also been our problem—the great dilemma faced by the other new nations in keeping faith with freedom, while at the same time maintaining the political stability necessary to prevent anarchy and avoid destruction.

Foreign aid is the American Revolution in action in the 20th century. Conditions differ, but the basic problems facing the new nations are similar to those which we faced and continue to face. It is through foreign aid—conceived not just as economic development, for that is only part of the problem, but conceived as a total plan of action for bringing about social, economic, and political change in less-developed countries—that the ideals and goals of the permanent American revolution, and the permanent interests and aspirations of the human race best find expression.

THE MARSHALL PLAN WAS A GREAT SUCCESS

Our commitment to foreign aid was a part of our assumption of world leadership following the Second World War. Helping Europe to recover was the first stage of this commitment. Beginning in the late 1940's it became apparent that the problems of the less-developed world were equally urgent, and the point 4 program was launched. Then came Korea, and we were diverted from long-range development into emergency military assistance through the mutual security program. For about 5 or 6 years most of our energies were directed toward providing military assistance to the less-developed countries. Toward the end of the 1950's the immediate menace of external Communist aggression had diminished, while the need for long-term development, combined with internal security, had increased. Once again we changed directions, shifting from a program primarily military in concept to one primarily developmental.

It has been only 5 or 6 years now since we began to devote most of our energy to long-range development. After 15 years of aiding the less-developed countries, 10 of which were largely consumed by military efforts, we can begin to see results.

The Marshall plan had its critics. There were skeptics then, as there are now. The fainthearted said it would ruin us economically. The penny-pinchers railed against adding to the national debt. The narrowminded complained about helping our competitors. The superpatriots protested spending our money on foreigners. Where are the critics and the skeptics now? What has happened to the doubters and complainers; to those who opposed the Marshall plan; to those who voted against the bill when it came up on the floor of this House?

Like the poor, they are still with us. And they are still singing the same sad

song. The tune has changed, but the lyrics are the old leftover lines of 15 years ago. Of course, the Marshall plan succeeded. But the Marshall plan, they say, was different. Foreign aid to Europe worked; foreign aid to other parts of the world is predestined not to work. Foreign aid to developed Europe was justified; foreign aid to underdeveloped Latin America is a waste of money. A recovery program makes sense; a development program is beyond our means and capabilities.

History has not been kind to the doubters, the pennypinchers, the hand-wringers who said that the Marshall plan would not work. If experience has taught us any one lesson, it is that progress is made by those who look ahead, who have a vision of the future, who have the courage to attempt the seemingly impossible.

Foreign aid is the most ambitious and difficult endeavor in history. The concept itself is revolutionary. One hundred years ago England forcibly prevented her technicians from leaving the country for fear they would make their knowledge available to others. Today, it is a mark of enlightenment for a country to make available its technical skills and knowledge, and even to provide the capital necessary for economic growth. Yet part of our problem is that despite all the evidence to the contrary some are still reluctant to accept the validity of the concept itself. Others rightly argue that although the concept is valid, it has not been properly executed. But it is one thing to say that there have been mistakes, and quite another to say that the concept of foreign aid is not valid. It is one thing to offer constructive criticism—that is our duty, but it is quite another to find nothing but fault. It is one thing to say that foreign aid needs to be improved, but it is quite another to criticize without suggesting any alternative except less aid to fewer countries by a smaller staff with lower appropriations.

Every Member of this House wants to see improvements made in the foreign aid program. There is not a Member who does not have his own ideas about how this could be accomplished. Some of the criticisms and suggestions of Congress have been put into effect and have helped to improve the program. It is important for Congress to continue to suggest changes and improvements. If anything, there is need for even greater congressional examination of the strengths as well as the weaknesses of foreign aid. But there are any number of ways in which Congress can influence the course of foreign aid without casting doubt on the concept, undermining confidence in the program, and creating a negative political climate which favors restrictions and reductions rather than healthy, constructive criticism, and support.

ASSISTANCE TO LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES ACHIEVING RESULTS

What are some of the accomplishments of foreign aid to the less-developed nations? We know what foreign aid achieved in Europe, but what do we know,

beyond the successful prevention of Communist aggression, about the achievements of foreign aid in the less-developed world?

In terms of overall economic success, a recent analysis of 41 countries which have received more than \$300 million in American assistance since the beginning of the program, or, in the case of countries of less than 10 million which have received at least \$30 per person, reveals that 33 have achieved substantial economic growth of at least 1.5 percent per capita in increased income per year for the last 5 years. Fourteen of these countries have achieved complete self-sufficiency, while another 11 have reached the point of adequate self-sufficiency with less than 20 percent of their total investment presently being covered by foreign aid. In all 24 of the countries which have achieved both substantial economic growth and adequate self-sufficiency, democratic political institutions have also been strengthened. Let me put this record another way. Of the 50 countries which have received more than token U.S. assistance over the past 15 years, more than 30 have already achieved or are approaching self-support status. This is a record of effectiveness of which all Americans can be proud.

Another overall measure of the success of our foreign aid program is the increase in our trade with countries receiving our assistance. U.S. exports to Marshall plan countries more than doubled from 1953 to 1962. Our exports to Japan have more than tripled since 1950. In 32 countries receiving 80 percent of U.S. aid between 1957 and 1962, imports from the United States have increased four times as fast as U.S. economic aid. There are many reasons why foreign aid is in our interest. One of these is the contribution foreign aid makes toward promoting trade. The less-developed world is potentially a vast market for American goods and services. Through foreign aid American business can achieve new opportunities for commercial relations with countries which can become good customers in the future.

We know that besides promoting more and better trade between the less-developed countries and our own, the foreign aid program is also having an increasingly beneficial effect on the American economy—80 percent of all procurement now consists of American goods and services, and much of the remaining 20 percent eventually comes back home. Almost every State in the Union is now beginning to experience the good effects of aid contracts.

In 1960, only 11 percent of the iron and steel products financed by foreign aid appropriations came from American steel mills. During 1963, about 87 percent was purchased from U.S. producers. In 1960, 11 percent of the nonferrous metals financed under foreign aid came from the United States, compared to about 92 percent in 1963. For fertilizer the percentage rose from 17 to 97 percent. Similar figures could be given for many other products.

Furthermore, the restriction of foreign aid spending to U.S. goods and serv-

ices means that a substantial share of U.S. exports in some lines is now financed by our foreign aid program. For example, in calendar year 1962, one-third of U.S. exports of locomotives, one-third of U.S. exports of fertilizer, and 21 percent of U.S. exports of iron and steel products were among the commodities purchased under the foreign aid program to assist the economic development of countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Under these new policies, the foreign aid program today accounts for a relatively small and declining element in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. The outflow of dollars under foreign aid next year is estimated at about a half billion dollars—far smaller than the \$2½ billion spent abroad each year by U.S. tourists, or the nearly \$3 billion invested abroad each year by U.S. business.

In addition to the direct benefit of sales, aid-financed U.S. procurement is also providing the opportunity for U.S. business to gain experience in world trade. Many contracts are being let to businesses which have never had any experience, or have had very little experience, in selling overseas. Through foreign aid contracts American businessmen are learning the ropes and acquiring the skills necessary for selling through regular commercial channels in the future. As trade replaces aid in the years to come, these skills, techniques, and business contracts will prove invaluable in enabling the American businessman to take his rightful place in the world market.

There are countless other examples of the successes being achieved in the less-developed countries with our help. You could write a shelf full of books on the technical assistance achievements made possible through U.S. aid, or on the advances made in public administration, taxation, and business administration. Countless other examples could be cited in the field of cooperatives; in the development of private enterprise through the extension of credit; or in the development of agriculture through a combination of technical assistance and agricultural credit.

Many stories could be told about the great achievements in the fields of health and education. One of the most dramatic of these is the story of malaria eradication. During recent years the number of cases of malaria in the world has been cut from 350 million to less than 100 million. In some countries malaria has been eliminated altogether, freeing millions of people for more productive lives. This is not only a great human achievement, it is a great step toward developing the economic potential of countries burdened with sickness and disease. In several areas of India, for example, the return on money invested in controlling malaria has been about 50 to 1 in increased industrial production, resulting in an increase in the Indian gross national product of some \$500 million each year. In one rich region in northern India the elimination of malaria increased the area of cultivated land by 400 percent and the production of food grains by 130 percent.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IS BEGINNING TO WORK

Although Latin America began to receive major foreign aid only 2 years ago, progress under the Alliance for Progress has been encouraging. Despite the great difficulties encountered in transforming the societies of Latin America, 11 countries have initiated significant tax reforms, 10 countries have passed land reform legislation and 3 others have legislation pending. Ten countries have exceeded the goal of a 2.5 percent annual growth rate called for by the Alliance. The total value of Latin American exports increased 7 percent in 1962, the last year for which figures were available, and trade within the region rose by 12 percent. Equally important, between 1957 and 1962 U.S. manufacturing affiliates in Latin America increased their sales by 70 percent.

By June 1965, more than 300,000 new homes, some 36,000 classrooms, more than 2,000 water systems and some 600 hospital and health units will have been built in Latin America with our help. Three hundred thousand farm credit loans will have been issued. Eleven million textbooks will have been printed.

All of the Alliance countries have improved their tax administration capacities. In a number of these—such as Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, El Salvador, Mexico, and Bolivia—these administrative changes are, or promise to be, sweeping. U.S. Internal Revenue Service teams have been assisting tax reform efforts in 10 countries and will soon be helping in 4 others.

Progress in basic agrarian reform has been slow, but there has been some encouraging movement. Cooperatives and credit unions are growing. For example, rural electric cooperative activity has begun in a dozen countries. Colonization and land settlement programs are active in half a dozen countries. Progress continues in the introduction of new legislation and in issuing regulations for the administration of existing laws. Twelve countries have already introduced agrarian reform legislation. The agrarian reform institutes or land reform agencies in these 12 countries have greatly strengthened their technical resources and show encouraging progress in conducting basic surveys and project development. AID is assisting in this rural development effort through the cooperation of the land-grant colleges.

Fifteen countries have self-help housing programs. Savings and loan legislation has been adopted by nine countries: Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, Argentina, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama. The first five of these countries now have operating systems—a total of nearly 70 savings and loan associations with 100,000 depositors who have accumulated deposits equivalent to more than \$35 million. These associations provide savings badly needed for productive investment.

The building of new institutions to channel savings into investment is clearly seen in the establishment of development banks or other intermediate credit institutions in most of the Latin

American countries. Since the inception of the Alliance, private or public development banks have been set up or are in the process of creation in eight countries: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama. In addition, the Central American Bank for Economic Integration—CABEI—has been established and is promoting private sector development in member countries.

Latin America is truly on the march. Nothing better demonstrates the difference between communism and democracy than the progress being made in the free countries of Latin America, by contrast to the slow death of Cuba under Communist rule.

SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN AID IS GROWING AMONG BUSINESSMEN

These are but a few examples of the accomplishments which can already be seen, even in this brief time, from long-term development assistance to the emerging countries. Clearly, this is not a time to turn back. This is a time to press ahead; to forge a more effective weapon for serving the ideals and purposes for which the foreign aid program stands.

There are those who would have us believe that the Americans are against foreign aid. On the contrary, support for foreign aid is strong, and growing stronger. A recent study of 1,500 prominent businessmen, for example, disclosed that a great majority of American business leaders consider foreign aid essential in promoting a self-supporting and prosperous community of free nations. These findings, reported in the General Electric Forum, were heralded as "revolutionary in their significance" and they are. They symbolize the new consensus in the United States about our responsibility as the leader of the free world, to provide assistance necessary for developing this community of free nations. American businessmen understand the significance of the foreign aid program for the future economic strength of the United States. They know that economic assistance to Western Europe and Japan has contributed to the doubling of our exports across the Atlantic, and a tripling of our exports to Japan.

The American businessman knows that there is a potential mass market of over \$1.9 billion waiting in the less-developed nations, and that helping to increase the purchasing power of these people could be just as revolutionary as the development of wide-volume mass markets in America. Foreign aid could be the key to helping spread the industrial revolution to Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The United States sells on the average \$5.12 worth of goods to every person in the less-developed countries each year. Every dollar by which this is increased will add nearly \$2 billion to total U.S. exports each year.

For every 1-percent increase in the gross national product of the less-developed world, U.S. commercial exports can be expected to increase by about 1.4 percent, or almost 50 percent as fast.

Foreign aid could, indeed, be the key to the creation of a great world market,

and an international capitalist system which could be the final answer to the pretensions of communism.

THE MEASURE OF OUR GREATNESS

These signs of progress are gratifying. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the road to development is not paved with quick solutions. It will take decades before many countries will achieve self-sustaining growth. The process will be long and painful, full of disappointment and temporary defeat. The task before us calls for determination but also for patience. We are an impatient people, used to doing things in a hurry. In the case of foreign aid, there are pressing problems—but they cannot be solved overnight.

We are also a very democratic people, intolerant of social injustice, extremes of economic inequality, and lack of political opportunity. We are sometimes impatient with others because we have difficulty seeing our own social, economic, and political progress in perspective. We also tend to measure the progress of others by what we have today, rather than by what they had yesterday. Only if we gain a better perspective of the process of development will we have the persistence to prevail.

It has been 15 years since the Marshall plan, yet only now are we able to see its results. I hope and believe that in years to come we will be able to enjoy the fruits of our present labor. It must be remembered, however, that in Europe all of the necessary conditions were present for rapid development. By contrast, many of the less-developed countries are beginning at the beginning. If it took 15 years to see the results of the Marshall plan for Europe, how much longer will it take to measure the results of our present program for the less-developed nations?

The world is entering a period of great uncertainty and stress, which will tax the patience and tolerance of every nation. It could become a time of trouble, with the poor turning on the rich, and the rich turning away from the poor. Or it can become the beginning of a new age, with freemen working together for their common good. That choice is in our hands.

Now, more than ever, our response to the challenge of development is a measure of our greatness as a people and our enlightenment as a nation. And now, more than ever, American genius is required to make foreign aid a more effective answer to the great questions facing the less-developed world.

President Johnson and General Eisenhower have asked for our support. Let us now give it, not grudgingly, or in a spirit of despair and defeat, but in full awareness that although the way be perilous and long, there can be no turning back. With a community of free nations as our ultimate goal, let us rededicate our country to the ennobling and historic task of helping two-thirds of the human race to win, not just freedom, but the blessing of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am going to submit here, because I do not want to trespass on the patience of my fellow members, some

comments on the minority report which I feel should be answered by someone. I have the greatest respect for the members on my side, and I know that a great many of these join with the chairman of the subcommittee, but I know that these are some of his feelings, because I sat in that committee along with the gentleman from Arizona who has done such a tremendous job and has been most diligent in working with the committee and sitting there patiently day in and day out. He and several of us have been sitting there because the attendance has not been too great. I think the reason why it has not been too great is because of the chairman's insistence on asking the questions and then answering the questions without giving the witness the opportunity. Therefore, I am taking this opportunity here today to submit some of my comments on the minority report.

The comments on minority views are as follows:

First. Page 16: The minority views state that we are financing over 4,000 foreign aid projects.

This is not accurate. There are at present 2,358 active projects being conducted by AID. This includes all loan and grant projects for which there are unliquidated balances. During the hearings Mr. PASSMAN maintained many of these projects could be broken down into subprojects. However, the figure of 4,000 projects cannot be substantiated. The best and most accurate estimate is the 2,358 of actual numbered projects now active.

Second. Page 16: The minority report charges that there are now 71,416 people on the foreign aid payroll, an increase of 7,000 since fiscal year 1963.

This total figure includes 33,000 foreign nationals who are not employed in the foreign aid program at all. These people are being trained as part of our foreign assistance program. About 21,000 of them are being trained under military assistance training programs. The actual number of personnel in the foreign aid program, including both direct-hire and contract employees, was 38,204 as of March 31, 1964. The corresponding figure as of April 30, 1963, was 41,709. Therefore, the actual number of personnel employed in the foreign aid program has been reduced by 3,505 in 1 year. It should be noted that more than 17,000 personnel are foreign nationals being paid at pay rates current in the country where they work, which are usually much less than U.S. pay scales. Participant trainees are not paid wages or salaries; they are in no sense employees of the U.S. Government. They do, of course, receive living expenses, tuition, and so forth, while being trained.

The details of personnel are set forth in part 2 of the hearings on page 121.

Third. Page 16. The minority report states that 10 percent of the funds appropriated for any purpose may be used for other purposes.

This refers to the so-called transfer authority provided under section 610 of the authorizing legislation. This authority to transfer 10 percent of the funds appropriated from one funding category to another funding category may not be used for development loans,

Alliance for Progress loans, or for administrative expenses. The authority may be used for other funding categories "whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purposes of this act." This authority has been used this year to transfer funds to the military assistance program, primarily to meet requirements in southeast Asia.

Fourth. Page 16: The minority views state that the contingency fund may be used for any purpose authorized under the act.

As pointed out in the majority report, the contingency fund may only be used to meet urgent and unforeseen assistance needs that cannot be accurately defined in advance. It should be pointed out that the contingency fund may not be used directly for military assistance. It can, of course, be transferred to military assistance under the authority of section 610.

Fifth. Page 16: The minority views state that military assistance has its own contingency fund in the amount of \$300 million.

This is not so. The statement refers to section 510 of the authorizing legislation which provides that the President, if he determines it to be vital to U.S. security, may use defense articles from existing stocks and defense services for the military assistance program. This special authority is limited to \$300 million. However, it is not a contingency fund as such, and the value of any goods and services used must be made up in the following year's appropriations. This authority has never been used, largely because of the problem of cutting into future years' appropriations.

Sixth. Page 16: The minority charges that the foreign aid program is "uncontrolled and uncontrollable," that appropriations can be justified for the construction of a dam in one country and used to build a bridge in another.

The foreign aid program is subject to congressional review and control. Each year the program must justify its fund requests by grant project and by anticipated levels of lending before four separate committees of the Congress. Congress has provided necessary flexibility in the foreign aid program so that it can respond to changing demands. The presentation to the Congress is illustrative to the extent that, legally, the Agency could justify money for a project and not go through with it. If a given project which has been included in the Agency's presentation turns out to be unnecessary, or if the recipient country is unwilling to undertake the necessary self-help measures, or if sufficient funds are not available, the Agency does not and should not initiate the project.

The facts are that virtually all of the projects and programs which are justified to the Congress by the Agency are, in fact, undertaken. Twice each year the Agency must report to the Congress under the provisions of section 634(d) of the authorizing legislation, any major changes in its programs in each country and in each funding category.

Seventh. Page 16. The minority states that foreign aid programs are based on "conjecture and estimates of the wildest sort."

In fact, the aid program each fiscal year is built on rigorous analysis which begins about 18 months before the presentation is made and continues until each project is completed. This analysis is conducted in the field as well as in Washington. Decisions as to whether to proceed with activities depend on the importance of the activity to U.S. foreign policy, a continuing review as to the soundness of the activity, self-help, and other performance by the recipient country, and the availability of funds.

Eighth. Page 16. The minority implies that accurate estimates of unobligated funds for any fiscal year are not available until October of the following year.

It is true that fiscal year 1963 final exact figures on unobligated balances were published early in October. However, accurate preliminary estimates of final unobligated balances are available near the end of each fiscal year. The Agency has made a close and continuing analysis during fiscal year 1964 of unobligated balances. On June 19, they presented to the Appropriations Committee up-to-date estimates of what unobligated balances would be as of June 30. The total of such balances at that time was \$53.1 million for both military and economic programs. The actual unobligated balances could be somewhat less.

Ninth. Page 17. The minority views quote a variety of witnesses on the adequacy of funds provided in fiscal year 1964.

The minority notes the appropriation of \$3,000 million in fiscal year 1964 but does not show the total fund availability of \$3,488 million. The quotation of executive branch witnesses which then follow were, of course, made on the basis of total funds available in fiscal year 1964.

The statements quoted are somewhat out of context. For example, the rest of the testimony of Secretary Rusk taken from part I, page 276 is relevant. He continued in part:

This leaves us without leeway in two directions. One is, if we run into a very serious deterioration of a situation in particular areas, such as in the Far East where the attitudes of Peking are ominous and threatening. On the other hand, as I indicated in my statement, we have not tried to budget for all of the important opportunities which would be in front of us if things went, shall we say, even more favorably.

It is possible that on either side of this main highway we are talking about, we might have to seek additional assistance from the Congress.

Mr. Bell responded to this point—part II, page 17:

Mr. BELL. I think the funds made available by the Congress, including the carryovers, are permitting us to do a great many things and conduct a great many programs that are strongly in the U.S. interests, and have a major impact. We are very tight on funds in the military assistance program, and in the supporting assistance program. In both

cases, we expect to draw on the contingency fund, as I indicated in my statement. We expect to have more projects completed and ready for funding which we will not be able to fund under the regular development loan appropriation.

Tenth. Page 18: The minority uses part of a colloquy to imply that there would be \$526.7 million more available in fiscal year 1965 than in fiscal year 1964.

This part of the report ignores a central point: Total availability in fiscal year 1964 was \$3,488 million. The estimate of fiscal year 1965 availability at that point was \$3,635 million—an increase of only \$147 million over 1964. The addition of the special Vietnam request raised the estimated fiscal year 1965 availability to \$3,760 million, and the difference to \$272 million between 1964 and 1965.

The paragraphs of Mr. Bell's statement immediately following the one quoted by Mr. PASSMAN explain the situation—part II, page 8:

That is exclusive of the social progress trust fund, for which we are not asking an appropriation this year. However, to that amount must be added reappropriations and carryovers of nearly \$400 million, and estimated recoveries and reimbursements during this year of another \$220 million, so that our total funds available for programing in fiscal year 1964 are nearly \$3,500 million.

We do not expect to have unobligated funds of a similar magnitude at the end of this June to carry over into next year, and our total program for 1965 is only \$145 million larger than for the current year.

Mr. Bell also said at that point in the hearings—part II, page 46:

Mr. BELL. I think it is only fair, Mr. Chairman, to note the point about carryovers. The availability of funds this year for both economic and military is \$3,488,656,000.

The availability we anticipate for next year, including the new appropriations we have asked for and adding the estimated carryover, after recoveries, is \$3,635,100,000.

Eleventh. Page 19: The minority implies that other nations take our aid and buy gold.

This is wrong. Those nations responsible for most of the gold outflow listed, in fact, repaid more to the United States on past assistance than they received during this period.

The table updates by 6 months a similar table included in the Passman report last year. Secretary Rusk placed in the testimony—part I, page 281—comments on this earlier table. The figures have changed slightly, but the comments are still valid.

COMMENTS ON GOLD PURCHASES STATEMENT IN 1963 REPORT OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

The 1963 report of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations pointed out that 52 countries which received almost \$12 billion in foreign aid between January 1958 and June 1963 purchased \$6.8 billion of gold from the United States during that period. The report concludes that resources released by foreign aid, enabled these countries to buy \$6.8 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury.

The facts are correct, but the conclusion is largely wrong.

The 12 of those countries which bought most of the gold—\$6.2 billion or 91 percent—actually returned to the United States \$400 million more repayments of past aid than the assistance they received during the period. These countries received nearly \$4 billion of assistance, two-thirds of it military, but repaid in principal and interest over \$4.3 billion to the United States during this period.

The 12 major purchasers of gold were Austria, Belgium-Luxembourg, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Spain, and the United Kingdom. It should be noted that none of these 12 countries have received AID assistance for a year or more and that military assistance has virtually ended to most of them.

Twelfth. Page 22: The minority states that, since April 6, funds have been deobligated and then reobligated for 236 projects.

The actual number is 228. Deobligation and reobligation normally occur in this period of the fiscal year. It would be equally true to say that funds have been deobligated and reobligated for 228 projects in the amount of \$50 million since the start of the fiscal year. Reobligation of deobligated funds is based on careful analysis of project funding requirements. This analysis continues throughout the fiscal year. Generally, reobligations occur toward the end of this process near the end of the fiscal year. It should be noted that estimates of deobligated funds which will be available for reobligation are taken into account in preparation of the budget estimates and the request for new appropriations reduced accordingly. As required by law, reobligations of funds are for projects previously justified to the Congress and are reported to the Committees on Appropriations.

Thirteenth. Page 22: The minority points out that expenditures from economic and military assistance funds and Public Law 480 commodities will be made in a total of 99 countries and 9 territories during fiscal year 1965.

What the minority does not state is that new commitments under programs of economic assistance will take place in only 76 countries and approximately 90 percent of the funds will go to 25 key countries. The minority does not point out either that military assistance programs are planned for only 40 countries with additional small training programs in 13. Naturally, economic assistance and military assistance do not always go to the same countries. Emergency and relief programs under titles II and III of Public Law 480 go to many countries.

Fourteenth. Page 22: The minority uses a colloquy between Mr. RHODES and Mr. Bell to imply that only \$30 to \$50 million additional is needed for Vietnam.

This colloquy took place on April 22, 1964, relative to the President's request of January. It predates the events which led to the President's special message to Congress requesting an additional \$125 million for Vietnam.

This special request was sent to the Congress on May 18, following a special trip to Vietnam by Secretary McNamara.

Fifteenth. Page 22: The minority points out that Burma has declined an \$18 million supporting assistance grant.

The \$18 million grant, which was to fulfill a commitment made to the Burmese in 1959 by President Eisenhower, has not been accepted by the Burmese Government. Events in southeast Asia which led to the President's special request for additional assistance for Vietnam will require an intensified effort during fiscal year 1965 in that area of direct confrontation with the Communists. We expect that this \$18 million in supporting assistance funds will be needed during fiscal year 1965 to help support the defense of southeast Asia. By using supporting assistance funds there will be less demand on the contingency fund and, to the extent that the contingency fund is not used, money is returned to the Treasury.

Sixteenth. Page 22: The minority report comments on supporting assistance for Laos.

This paragraph is somewhat misleading without the context of other testimony on this point. A colloquy between Mr. Poats and Mr. PASSMAN from part II, page 435 follows:

Mr. PASSMAN. At page 8 there is a statement: "We also finance those documented Lao 'invisible' expenses for official educational, transportation, insurance, and medical costs abroad which the AID mission in Laos determines to be legitimate."

What kind of a program is that?

Mr. POATS. That is part of a program whose total effect is to finance the Lao Government in almost every aspect of its existence. One aspect is the invisible expenses, and so forth, that any government or economy has for the purposes mentioned here—educational, medical, travel, official expenses of embassies.

Mr. PASSMAN. How do you define "invisible"?

Mr. POATS. This is a term which distinguishes from visible imports; that is, goods. This covers services, in effect.

U.S. FINANCING OF EXPENSES FOR LAO EMBASSIES

Mr. PASSMAN. Is that financing actually the expenses of the Lao Embassies abroad?

Mr. POATS. It is the financing of expenses of Lao Embassies, other than in the Communist countries.

Seventeenth. Page 23: The minority attacks AID's operations with regard to financing of the Tachien Dam.

The \$40 million loan, repayable in Taiwan dollars, for the Tachien multipurpose dam was made by the Development Loan Fund prior to its incorporation into AID. When AID took over responsibility for the loan, it reviewed the project. That review called into question the benefit-cost ratio and reliability of the earlier estimates. As a result, negotiations with the Chinese Government were undertaken to revise and postpone the Tachien Dam project and to find alternative sources of power to the dam. Agreement was reached to build a thermal powerplant and a smaller hydroplant near the site of the proposed original dam. While the Chinese were

reluctant to postpone the Tachien high dam, they did not object.

Economic assistance to Taiwan was coming to an end. Because AID had delayed the implementation of the \$40 million loan, it was agreed that this \$40 million loan for power development should not be subject to termination. Consequently, it was reserved until final plans for alternative power projects could be completed. Agreement has now been reached with the Chinese to proceed with the alternative proposal, and funds have been obligated.

These events were fully reported to the committee in the AID presentation for fiscal year 1964, page 503 in the presentation book for fiscal year 1965.

Eighteenth. Page 23: The minority attacks AID with regard to a \$20 million loan to the United Arab Republic which AID has not made.

The loan discussed was, and is, under consideration by AID. On page 804 of the hearing Mr. Macomber testified:

There are economic conditions important to this loan. We are not going to give this loan unless certain economic conditions are met.

This statement means that self-help and other requirements that the United States is requesting explain why there is no commitment to make the loan and why the negotiations are continuing.

AID would not make the loan in order to "reduce the amount of unobligated funds just prior to the end of the fiscal year," as implied in the report.

Nineteenth. Page 24: The minority states that new projects are begun without prior justification to Congress.

New projects are initiated in such cases where initiation of new projects is in the national interest and in accord with congressional criteria.

However, such projects are a small percentage of the total projects presented to the Congress. The need for such flexibility is authorized by law.

The Congress is informed of such changes. Although the 60 projects were not listed in the 1964 presentation, all of them are listed and fully described in the 1965 presentation to the Congress.

Twentieth. Page 24: The minority attacks AID for not sending Cambodia trainees home.

As indicated during the testimony, a decision was made by AID to continue support for training of students from Cambodia, although other aspects of the AID program to that country have been ended.

The major reason for the decision is that these students were already in the United States, pursuing a course of study at the time of the cancellation of aid to Cambodia. Sending them home without completing their prescribed courses, some of which will extend over several years, would have wasted the investment already made.

No new students have been brought to this country since the decision to terminate aid to Cambodia.

Twenty-first. Page 24: The minority states that a total appropriation of "\$4,802 million" would provide very adequately for programs covered by this bill.

The majority of the committee is recommending an appropriation of only \$3,739 million for the foreign aid program. The minority apparently considers the \$1,353 million limitation on operating and administrative expenses of the Eximbank as appropriations. Obviously, this is not an appropriation at all.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, today we are faced with what seems to become a more bitter battle every year—the battle over foreign aid. Last year we witnessed a House in session at 7 a.m. to finish action on foreign aid appropriations.

It is remarkable and significant that we are over 5 months ahead of last year on appropriation bills in the House. There could be no clearer indictment of the failure of the Congress last year to do its work promptly and effectively.

The foreign aid bill we have this year seems to be a more realistic one. Despite several reservations and deep concerns I have over the administration of foreign aid and the policy that implements it, I, nevertheless, plan to vote for the bill.

From our own experience, from the ideas and the ideals we have received from others, we have learned that interdependence is the password today in world affairs. The days of a fortress America have long passed. What is important to us today is to have a world in which freedom can survive and in which it can be allowed to grow and blossom even more.

Economic viability—the economic well-being of a world community—is the best insurance policy in which this country can invest. The premium on that policy is foreign aid.

Certainly we should insist that our investment is worth every dollar. We must seek full value, but a cost-benefit ratio concept cannot be the sole guiding force behind our foreign aid program.

We are in these programs because they are right. This is the important thing. As a distinguished Latin-American visitor said to me:

The foundation, the guidelines of U.S. foreign aid to other countries * * * cannot be exclusively on an economic basis. Foreign aid cannot be guided by a banking concept.

I wonder, when we weigh and measure every dollar of foreign aid, whether we realize that our own United States was the great recipient of foreign aid in the 18th and 19th centuries. During the Revolutionary War and thereafter, foreign capital played a key role in our economic development. The Federal Gov-

ernment, State governments, municipalities and private enterprise all borrowed heavily in Europe. The construction of canals and railroads, as well as the development of industry, relied heavily on foreign funds. In 1854 the Secretary of the Treasury estimated that the aggregate amount of Federal, State, county, railroad, and canal bonds, stocks, et cetera, held by foreigners amounted to \$184,184,174 out of a total of \$1,178,567,882. Of these foreign lenders England was by far the most important, followed by Holland and Germany. Furthermore, English merchants advanced credit to American importers on liberal terms and British capital helped develop many a western mine in the days of the mining frontier.

The European investor in the 19th century America received no guarantees on his investment. Indeed, he was sometimes victimized by fraudulent promoters and defaulting State governments. But he saw the promise of America; he contributed to American prosperity; and he realized a substantial profit thereby. Perhaps there is a lesson in this experience that we can apply today.

Nor was the foreign aid we received confined to money. Instead, the greatest contribution we received from abroad was people, over 37 million from 1820 to 1927. This peaceful transfer of populations, the greatest mass movement in history, brought the skill and knowledge of Old World methods to the ingenuity, resourcefulness, and ambition of the native workingman. Their merger produced the greatest economy on earth. America could not be what she is today were it not for the skilled and unskilled millions who poured in from abroad; who built our railroads and our cities, mined our coal, tilled our soil and contributed to the special flavor of America. But all this would not have been possible if the immigrants had flooded into a land that was not free. It was freedom, as the first prerequisite, that made America's growth possible.

I also wonder whether, in our dissatisfaction with various aspects of foreign aid, we do not forget about its positive side. Do we think sufficiently of the schools, hospitals, or roads it has built, of the technicians it has trained, of the people to whom it has given hope? Do we think of the more than 50,000 foreign students brought to this country under Government programs alone since 1949, who go back with generally favorable impressions of the United States, and become our staunch advocates among the leadership groups in their countries? Do we think of the Peace Corps, living with the people they work among, and by all reports winning new friends and new respect for the United States? All this is foreign aid, in one form or another, after all. And what of those dedicated members of our Foreign Service who have gone far beyond the call of duty, setting up schools, training local personnel, and actively participating in the community life around them? We drain the good from all these activities,

it seems to me, when we haggle so loudly on foreign aid.

Of course we have every right to encourage freedom among the recipients of our aid today. Experience is the greatest teacher, and we know from our own experience that freedom is the precondition of growth. But you cannot have freedom without restraint, and restraint is rooted in the moral teachings of religion. In short, religion and morality are indispensable to free political development, and the United States need not apologize to anyone for pointing out these homely truths. Nor need we apologize for trying to develop freedom in foreign lands.

If any apologies are due, it is when we fall short of the ideals we espouse. As Americans, it is our job to inform and instruct by example. If we would impress on the emerging countries the importance of religion and morality to free political development, we must practice genuine religion and morality at home. If we wish to encourage democracy abroad, we must strive to perfect democracy at home. We must seek a deeper understanding of our own philosophy, if we aspire to lead the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America on the same path.

It is this very understanding which seems so sadly lacking in American foreign policy today. We have been floundering on a sea of pragmatism, with no sure principles to guide our action. Without clearly conceived national goals, our policies have been inconsistent, inadequate, our purpose unsure. Thus we can support a military coup in Vietnam while denouncing one in the Dominican Republic. Few would say that the Alliance for Progress is an unqualified success. We promise to keep our forces in Europe, but we stage exercise "big lift" which gives a contrary impression, and close out a base in Spain. Our foreign policy lacks conviction. There seems to be no long-range plan. We are heading for a dangerous crisis, a crisis of disillusionment. Should that crisis come upon us, it is likely to bring a retrenchment of American commitments all around the world. This will leave a vacuum into which Communist power will surely flow, and the forces that undermine freedom will be given a free hand.

But before the United States can follow a firm, consistent, purposeful foreign policy, it must define its goals. It will no longer do simply to be against something we do not like; rather we must clearly formulate and articulate what we are for. It is time for a clear-cut statement, in terms the American people can understand, of what the United States stands for in world affairs, and why we stand for it. Such a statement would open the lines of communication between the people and the Government. It could form the basis of a vast popular dialog in which the American people could clarify their beliefs respecting our foreign policy. Fortified with new support and understanding, our Government could act with a surer hand on the world scene.

An attempt to define national goals has been made before. President Eisenhower appointed a commission for that purpose. There is much in that report with which I could agree, but in some respects I believe it misses the mark. For instance, it states that:

The basic foreign policy of the United States should be the preservation of its own independence and free institutions. Our position before the world should be neither defensive nor belligerent.

To my way of thinking, preservation of our own independence is not one of our goals abroad. Rather our goal should be the gradual extension of freedom. If we bring that about our own survival is assured, and so is world peace. Also, it goes without saying that our position should be neither defensive nor belligerent. Such a statement contributes little.

May I therefore suggest, with no intention to be presumptuous, but as an American concerned with the future of his country, those principles I believe the United States should stand for in the world: First, we must stand for freedom. That means that the United States must everywhere associate itself with those programs which have as their object the extension of basic freedoms. In my conception there are five freedoms, comprising the famous four freedoms—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, plus what may be called the freedom of movement. Men and goods, ideas, and ideals should be free to move across national boundaries. Communism professes to be for freedom from want only. It responds to none of the basic human aspirations beyond the material. Since it values neither religion, morality, nor the self-restraint which are the hallmarks of a free society, freedom cannot grow out of it. But the United States undergirds freedom around the world, and we must make it unequivocally clear that we support man's eternal quest for freedom.

Second, we must make it plain that we will resist, with all our powers of reason and judgment, every attempt to defeat or thwart the growth of these freedoms. Each foreign aid program has been an exercise of our reason and judgment aimed at this goal, although too often that end has been obscured. Indeed our entire foreign policy has been directed, or should have been directed, toward strengthening and extending the area of freedom, without resort to force.

Third, we must make it plain, beyond peradventure of doubt, that if the adversaries of freedom will not permit us to exercise our reason and judgment in its defense, we will resist with force. This is not warmongering. It is a simple statement of freedom's right to survive. That right cannot be qualified.

If we set out our goals in this fashion, it seems to me that the results would be salutary both at home and abroad. I believe that the American people would respond to the linking of aid and freedom in a way in which they have not re-

sponded in the past. People cannot get excited simply by being told they must support development. But they can get excited when they understand that the basic purpose of foreign aid is to support liberty. If Americans are given a definition of our foreign policy goals which they can understand, they will respond with overwhelming support for what needs to be done.

But it is not only at home that a broad discussion, debate, and new formulation of our goals is desirable. It would be most welcome abroad, too, where Lord knows there is ample misunderstanding of America's purposes, some of it willful. We need to allay suspicion of our motives, and again, a simple but firm declaration of our commitment to freedom, which is after all, the desire of the vast majority of mankind, would really help to clear the air. With freedom first in our order of priorities, I believe we can regain the moral initiative, both at home and abroad, which will enable us to move forward with our great world task of reconstruction and development.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, Fidel Castro's sister has defected to the free world. Yesterday in Mexico, Juanita Castro not only made known her flight from the Communist regime her brothers have instituted in Cuba, but condemned them for betraying the Cuban revolution and handing Cuba over to the Communists.

Juanita Castro's remarks assailing Fidel and Raul Castro, as well as her defection, represent a moral victory for the United States and the free world. Furthermore, her condemnation of her brothers' Communist ties now presents the United States with an excellent opportunity to influence world opinion.

This opportunity is particularly timely in light of the anti-U.S. propaganda which the Castro regime is making with the American student visitors now touring Cuba.

Here is a set of circumstances which requires quick action, and presents this Nation with a chance to use its initiative. I urge that immediate steps be taken to arrange for Juanita Castro to tour the United States and see firsthand the operations of a democratic society, to note the contrast between democracy and communism, and to take her observations before the people of Latin America in a subsequent visit.

I have contacted the U.S. Information Agency to urge that an immediate effort be made to take advantage of this dramatic way to demonstrate the failures of communism in Cuba and the strength of democracy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief, because the hour is late.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the bill which you have before you today is a high bill. It is a bill, going into the appropriations process, which is at least \$300 million higher than was the foreign aid bill at the comparable period last year. So let us have done with talk of this being an economical bill. Let us not say this is a low bill. Let us not say we are being penurious in this program. Let us recognize the facts of life, that this is a high bill. It is a bill \$300 million, at least, higher than that of last year.

My good friend from Mississippi has an amendment which is unique, as far as this program is concerned. I understand it has worked and worked well in other programs and like the gentleman from Michigan, I sincerely hope that it will be adopted, and that it will work well. I shall do what I can to make sure that it stays in conference, if it remains in this bill. But I have very serious doubts whether it will work in this program because of the type of program this is, not because of any defect in the gentleman's amendment.

As we all know this is a program which is illustrative in nature. There is no line item appropriation for foreign aid. As we have realized before, you can justify funds for construction of a dam in Turkey and instead use it to build a bridge in Iran. Because of the very nature of the program and the fact that the money is appropriated for very broad purposes, I am at a loss to know how the administration would be able to administer the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi. As I understand it, it would be necessary for the administration to divide the amount appropriated for each broad purpose into moieties to be spent by quarters and deduct from each one amount which would add up to \$300 million for fiscal 1965. If the amount remaining was not sufficient to finance the activities of the department for a particular quarter then the department would be able to go to the Bureau of the Budget and ask for the release of all or any part of the \$300 million which is to be withheld from immediate availability, as a result of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that since the purposes are so broad and so general there would be no difficulty whatsoever for the administration to make a very good case for release of some of the money. Either, it would not be difficult or it would be impossible. I do not know which will be the situation. I suppose that might depend upon the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in making these remarks is to question the efficacy of the amendment as it applies to this particular program.

I have all the respect in the world for the gentleman from Mississippi and all of the admiration in the world for his ability as a legislator. Therefore, I certainly am glad now to yield to the distinguished gentleman for any further explanation which he would care to offer.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding. May I say that I appreciate the kind remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. Certainly, it has been my pleasure to work with him through the years and I return the compliment to him insofar as application, ability, and sincerity in his work are concerned.

May I say, if the gentleman will recall, this amendment was voted on after other amendments to cut the overall amount had failed. Only then did I insist upon voting on the amendment.

What the amendment does, in effect, is direct that of the items which have been approved by the Committee for Economic Assistance, the executive department would be directed by this provision to go back to those amounts and pull out \$300 million from the totals which appear earlier in that particular section and put it on the shelf, so to speak. Then they would allocate, under existing law, the remaining amounts in those items on a quarterly basis, as is provided in section 665 of title 31, United States Code.

Then they would go from that point and the provisions of the antideficiency statute would apply. Again, the President would have to determine that the new projects which might be financed from the \$300 million not only are in the public interest, but that there be a separate determination that the funds already in the hands of the Economic Assistance group are not enough to meet that which he then determines necessary. So with that in mind, I believe it meets many objections that I have heard through the years here not only from the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], but others and in fact from all Members who have spoken in opposition to this bill. Each year I have heard complaints that this Agency has obligated and deobligated and that just before the 1st of July of each year they had obligated practically everything in sight, only to deobligate once the new fiscal year started.

Therefore, I believe this \$300 million would obviate that kind of operation and, at least, would bring the Bureau of the Budget into the picture as the arm of the President in passing judgment prior to the use of any of this \$300 million.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would the gentleman from Mississippi permit me to propound a specific question? The category of development loans is to receive \$782.2 million under the bill which we now have before us.

Would it be possible for the administration to take the entire \$300 million out of that one category, or is it necessary to divide it on a pro rata basis among the various categories?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to say that insofar as the wording of the provision is concerned, it makes no effort to tie it down on a pro rata basis or other basis. Presumably it would be done in the best judgment of the fellow doing the job, but I felt that we would get into too much detail if we were going to be able to get it adopted.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would it be equally correct if the \$300 million is all taken away from development loans, and if it became the objective of the administration later to beef up the category known as development grants, to have all of the \$300 million then transferred into development grants?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that my answer up to this point as to the meaning of the section and the requirements of the section—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WHITTEN. Continuing my answer, if I may, I was referring to the requirements in the section mentioned, which is on page 4. There is nothing in there to require that this be prorated; however, the Administrator or the executive department having justified in the preceding item these items in the amount specified, I would presume anybody following this would, in effect, prorate. But I would also say that under no circumstances would I feel there would be any basis to use \$300 million to exceed the amount fixed here in the first part of the act unless it is needed. The full amount of money is available to the President on two determinations: One, is it necessary to spend it in the national interest and, two, funds are not available from other sources.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman think that under no circumstances would more money be obligated in this next fiscal year in any one category than the amount provided in the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. May I say the point the gentleman makes about the broad authority: he is more familiar with that than I am, and he would be a better judge of what the basic law might permit. But I have no such intention.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the minority will offer certain amendments at the proper time. Let me state that in every instance the amendments which the minority will offer will exceed the amount of money which was in the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964. We have not attempted to ruin the program. We are attempting to help it. We have been told time

after time by witnesses before the committee that the program of last year was an effective program; that enough money was appropriated for them to do the job which they had to do, with the sole exception of military assistance. I think it has been stated on this floor many times we were exceedingly disappointed with the administration for coming before us and asking for a military assistance appropriation which they stated at the time was too little and would not do the job. I hope that this type of budgeting is not followed by this administration or any other administration in the future. It is certainly within the rights of Congress to expect that when a budget come, up from downtown the executive department, that the amount recommended is the best guess of the amount that they can use in the next fiscal year.

To have them come up here and say they are asking for x amount, but they really feel the amount should be x plus three, is to me not playing fair with the Congress.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the money which we are voting here, in view of the other spigots of foreign aid—and bear in mind that there are 29-some spigots—in view of the amount of money that is being spread throughout the world, we are being anything but generous with our foreign aid. I think we are doing the job which must be done, to use foreign aid as an adjunct of our foreign policy, if, indeed, the administration desires to do so. So I do not think it is necessary for any Member of the House or any Member of the other body, and particularly any member of the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations, to feel other than that he has done an adequate job. In fact, as I said, many of us think it is much too adequate, about \$300 million too adequate. We will try at the proper time to reduce the sums which will be appropriated to a level which we feel is about right.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers except to close debate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, 1 hour.

Mr. PASSMAN. Happy fiscal New Year's Eve, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues.

This is New Year's Eve as it applies to our fiscal years. Today we pull the curtain down on another fiscal year with a deficit no doubt in excess of \$7 billion. This deficit condition has been repeated about 29 times out of the past 34 years. In the period of our greatest prosperity our budget deficits have been, and are, the largest.

Tomorrow we start a new fiscal year, fiscal 1965, and it is already acknowledged that we will again experience a huge deficit.

As I speak to you this afternoon, may I remind you that our public debt, including both borrowed money and statu-

tory obligations, now exceeds \$1,056 billion. Of this sum, \$310 billion of the obligation is borrowed money, and some 108 statutes call for a payout of funds in subsequent years for services previously rendered, in the amount of \$746 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I surely am not "holier than thou" and certainly not wiser, but I have practically lived with this worldwide foreign aid program for 10 years—weekdays, holidays, Sundays, and many nights. I have tried diligently to learn as much about it as possible.

And I have endeavored to keep the Members cognizant of some of the shenanigans practiced by the AID by, among other means, keeping your desks loaded with verified pertinent information.

I have also tried on many occasions to yield to several of our Presidents, but I have found that they have limited knowledge of many of the weaknesses of the program. On one occasion, for example, I spent a good part of an afternoon with one of our Presidents and 12 of the top leaders of our Government, from both the legislative and executive branches. When the meeting ended, the President reluctantly admitted that he had been misinformed by his subordinates, and that year we cut the foreign aid appropriation bill by \$1 billion and still left the program overfunded.

That kind of situation has been true with relation to the Presidents up to and including the present Chief Executive. The program is indeed a "monster" of the State Department, and not a program of the President of the United States.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that most of the members of the subcommittee who attended the hearings the longest are today most assuredly supporting my position the strongest.

And, I state to you now, without fear of successful contradiction, that if the House should refuse to ever again appropriate a single dollar for foreign aid, the unexpended funds now on hand to the credit of the program could discharge every legal commitment we have outstanding for foreign aid.

So it is really a question of how much money you want to borrow and give away in fiscal year 1965.

May I repeat, if you never appropriated another dollar for foreign aid, every legal commitment we have outstanding in the program could be met out of the unliquidated funds presently on hand.

May I also state, most emphatically, that the request before you is not a "bare-bones" figure by any stretch of the imagination.

Title I only of this bill, as reported to the House, calls for \$3,316,572,400. Contrast this sum, if you will, with the amount in the bill that the committee reported to the House and which you approved last year for comparable items. The last House bill at this point for these purposes was \$2,666,700,000.

Therefore, the committee is asking you today to appropriate new funds for title I only in the amount of \$649,872,400

more than the House approved last year at this point, or, in round numbers, \$650 million more than you were asked to approve last year at this point.

And this fact does not take into account the large increases in title II appropriations or increases in many of the other agencies that distribute foreign aid funds.

You hear a lot of talk about title I, but they do not get into title II, and they do not get into title III and into the other spigots and the other agencies that are now dispensing foreign aid.

Mr. Chairman, this worldwide giveaway program is now to some extent being disbursed by about 26 agencies, and the total cost scattered throughout these agencies calls for foreign aid—in fiscal year 1965 in excess of \$7 billion, and not \$3.3 billion, as you have been told today.

Add to this amount the interest that we will pay in fiscal 1965 on what we have borrowed to give away, and the total cost will be in excess of \$10 billion in fiscal year 1965.

Mr. Chairman, it is fantastic, but true, that our government will be disbursing funds during fiscal 1965 in 99 nations and 9 territories.

This is getting close to an aid program in every nation on the fact of the earth—including Communist, pro-Communist, and so-called "neutralist" countries.

Actually, is this the kind of "monster" that Congress desired to create?

The program cries out for correction. It cries out for control.

I have not misled the Members of the House in the past. I will not mislead you today. And, I will not mislead you in the future.

Capitulation to the wishes and whims of the 71,416 people, including participants, who are on the payroll of this "monster" is something I cannot do.

May I state further that this uncontrolled program has gone so far until now it has contract personnel from, or with, trade schools, business schools, auditing firms, teaching firms, colleges, and universities in 46 of the 50 States.

It is estimated that it is costing close to about three-fourths of a billion dollars annually to pay the salaries, traveling and related expenses of these 71,416 personnel, hopping all over the face of the earth. Is that what you want?

Mr. Chairman, should we not take control of this program? It is probably looser, wilder, more extravagant this year than in practically any year since I have dealt with this bill as chairman of the subcommittee.

I respectfully refer the Members to page 20 of the minority views in the committee report. This information is current, actual, and factual.

There are 57 countries included in the table on page 20. They have received \$12,436,400,000 in military and economic assistance from the United States during the period covered by this table. During the same time—from January 1, 1958, through December 31, 1963—these 57 countries purchased \$6,977 million of

our rapidly diminishing gold reserves. That is nearly \$7 billion of our gold to 57 aid-recipient nations in 6 years. Is that kind of situation what you want?

And, how about the balance-of-payments situation? It is a frightening story.

Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

The AID people have put out propaganda across the Nation that 80 percent of all the money for procurement in the program is spent here in America.

Hypothetically, let us say General Motors ships out a shipload of trucks. When that shipload of trucks goes out, does the invoice go to the country receiving the gift? No. It goes down to the U.S. Treasury. It is paid out of the American taxpayers' till, and not by the recipient nation.

So when you do that, when you credit to the recipient country \$3 by which they can requisition what they would normally purchase, in a great many instances that act releases what they earn from exports, to buy our gold and to speculate.

If what the AID people advocate in this myth and misrepresentation—that 80 percent of the money is spent in America—is the case, then let us triple this program, and then really have some prosperity.

But, you know and I know that when we give money away it is a one-way street.

Now, let us take a look at the international organizations, which are getting bigger and bigger all the time. The International Development Association, for example, is a giveaway program. We put up 43 percent of the money and other part I countries put up 57 percent. However, 13 of them are getting more direct aid from us than they are contributing to IDA. If you will look at the record, you will find we are literally contributing, directly and indirectly, about 96 percent of the total. These things are not loans. They are credits, which is the designation Secretary Dillon gives to them. What countries have credit? India, for one. Maybe we give them \$600 million out of bilateral funds and IDA comes along and gives them a \$150 million credit. How is it handled? The maximum is 50 years and no interest, with a three-quarters of 1 percent service charge and 10-year grace period before anything is paid back; and then it will be 1 percent a year on the principal.

Let us also look at the Inter-American Development Bank, in title II of the bill. Last year we appropriated \$50 million for the IDB. This year the bill calls for more than \$205 million.

Mr. Chairman, how wild is this program? Everything is on an illustrative basis. AID can spend the money wherever they want for whatever they want. They can testify for funds for a highway in Brazil and can take that money and build a brick building in Algeria. Flexibility? Yes. They can testify for funds for 140 projects in Argentina and can vacate every one of those projects

and spend every dime of the money in India. Is that what you want?

The foreign aid allocations are made on a political basis and made to nations whether they need the money or not.

Of course most foreign countries will take our aid. I talked to one of the ministers out in Lebanon and inquired of him as follows, and I paraphrase:

Will you tell me, Mr. Minister, why my country, which has balanced its budget only a few times in the last 30 years, which has chronic inflation, a dollar steadily losing its purchasing power, and owes more money than all the rest of the governments in the world combined, should continue to send your country millions of dollars a year?

The Minister smiled as he replied:

I know of no reason why you should, but if you are foolish enough to do it, of course we shall accept it.

Lebanon received \$88 million, \$77 million of it in outright grants.

In fiscal 1965 our Government will disburse funds in 99 nations and 9 territories. The prime "sub" and related projects are in excess of 4,000.

How are you going to examine a program when there are 4,000 projects in 99 nations and 9 territories?

Then, when you get into the bill itself, they have got it cut up into many different captions, to further confuse the issues.

During the first 9 years it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee, the Congress reduced the several Presidents' requests by more than \$8 billion below the budget estimates. But, even so, we gave to AID so much money that every time they needed \$1 to pay for something they obligated \$1.12. In the military every time they needed \$1 to pay for something they obligated \$1.28.

There is admitted overfunding of the cost of projects of approximately \$3 billion in 9 years.

And the AID people have admitted that they are funding projects 8, 10, and 12 years in advance of the completion date. They are building in 10-percent contingencies in practically every development credit project.

Also, the abuses are so rampant that there are tens of millions of dollars carried in an obligated status for projects long since completed.

Since April 10, 1964, AID deobligated and reobligated funds from 236 projects totaling \$50,065,000. If we could put a squeezeout on the remainder of the some 4,000 projects and related projects it might well be that out of the \$7 billion in unliquidated funds \$1 billion or more would be totally unencumbered.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example of just how gullible we are. Let us consider the Inter-American Development Bank. It is not under our control; we have one board member.

I shall never forget when we brought the bill out supporting the full amount to set up another "window" in this Bank. And when we appropriated the money, probably before the Bank had negotiated a loan, certainly before they had col-

lected one penny of interest, they were pawing to get more of this money. So, they had a little "clambake" down in Rio that lasted for 6 days. They spent \$143,358; \$17,745 for representation allowance.

In 1962 they pulled another little party down in Buenos Aires and they spent \$207,501 there.

In 1963 they pulled another one in Caracas, and they spent \$201,624 in 1 week, entertaining each other.

Mr. Chairman, Assistant Secretary of State Bullock submitted some DLF telephone calls. He stated and I paraphrase:

Attached here for your signature are five DLF toll calls on the following loans: India, Tunisia, Ecuador, Argentina.

Then there is a little note.

Regarding four Pakistan loans just sent to you, Mr. Bell wishes to have these loans approved prior to your appearance before the Passman committee tomorrow.

Now, let us go into the Tunisian matter. If you do not think you are being taken for a buggy ride with a bare axle, listen to this: On November 27, 1962, AID credited Tunisia with \$10 million in commodity assistance. On June 20, 1963, with a huge unobligated balance, AID started allocating funds left and right. So, they allocated another \$15 million to Tunisia. Then in May, 1964, they allocated another \$10 million to Tunisia.

Now, what are the facts? Thirty days ago there was in excess of \$3 million of the 1962 money still on hand, untouched. All of the fiscal year 1963, \$15 million was untouched, and the \$10 million that was allocated for them the other day also is untouched.

Mr. Chairman, in March our public debt exceeded by about \$25 billion the combined public debts of all of the other nations of the world.

Ways and Means Committee Chairman MILLS stood in the well of this House a few days ago and pleaded with the Members to raise the debt ceiling. Did he not state forthrightly that the blame for this condition is, of course, on the Congress, because we continue appropriating money and borrowing money and spending it and obligating it so that it becomes necessary to ask that the debt limit be raised? That kind of exercise in futility is becoming just about as regular as Members go after their pay checks.

The practice every year is to collect what we can, spend all we can borrow, and keep pushing the debt ceiling up.

Mr. Chairman, I shake in my boots when I think of the insults that our great Nation takes from some of the countries scattered around the world.

Egypt at one time said, "Get out." We suspended the program out there for 2 or 3 years, but we did not stop the funds.

Syria at one time said, "We have had enough; get out."

Mr. Chairman, I was out there a few years ago and a consul for them said:

"If you will be nice and go with me we might start back receiving your aid."

I said: "Why do you not get a ticket and go home?"

Now let us look at Portugal. They said: "You are not going to wreck our country; get out. We like how we are getting along."

They would not accept our technical aid.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider Cambodia. They said: "Get out; we do not want it. If you do not get out, we will throw you out."

Let us take Indonesia and Sukarno. He told us along about April: "Go to hell with your aid. We do not need it."

About 3 weeks later he said again, "Go to hell." I asked the AID people why they did not get out and they replied, "Oh, it might create an incident." I asked one of them how stupid could we be? He said: "You know Sukarno lives a fast life. He may die, and if he does, we might get somebody friendly."

Let us take Burma. We poured hundreds of millions of dollars into Burma. In this bill you have some \$18 million for one item, and they have no use for it. They say: "We do not want it, we are not going to accept it. Our philosophy and yours are not compatible, we will not take it."

Let us consider another item. That country said: "We do not expect aid, but we will accept it if you will let us do the pricing."

We said, "That is wonderful." So we gave them \$40 million worth of our aid.

"What price are you going to fix on it?" we asked.

"About 5 percent of what it cost you, around \$2 million," they said.

"That is wonderful," we said.

"We want you to take the \$2 million in local currency," they said.

We said, "That is all right, too."

They said, "Let us issue a joint statement. We have made ourselves a party to it."

They still owe us most of the money, even though it is in local currency.

I doubt that many Members of Congress realize that in connection with many of the aid programs they have blank checks. They go out, and they obligate and they spend and they draw checks.

Do not let anybody tell you that they have an empty pipeline. Do not let them tell you, unless you want to believe it, that the unobligated money is down to nothing.

We asked them, "What are the unobligated funds now?"

"We cannot tell you," they said. "We are waiting for another audit."

Later on we asked them the same question, and they told us the same thing.

We asked them in September, last year, and they said, "It will be October before we can tell you."

But, here we are in June, and they can tell you, "We have no money on hand."

However, if you look at the hearings they said, "It is going to be October before we can tell you."

Mr. Chairman, the AID directors come and go. It has reached the point where no outstanding American businessman will accept this position. I think 14 turned it down in 1 year.

They called in an Ambassador, Mr. Riddleberger, but he came back and said, "Get me out of this."

They brought in another one, Mr. Labouisse, an Ambassador. He stayed a little while, and then said, "Get me out of here," and they went back to the field.

Now, we have Mr. Bell, and a nice fellow he is. I understand that maybe his time is now about up, and that he is possibly going to be an AID chief in one of the countries, maybe South Vietnam.

They come and go, and the tenure is about 16 months on the average.

They have changed directors so often that I cannot keep up with them.

I questioned one of the regional directors, one time, and he said, "I do not know, sir."

I asked him about something else. "I do not know, sir," he said.

I asked, "Do you know anything about how we justify the projects?"

"No, sir; I do not know," he said. The situation was so absurd that I said, "Off the record."

Then I told him: "I am going to ask questions, and I am going to give you the correct answers. I am going to go back on the record, and you give me my answers as though they were yours, and I will cover up for you."

That was to keep him from being embarrassed.

I asked the AID Comptroller a question 2 or 3 years ago.

He said, "We will get that, and we will have the answer tomorrow."

So the AID called the Library of Congress and asked them to come to their rescue.

The Library of Congress called me. I said, "Yes, I know the answer." I gave them the answer.

The Library of Congress called the AID people back. The following day they gave me my answer.

That is how cooperative they are.

Mr. Chairman, my position on this bill is the same as it has always been, and it certainly is not to destroy the program.

Now, may I quote a few statements of some of the outstanding Members of this House:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 108, pt. 15, p. 20168]

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, as I stated just a short time ago in paying tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I have been associated with this program since its inception, and we have been fighting inefficiency and waste every year. This cut in the foreign aid program is nothing new. We have cut it every year, and every year we have been told that we were wrecking the program. Well, now, we have wrecked it about 10 or 15 times, but it is still going stronger today than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that we have made some deep cuts. We have done so because we believe that they are justified. We believe that there is waste in the pro-

gram. But I feel that our subcommittee under the able leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has brought to the House a fair, just, reasonable, and sane bill. I believe that we can carry on an adequate program of foreign aid under it.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 107, pt. 13, p. 18156]

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this is a difficult bill to handle. I had the privilege of handling it as chairman for 4 years. We have been told, to my certain knowledge, every year for the past 10 years when we cut this bill, that we were wrecking the program. Yet, during the 13 years of the foreign aid program, we have succeeded in spending \$106 billion and the program is still going strong. I think you will agree that we have not at any time wrecked this program by the cuts that have been made by the Congress upon the recommendation of our committee.

In addition to that, notwithstanding the cuts we have made, we have had the Comptroller General of the United States appear before our committee time and again, and the Comptroller General is reviewing these programs all over the world and is auditing the accounts, and his statement time and again before our committee has been that the greatest trouble with the program has been that they have had too much money to spend.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 106, pt. 10, p. 13106]

Mr. GARY. In the last 25 years since 1935 we have balanced the budget only five times—five times in 25 years. We have had a deficit in every year except five. Let us see what the figures are today. For 1960 the expenditures are \$77 billion. The national debt as of last Monday, June 13, was \$289,300 million.

Do you think we can keep that up for 25 or 50 years? I do not think we can. The time has come when we must begin to consider these facts. One thing is absolutely certain—a bankrupt nation cannot defend itself. And let me give you one other figure here. Already so far this year we are \$4,772,354,000 over the receipts. That is, our expenditures for the 11 months and 13 days of the present fiscal year exceed our receipts by \$4,772 million. How can we keep that up?

We have got to stop and consider these programs in the light of our fiscal situation.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 108, pt. 17, p. 22715]

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman would yield further, I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the magnificent job which he has done on this bill. I think the gentleman has done as good or a better job this year than in previous years. He has performed a service to the country and I support him. I am glad that the reductions were made.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Had the reductions not been made, I do not think I could have voted for this bill.

Let us continue, quoting now the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. FLYNN]:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—vol. 102, pt. 9, p. 12356]

With reference to the foreign aid program "I have opposed it consistently on each rollcall vote since I have been in Congress. * * * Mr. Chairman, my study of this subject has truly convinced me of this: that our position among the nations of the world

is not being strengthened and cannot be strengthened by an annual appropriation of \$3 or more billions for foreign aid, or mutual security. Our actual security is possibly not one bit stronger because of mutual security expenditures than it was 10 years ago. We can never strengthen our position by this poorly administered mutual security program."

Another year, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNN] offered an amendment to the foreign-aid appropriation bill providing that no part of the appropriation could be spent until after our budget was balanced.

He explained the purposes of his amendment in this manner—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14521:

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is proposed and offered for two purposes:

First. To write into law that the mutual security program shall not be paid for by deficit financing; and

Second. To make another genuine attempt to balance our national budget, bring an end to deficit financing and make some payments on the existing national debt.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I was compelled to oppose this amendment. But I would say now that if the gentleman from Georgia should offer a similar amendment to the bill now under consideration, I would certainly support it.

And now, to quote the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, has deplored the effects of the foreign-aid program on American agriculture. He has shown how oversea production in competition with U.S. production is encouraged by investment surveys, dollar loans, local currency loans, investment guarantees, and by other means, through foreign aid.

In this connection, I shall quote now only one paragraph from Report No. 1387, by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], dated May 8, 1964, to accompany the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I shall read briefly from page 17 of that report, as follows:

Our own Federal Government has been providing funds and technical assistance to enable competitors (Americans and foreigners) to increase their production overseas—both in quantity and quality—and to take over much of our traditional world markets with commodities produced with cheap labor, land, and materials. It is extremely difficult for the American farmer to compete with foreign producers—although efficiency of production and superior quality have enabled him to retain some of his foreign markets despite this disadvantage.

I agree with the points these outstanding gentlemen have made.

Now, Mr. Chairman: Convince a man against his will; he is of the same opinion still.

Let us face up to our responsibilities.

Do the Members realize that this is probably the only piece of legislation that

was ever created in Congress whereby we just cut them loose and give them a blank check? You give the money to them and they can do exactly what they want to do with it.

I do not believe there is a Member on this floor who really believes we are justified in disbursing funds in fiscal year 1965 to 99 nations and 9 territories. It is fantastic. It is unbelievable. But, it is in the hearings. They give you the figures. If that is what you want, that is what you are going to have. However, I do not believe that is what you want.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to summarize:

The bill under consideration would provide funds far in excess of needs for the foreign aid program. Last year, the Congress appropriated \$3 billion in new funds, and during our hearings this year the committee was told repeatedly by "key" witnesses that the fiscal year 1964 program was "reasonable," "adequate," and "satisfactory." And the facts of record make it clear that a \$3 billion appropriation would be just as adequate this year.

This year's so-called "tight" budget for title I of the program is \$651,700,000 above the comparable appropriation for fiscal year 1964, although 14 countries and territories which were included in the budget last year have been deleted from the program for new money this year.

During the past 9 years the appropriations for foreign aid have been reduced by the Congress, \$8,108,262,000, or 21.10 percent, below the budget estimates. Each year, without exception, the administration in power has predicted the direct consequences to our Nation and the so-called "free world" if such action were taken. But, in every case, the amount appropriated by Congress has proved to be excessive to actual needs. By not being taken in by cries of "wolf," the Congress has directly saved more than \$8 billion for our country, while providing more money than the program needed. It is my hope that the majority of the Members of this House will refuse to be "taken in" this year.

The "pipeline" of unexpended funds in the aid program has increased by \$1,783,162,000 over the past 5 fiscal years. This has been so despite the money cuts made by the Congress. One of the primary causes for this huge "pipeline" of money is the number of countries which are recipients of our aid—99 countries and 9 territories in fiscal 1965 from military or economic assistance or Public Law 480—surplus agricultural commodities—and 38 of these countries will be beneficiaries of all three of these spigots of aid.

The foreign aid program has no counterpart in any other program operated by the U.S. Government. The legislative authority specifies that funds shall be spent for programs which are outlined in the broadest of terms. Funds are authorized and appropriated for these purposes, but up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated for any purpose

may be used for other purposes. In addition, a contingency fund is provided which the President may use for any purpose authorized under the act. And, military assistance has its own contingency fund, provided by law, in the amount of \$300 million. This is indeed the most flexible program known to man.

The aid program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. The executive department justifies its requests for appropriations on an "illustrative" basis. It tells the Appropriations Committee what it intends to do with money when it is appropriated; however, it can do something entirely different with the funds once they are appropriated. For example, it would be entirely possible for the Agency to justify the appropriation of money for the construction of a dam in Tunisia, and then use it to build a bridge in Iran.

During the fiscal year 1964, the AID initiated at least 60 projects which were never presented or justified to the Congress. The fiscal year 1964 cost of these projects was \$7,202,000 and the cost to complete them is estimated to be \$21,697,000.

Any budget prepared for the foreign aid program must, of necessity, be an estimate of the wildest type imaginable. From start to finish, it is based on conjecture as to, first, the number and extent of the projects which will be approved; second, development of worldwide situations; and third, the physical ability to spend money appropriated.

We are financing more than 4,000 foreign aid projects scattered all over the face of the earth, including prime, "sub," and related projects. Furthermore, there are 71,416 people, including participants, on the aid program payroll, and this represents an increase of 7,000 during the last year. The program has reached such proportions that even the confusion is confused.

Cambodia recently requested that we withdraw our aid program from that country—but on April 29, 1964, 5 months after we had been requested to get out of Cambodia, the AID obligated funds to continue the training of Cambodian participants through fiscal 1968, at a cost of \$1,650,000.

It should be obvious to all that, at best, the foreign aid budget is not even a well-founded guess. Only a few people have gone into this program well enough to be thoroughly informed—and, I would say to the House that all of these people are not, by any means, in the executive branch. With due modesty, I should inform the Members that I, myself, spent more than 800 hours dealing with this program during calendar year 1963 and more than 300 hours, already, this calendar year in research and conducting hearings, and similarly during the preceding 8 years. I have looked only at the facts as I see them.

Among other serious matters in connection with the foreign aid program which disturb me a great deal is our Nation's "gold outflow" problem. Our gold stockpile stood at \$15,596 million on last December 31, as compared with \$22,857

million on December 31, 1957. Against this gold stockpile, which is the source of strength of the dollar, there are short-term U.S. due bills held by foreign nationals and governments estimated to amount to about \$26 billion. Consequently, it is literally within the power of those countries, if they should so choose, to bankrupt the U.S. Treasury. The 57 countries which received \$12,436,400,000 in military and economic aid from the United States during the 6 years from 1958 through 1963 purchased, in the same period, \$6,977,800,000 of our gold.

Joined by others of the committee, I strongly feel that a total of \$4,802,190,400—including more than \$3 billion for economic and military aid under title I—will provide more than adequately for the programs covered by this bill. I wish to emphasize that for every category of economic and military assistance this recommendation provides for more than the amount approved by the House in the bill for fiscal year 1964 and is equal to or more than the amount provided in the final appropriation act for fiscal 1964.

This recommendation provides the full budget estimate for military assistance and the full budget estimate for Vietnam. Actually, about all that the recommended reductions would result in would be a long-overdue "squeezeout" of overobligations and a long-overdue shortening of the around-the-world "pipeline."

As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I have had tremendous support in the past from the majority of the members of the subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, and the membership of this House. My position today is the same as it has been in the past, and I hope that those Members who have not had the opportunity to study the bill in detail will again support my position, as they have done in the past.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. STAEBLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. He has again referred to the gold flow problem.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. PASSMAN, the largest purchaser of our gold was Great Britain, was it not?

Mr. PASSMAN. You look at the sheet. There are 57 nations. You can analyze it.

Mr. STAEBLER. The largest was Great Britain.

Mr. PASSMAN. There had to be a largest and there had to be a smallest. Let us get down to the smallest and then work it in between. Go right ahead.

Mr. STAEBLER. Great Britain took more than a third of the gold we have lost in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am surprised they did not take half of it.

Mr. STAEBLER. The figures were for Great Britain \$2,368 million in gold

purchases from us. During that period the amount of aid Great Britain received from us was a total of \$280 million. In other words, a very small fraction of the total amount of gold. And at the same time and during the same period Great Britain repaid to us on prior obligations \$1,112 million. So that there was no connection between aid and gold flow in the case of Britain.

Mr. PASSMAN. According to your understanding. That is your view and not mine.

Mr. STAEBLER. Are you able to demonstrate any connection here?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am getting a lot of fun out of hearing the gentleman run along. Go ahead, please.

Mr. STAEBLER. I follow the principle of the last laugh.

Mr. PASSMAN. Go right ahead.

Mr. STAEBLER. The second largest purchaser of gold was France. During the 6-year period France purchased \$1,000,400,000. During that period the French repaid to us more than that, \$1.03 billion on prior obligations. What connection here?

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. Will you answer one of my questions now?

Mr. STAEBLER. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. How much have you changed this figure here of \$7 billion that these 57 nations borrowed of our gold in your deliberations? I used a net figure. Now, some may happen to be the largest and some must be the smallest and some must be in between. I can only repeat what I said, and you cannot refute these figures, my very dear friend from Michigan. Look at the table. Let us not just go over part of it. Let us look at the facts as they are. I do not care whether you give it all to one country or half of it or what. We have listed 57 nations that we gave \$12 billion of aid to, and those 57 nations, whether it was Britain, France, Portugal, or what have you, purchased from us \$7 billion worth of our gold. You know these figures are accurate. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman before and I thought we had agreed. I am sorry to find out we are in disagreement again.

Mr. STAEBLER. But the gentleman has not established any connection between the purchase of the gold and the aid.

Mr. PASSMAN. How much have you reduced the amount the 57 nations purchased, net? I am referring to a net figure. Fifty-seven aid-recipient nations have drawn out \$6,980 million worth of our gold at the same time we were giving them \$12,400 million. That is of record. You cannot change the record.

Mr. STAEBLER. May I point out that the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman ask his question again?

Mr. STAEBLER. The connection between the purchase of gold and the granting of aid in the countries we talked about which account for more than half

of the gold purchased. There is not any connection.

Mr. PASSMAN. If I drive down a road 3 miles and back up 2 miles, what is the difference between the two? One mile. It is all the same. Here we have a net loss of \$7 billion in gold.

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

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, may I state to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER] that in the case of the United Kingdom since World War II we have given them some \$7,258 million of foreign aid. In the case of France we have given them some \$7 billion of foreign aid. I know the point that the gentleman is trying to make. But let me point this out, that that aid was not all delivered in 1 year. These are the years in which it was obligated. Therefore it is impossible to say that the aid did not have some effect on the ability of Great Britain to buy \$2½ billion worth of our gold. That is the point the Chairman is trying to make, and it is a valid point. He has made it for the nations around the world.

The gentleman from Michigan is trying to put him to a point of proof which would be almost impossible to make. But the implication is so clear, if you have given this much aid and that much gold has been purchased within a certain reasonable period, the correlation is obvious. To me it is very obvious that there has to be a connection between the two.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not quarreling with him. I am speaking of the net result. Any way you take it, we have remaining in this country to our credit only about \$15 billion worth of gold. It requires \$12 billion to support our monetary system. That leaves \$3 billion to pay \$26 billion of short-term due bills held by foreign nationals and governments.

I do not believe we can pay \$26 billion with \$15 billion.

I have endeavored to make only one point and it is a valid point; it is factual. I only know that the 57 nations that we have documented, to which we gave \$12 billion worth of aid in 6 years, requisitioned approximately \$7 billion worth of our gold. That is a matter of fact.

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

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of breaking into the gentleman's presentation I would like to compliment him on his usual fine job of presenting the facts with reference to the foreign aid bill. He has done a magnificent job, in my opinion, as he always does. The gentleman from Louisiana is not only a very capable, industrious, and intelligent Member of Congress, but he is a very courageous man. And, whether

you agree with him as to what he has done today, you have to admire his courage.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am very grateful for the confidence of the Members of the House and for their support in the past.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly.

Mr. STAEBLER. I hope the gentleman's information in other fields is better than it is on the subject of gold flow.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am going to kid him a little now. Do not let this get back to the people of Michigan, because they are already calling you "Governor." They will find that neither one of us knows very much about it, and this will also get me in trouble down in Louisiana.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana and to the next "Governor" of Michigan, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana knows more about this program than the entire Congress, collectively.

Mr. PASSMAN. Thank you, my friend.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my highest tribute to a great American, a great statesman, the Honorable OTTO PASSMAN, who has just given the House the plain true single facts and figures on this foreign giveaway program that has cost the American taxpayers far over \$100 billion.

How any Member of Congress can vote for this bill after listening or reading Mr. PASSMAN's remarks of this day—June 30, 1964, is to me beyond all understanding.

Every American owes you, Mr. PASSMAN, a great debt of gratitude for your good works here in this U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

We will have a better President, we will have a better program, we will have a better administration, and we will have a better Congress if we do not yield to the whims of someone downtown, and if we work our will and cut this bill down to probably \$300 million more than was appropriated last year.

You know, if you want to spoil a child, just give him everything he wants. And, in this connection, I wonder whether this observation might also apply to Presidents?

Now, Mr. Chairman, before inserting some material in the Record, as a part of my remarks, I should note that under the

rules of the Committee on Appropriations, subcommittee chairmen either have to defend and support the recommendations of the majority of the committee or, else, temporarily step aside

as chairman. In this case, that is what I have done, and the reasons are, of course, quite obvious.

I thank the Members for their attention, and I thank the distinguished gen-

tleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] for yielding this time to me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the information I mentioned for insertion in the Record, as an extension of my remarks:

	1964 appropriation		Fiscal year 1965			
	House bill	Final	Estimate	House authorization	Appropriations subcommittee recommendation	Reduction below authorization
TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)						
Economic assistance:						
Development grants	\$150,000,000	\$155,000,000	\$224,600,000	\$224,600,000	\$155,600,000	-\$69,000,000
American schools and hospitals abroad	14,300,000	14,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	
American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)	4,700,000	4,700,000				
Surveys of investment opportunities			2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	
International organizations and programs	100,000,000	116,000,000	134,400,000	134,272,400	114,272,400	-20,000,000
Supporting assistance	300,000,000	330,000,000	405,000,000	405,000,000	354,000,000	-51,000,000
Contingency fund	50,000,000	50,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	100,000,000	-50,000,000
Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	100,000,000	135,000,000				
Alliance for Progress:						
Development grants	80,000,000	80,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	
Development loans	350,000,000	375,000,000	465,000,000	465,000,000	375,000,000	-90,000,000
Development loans	600,000,000	687,300,000	922,200,000	922,200,000	687,300,000	-234,900,000
Administrative expenses, AID	50,000,000	50,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	
Administrative expenses, State	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	
Subtotal, economic assistance	1,801,700,000	2,000,000,000	2,461,700,000	2,461,572,400	1,946,672,400	
Military assistance	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	
Total, title I	2,801,700,000	3,000,000,000	3,516,700,000	3,516,572,400	3,001,672,400	-514,900,000
TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)						
Peace Corps	80,000,000	92,100,000	106,100,000	106,100,000	94,100,000	-12,000,000
Army: Ryukyu Islands	10,000,000	10,000,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	
HEW: Cuban refugees	56,000,000	39,717,137	45,400,000	45,400,000	45,400,000	
State: Migrants and refugees	10,550,000	10,550,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	
Inter-American Development Bank	50,000,000	50,000,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	
International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	
Total, title II	277,206,000	264,023,137	441,677,000	441,677,000	429,677,000	
TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK						
Limitation on operating expenses	1,314,366,000	1,314,366,000	1,350,060,000	1,350,060,000	1,350,060,000	
Limitation on administrative expenses	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,781,000	3,781,000	3,781,000	
Total, title III	1,317,866,000	1,317,866,000	1,353,841,000	1,353,841,000	1,353,841,000	
Grand total, all titles	4,396,772,000	4,581,889,137	5,312,218,000	5,312,090,400	4,785,190,400	-526,900,000

U.S. GRAIN TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC
(By Drew Pearson)

During the last 3 to 4 years, the United States has been supplying \$140 million worth of grain to Egypt under Public Law 480. This is the dollar value, and the actual value in Egyptian currency would be less. However, the total amounts to more than the contribution which the Soviet Union has made for the construction of the famed Aswan Dam. According to the American Embassy, the U.S. grain contribution amounts to 60 percent of all the wheat and wheat flour consumed annually by the Egyptian people and 25 percent of all grains consumed.

President Nasser has made no public effort to identify this big grain contribution with the United States. However, American Embassy officials are convinced that the Egyptian public generally recognizes the source of the grain.

Nasser's anti-Americanism: At the same time that the United States has been in effect balancing the Egyptian economy, Nasser has engaged in drastic, unrelenting opposition to American policies in the Near East. He has not been as vocal in his attacks on the United States as he was during the Eisenhower administration, at which time John Foster Dulles had canceled U.S. participation in the Aswan Dam. However, Nasser's anti-Americanism has been of late much more effective. They are as follows:

1. Unquestionably Nasser persuaded the Libyan Government to cancel the lease of the U.S. Air Force Base in Libya.

The Wheelus Base is the largest bomber base outside the continental United States and is considered of great strategic impor-

tance. Its importance has increased following American withdrawal from Air Force bases in Morocco. Nasser's demand that Arab countries cancel military contracts with the United States led to Libya's formal demand that the United States leave Libyan soil.

2. Nasser has been pressuring Ethiopia to cancel the Kagnew communications base at Asmara, the Ethiopian city on the Red Sea. This is probably the most important communications base the United States operates outside of the continental American territory. It is not only a tracking station but a communications center for the clearing of all messages across the Atlantic. Its geographical location is important, because it is near the Equator. Nasser has been embarrassing Emperor Haile Selassie with demands that all U.S. military installations be cleared from African soil. So far the Emperor has not yielded.

3. Nasser has been shipping arms to Somalia to be used against Ethiopia. This created a hot, guerrilla war during 1963 and part of 1964. Part of his strategy was to pressure for the removal of Kagnew; part was to create Arab unity as against a Christian state—Ethiopia. Ethiopia, while predominantly Christian, has large segments of Moslem population along the border of Somalia, and both Somalia and Nasser have been trying to get control of these areas. Ethiopia has been perhaps the most friendly country toward the United States of any in east Africa.

4. Nasser now has 40,000 troops in Yemen, chiefly for the purpose of trying to take control of that country and from it wage a po-

litical war against Saudi Arabia. Yemen under Nasser has declared the end of monarchies, and this, of course, is aimed at the monarchy of Saudi Arabia and its long alliance with American oil companies. Nasser's chief aim is to try to get control of Saudi Arabian oil, which would finance his drive for Arab unity.

5. Nasser has not paid American citizens for the property seized from them during his Socialist takeover. Most Americans whose property was seized have given up any thought of financial restitution. Meanwhile, within the past 2 weeks, Nasser has seized the property of the Shell Oil Co., valued at \$100 million. While this is chiefly a British concern, it is closely affiliated with American companies and many American investors have their money in it. The fact that Nasser has seized this company so recently is significant.

6. The next Nasser attack on the United States, whether public or private, is expected to take place at the coming African unity conference in Cairo this summer.

WOULD NASSER RETALIATE?

Nasser's opposition to the United States even though unpublicized has caused many Americans and some U.S. Embassy officials to consider the question of whether the sale of American grain under Public Law 480 should be continued. In general, the American Embassy in Cairo believes that the policy should continue. One of the questions raised unofficially by Americans is what would Nasser do if the food was cut off. They seem to fear drastic retaliation such as Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal when John Foster Dulles announced the end of American plans to finance the Aswan Dam. Dic-

tators, it is pointed out, have a habit of losing their tempers and acting irresponsibly when they are provoked. Among other things, it is argued that Nasser would attack Israel in retaliation.

THE ANSWER

In Israel, various parts of Africa, and parts of southern Europe, I canvassed the question as to whether Nasser would attack Israel if American grain was cut off. There is no question but that Nasser is counting very heavily on this grain to balance his economy. He has budgeted it up to 1970. On the other hand, the United States has made no commitment to supply him with grain beyond 1966. Therefore it is quite possible that Nasser could and would take drastic action.

However, I doubt very much that he would attack Israel. In the first place Israel leaders with whom I talked are not worried about an attack. In the second place my own observations are that the Israel Army is too strong and is feared by all the Arab leaders. Nasser himself has said privately during the recent Arab summit conference that he was not going to fight a war against Israel with Egyptian troops. He had some experience on this point in the past, in fact was taken prisoner himself in 1948 by the Israelis.

There may well be an attack on Israel later—but only when Nasser has developed atomic weapons from the German scientists he has employed. He is not going to fight another ground, conventional war.

Meanwhile, the payment for atomic research by these Nazi scientists is indirectly supplied by the United States through the \$140 million worth of grain shipments annually.

If U.S. grain was curtailed, Nasser could not turn to Russia because the Soviet Union is desperately short of wheat itself. The United States in effect is the chief country from which grain can be supplied. This means that as of now the United States is not only subsidizing indirectly the expense of Nasser's 40,000 men in Yemen, not only financing the experiments of Nazi scientists, but also curtailing the dollar balance of the United States which could get cash for this wheat. Even if Nasser did not buy the wheat directly from the United States and bought from Canada instead, the United States in the long run would benefit through indirect increased sales.

CONCLUSION

The tactics of President Nasser are quite similar to those of Fidel Castro in Cuba. He has seized American property for which he has made no payment; he has endeavored to stir up trouble for the United States in all the surrounding area. He has aspired to acquire American oil companies in Saudi Arabia just as Castro has tried to get control of American oil companies in Venezuela. He has taken over the Suez Canal just as Castro has aimed propaganda and won expeditionary force at Panama with a view to disrupting the American hold on the Panama Canal.

The chief difference between Nasser and Castro is that the first is well groomed, un-bearded, speaks with a flawless English accent, and is a past master at buttering up diplomats—in fact more—than the uncouth, bearded dictator of Cuba whom we now boycott.

The effect of this is to make our friendly allies in Africa wonder whether they, too, should not adopt Nasser's tough tactics against the United States. They note that we fall for blackmail.

The only logical excuse for continuing food to Nasser is to help the Egyptian people. When I discussed the matter with Israeli leaders, they were not worried about an attack by Nasser and dispelled the myth that they had asked the United States to feed

Egypt in order to prevent an attack. Their only concern was that the people should be fed no matter what their religion and their enmity toward Israel.

This is a question to be considered seriously by the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. Government.

My own belief is that Nasser will not allow his people to go hungry. He has some internal problems already and he cannot afford a revolt. It is quite true that he would unloose a bitter barrage of propaganda against the United States if this food were curtailed. But he would find the money from other sources to feed his people. He could curtail his operation in Yemen, his large outlay of funds to Nazi scientists or his own television and radio propaganda in the Arab world which runs into considerable money and which again is paid for indirectly by the United States.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, May 5, 1964]

TWO DANCE GROUPS' TOURS COST THE UNITED STATES \$1 MILLION

WASHINGTON. — Government-sponsored trips abroad by two modern dance groups cost the taxpayers more than \$1 million, the State Department has advised Congress.

Status of prior commodity assistance loans to Tunisia

Loan No.	Purpose	Date of loan agreement	Amount authorized	Disbursements per loan ledger as of May 31, 1964
664-H-011	Commodity assistance	Nov. 27, 1962	\$10,000,000	\$6,745,109.33
664-H-014	do	June 20, 1963	15,000,000	0
664-H-019	Commodity financing	May 22, 1964	10,000	0

[From Newsweek, June 22, 1964]

DISSERVICE TO INDIA

So our aid to India has gone mainly to subsidize and prolong socialism, price controls, and an artificial value for the rupee. As the eminent Indian economist B. R. Shenoy wrote in the May 21 issue of the Wall Street Journal: "Foreign aid actually is doing a disservice to the Indian economy * * *. Aside from helping to perpetuate industrial white elephants, foreign aid * * * provides the foreign exchange needed for illicit export of capital; for illegal imports of gold * * * for speculative accumulation of inventories; for the construction of urban property as a hedge against inflation; and for luxury living for those few who succeed in manipulating the nation's economic controls to their own advantage."

In brief, aid to India, insofar as it has not been merely a futile effort to fill a leaking tub, has been encouraging and prolonging socialism, controls, inflation, and an overvalued currency. And what is happening in India is typical of what is happening in other "underdeveloped" countries into which we have been pouring taxpayers' dollars.

When, if ever, are we going to use foreign aid to encourage sound currencies, balanced budgets, private property, free enterprise, and increased productivity?

OF COURSE FOREIGNERS WILL TAKE U.S. AID (By Dr. Howard E. Kershner, president of the Christian Freedom Foundation, Inc.)

Two years ago it was my privilege to discuss economic problems and international finance with a highly placed official of the Government of Lebanon. He explained to me proudly that his country was not in debt, always balanced its budget, had no inflation, and maintained a strong, stable currency. I congratulated him upon these facts and then inquired, "Will you tell me, Mr. Minister,

The information was given to the House Appropriations Committee during hearings on the State Department's appropriations bill scheduled for House consideration Wednesday.

The Martha Graham Dance Co., the committee was told, made two trips under the Department's cultural presentations program.

The first tour, late in 1955 and early 1956, cost \$302,525.

The second tour cost \$241,608.

Reobligation of prior year obligations

Date of letter	Number of projects	Amount of reobligation
Apr. 6, 1964	15	\$9,838,000
May 1, 1964	5	1,502,000
May 28, 1964	7	2,387,000
June 2, 1964	3	11,970,000
June 5, 1964	6	181,000
June 8, 1964	19	338,000
June 10, 1964	35	2,341,000
June 11, 1964	88	6,678,000
June 12, 1964	37	1,768,000
June 17, 1964	17	11,814,000
June 19, 1964	4	648,000
Total	236	50,065,000

why my country that has balanced its budget only six times in the last 30 years, has chronic inflation, a dollar steadily losing its purchasing power and owes more money than all the rest of the government in the world combined, should continue to send your country millions of dollars a year?"

The Minister smiled as he replied, "I know of no reason why you should but if you are foolish enough to do it, of course we will take it."

U.S. LEBANON AID

Through December of 1961, the United States had given Lebanon \$88 million in foreign aid. Broken down, \$8 million was in military assistance, \$77 million was in grants (gift), and \$3 million was in loans.

In 1950, Lebanon had a gold reserve of \$20 million. At the end of July 1962, Lebanon's gold reserve stood at \$172 million.

From the above figures, taken from official sources, it is unmistakably clear that Lebanon was never in need of our foreign aid.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], to close debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak quite briefly, indeed. Certainly, at this hour it would not be appropriate for me to detain you long.

I want to compliment my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], upon his very excellent talk. He is always very interesting. I believe, as my friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] stated, that the gentleman from Louisiana knows more about the details of the foreign aid program than anyone else in the Congress. He knows more about the details.

Now, one of my good friends said how anyone could have listened to that speech and vote for foreign aid, or words to that effect, he was not able to understand. Well, it is understood and known that my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, does not support the foreign aid program, though he has voted for the appropriation bills which he has handled.

Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that if you completely accept the philosophy of the gentleman from Louisiana, you certainly should not vote for any money for foreign aid because it is, in his opinion, an abomination, without a doubt.

Mr. Chairman, there really is not much difference between our good friend from Louisiana and the majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the content of the bill.

The gentleman wants to cut out in a direct amendment \$300 million. The committee wants to put the \$300 million on the shelf and make it unavailable to the President unless he makes a specific determination that these additional funds are needed and that they cannot be obtained from any funds otherwise available for the economic assistance program.

So there is really very little difference between the full Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], insofar as dollars are concerned.

The majority of the Appropriations Committee, not wanting to cut more than \$200 million in cash, which amount we cut, recommended that we put \$300 million on the shelf, and not deny the President's pleas for flexibility in dealing with military and foreign policy and the opportunity to use these funds if they are urgently required. Is there a man within the sound of my voice who would deny to the President the \$300 million that is in question in the reserve which the bill provides? I really doubt it very much. So the point is, the majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations would put \$300 million on the shelf and make it available only under certain circumstances.

The gentleman from Louisiana would cut it out, eliminate it entirely.

It seems passing strange, however, that the gentleman from Louisiana would be willing to provide about \$3 billion for a program which he says is so bad. It is amazing and shocking to me that my friend, feeling that this program is so indefensible, would want to throw away \$3 billion of the taxpayers' money. That to me is quite incomprehensible, and I think you must agree.

Another thing that shocks and disappoints me in my friend is that he has said in his remarks, and he has said it in the report in the minority views, that this program of foreign aid is "uncontrolled and uncontrollable."

Who has been Mr. Big in foreign aid, for the last 10 years? If it has been uncontrolled, who must answer at the bar of justice for the fact it has not

been properly circumscribed in the appropriation bills?

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

Mr. MAHON. Why, if it is uncontrolled, has the Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of two of my dear friends, not done a better job of controlling it?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to answer the question. The reason for the bill being uncontrolled and uncontrollable is that the authorizing legislation provides that the funds will be appropriated for programs which are so broad it is impossible to have a line item appropriation. You get justifications on illustrative bases, bases which would allow the people who get the money to say they are going to build a dam in Iran, then build a bridge in Turkey. That is what the chairman means when he says it is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. If the legislation were the same type of legislation which we have, for instance, when we authorize a public works measure in the United States, it would be very simple with us to do the same job of controlling as we do in the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. But this is not the fault of the Appropriations Committee. I want to make that clear.

Mr. MAHON. If you provide only \$3 billion, I assume that the gentleman would still say that the program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. So, if the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Louisiana is adopted, the program would be as uncontrolled and uncontrollable as it would be with the higher figure.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This program is a guess, and whatever we say is right is just about as likely to be right as anything else. In the last 10 years since this subcommittee has been appropriating for this item, there have always been carryovers, and we have always given them more money than needed.

Mr. MAHON. My friend from Louisiana made reference to the request of an official in the executive branch that certain funds be obligated prior to the appearance of Mr. Bell, the AID Administrator, before committees of the Congress in connection with the foreign aid program. While I cannot personally vouch for the facts in this case, I have been told that nine projects were involved and that some of them had been under study for several months. Mr. Bell advises that he wanted to have the latest information available before appearing before the appropriate committees. Mr. Bell has provided the following table in regard to the nine loans involved:

Aid loans approved by the DLC and the NAC during the week of Apr. 20, 1964

Loan	Amount (in millions)	Discussion of loan began—	Formal application received
Argentina:			
1. Secondary agricultural schools (Institucion Salesiana).	\$6.8	December 1962....	March 1963.
Ecuador:			
2. Consortium Road.....	13.3	1961.....	November 1963.
India:			
3. Program loan.....	50.0	December 1963....	Mar. 6, 1964.
Pakistan:			
4. Turbogeneration, Karnafuli Dam.....	3.8	1960.....	October 1963.
5. Thermal power station (Siddhergan).....	8.5	1960.....	Do.
6. Thermal power station (Lyallpur).....	18.1	1962.....	Feb. 18, 1964.
7. Malaria eradication.....	10.4	1963.....	December 1963.
Tunisia:			
8. Program loan.....	10.0	July 1963.....	Apr. 17, 1964.
9. Electricity distribution.....	7.4	September 1962....	Sept. 16, 1963.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is it not a fact that this program was cut by President Johnson to the extent of practically \$1 billion before it came to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MAHON. This is the point we have made, that in order to get in a better position for a tax cut, in order to comply with the will of Congress which has been expressed—last year—that we would support a program of \$3.5 billion, the President submitted his request. In effect, he said, "Let us be realistic." I am not using his exact words. He sent down a budget estimate which is approximately the amount we appropriated last year, and with our cuts we are providing less in the bill this year than was provided last year in total obligational availability. So it

seems to me that we are in good position.

My friend from Louisiana made reference to the fact that I had said I would not have supported the bill on one occasion if certain cuts had not been made. I must frankly say that if President Johnson had sent down a program the size of the one which came down in 1957, for example, of \$4.860 billion, or the one of \$4.275 billion in 1961, or of the \$4.775 billion, which was requested in 1962 or the \$4.961 billion requested in 1963; I would have, in all probability, supported a greater reduction. Yet, those who oppose the committee position strangle at a bill which provides \$1 billion less in total funds than they themselves permitted in conference reports in those previous years. The recommended total available for obligation in this year—1965—is lower than that available last year. This is the reason why I say I can support this

bill, though I have always looked with a jaundiced eye upon foreign aid programs and wanted to make reductions and save everything possible by making suitable reductions.

Under leave to extend, I include a table showing total funds available for obligation for the last 9 years and for fiscal year 1965 as reported by the Appropriations Committee:

Mutual defense and development programs—Statement of availabilities, fiscal year 1956 through fiscal year 1965

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget estimate ¹	Appropriation	Unobligated carryover	Transfers, reimbursements and receipts	Recoveries	Total available for obligation
1956:						
Military.....	1,442.2	1,022.2	33.9	+2.1	395.0	1,453.2
Economic.....	1,824.4	1,681.1	14.7	+6.4	160.6	1,862.8
Total.....	3,266.6	2,703.3	48.6	+8.5	555.6	3,316.0
1957:						
Military.....	3,000.0	2,017.5	195.5	+4.5	188.7	2,406.2
Economic.....	1,890.0	1,749.1	142.6	+8	127.8	2,020.3
Total.....	4,890.0	3,766.6	338.1	+5.3	316.5	4,426.5
1958:						
Military.....	1,600.0	1,340.0	538.8	-22.7	206.0	2,062.1
Economic.....	1,786.9	1,428.8	225.4	+29.1	144.1	1,827.4
Total.....	3,386.9	2,768.8	764.2	+6.4	350.1	3,889.5
1959:						
Military.....	1,800.0	1,515.0	21.5	+27.8	222.9	1,787.2
Economic.....	2,375.1	1,933.1	44.6	+3.4	170.8	2,151.9
Total.....	\$4,175.1	\$3,448.1	66.1	+31.2	393.7	3,939.1
1960:						
Military.....	1,600.0	1,300.0	52.1	+57.2	208.3	1,617.6
Economic.....	2,830.0	1,925.8	42.3	-26.1	163.8	2,105.8
Total.....	4,430.0	3,225.8	94.4	+31.1	372.1	3,723.4
1961:						
Military.....	2,000.0	1,800.0	50.9	+2.4	120.6	1,973.9
Economic.....	3,025.0	2,631.4	66.9	+30.0	146.4	2,874.7
Total.....	\$5,025.0	\$4,431.4	117.8	+32.4	267.0	4,848.6
1962:						
Military.....	1,885.0	1,600.0	58.1	-8.5	240.7	1,890.3
Economic.....	2,890.5	2,314.6	657.0	+6.3	104.7	3,082.6
Total.....	\$4,775.5	\$3,914.6	715.1	-2.2	345.4	4,972.9
1963:						
Military.....	1,500.0	1,325.0	64.2	+79.3	250.0	1,718.5
Economic.....	3,461.3	2,603.9	89.5	+27.5	134.5	2,855.4
Total.....	4,961.3	3,928.9	153.7	+106.8	384.5	4,573.9
1964:						
Military.....	1,405.0	1,000.0	22.3	+50.0	127.7	1,200.0
Economic.....	3,120.3	2,000.0	376.5	-44.6	91.8	2,423.7
Total.....	4,525.3	3,000.0	398.8	+5.4	219.5	3,623.7
1965 (appropriation bill):						
Military.....	1,055.0	1,055.0	25.0	-----	135.0	1,215.0
Economic.....	2,461.7	2,261.6	28.1	+3.6	59.5	2,352.8
Total.....	3,516.7	3,316.6	53.1	+3.6	194.5	3,567.8

¹ Represents executive requests as reflected in "House documents" and summarized in "Budget estimates" column of annual HAC reports adjusted to include supplementals.

² Estimated.

³ Breakdown between regular and supplementals is as follows:

	Fiscal year 1959		Fiscal year 1961	
	Estimate	Appropriation	Estimate	Appropriation
Economic:				
Regular.....	2,150.1	1,783.1	2,275.0	1,916.4
Supplemental.....	225.0	150.0	* 750.0	* 715.0
Total.....	2,375.1	1,933.1	3,025.0	2,631.4
Military	1,800.0	1,515.0	2,000.0	1,800.0
Total.....	4,175.1	3,448.1	5,025.0	4,431.4

* Includes \$600 for special Latin America program.

⁴ Excludes \$6 million requested for State administrative expense since request was originally in State's budget estimates; \$3 million was subsequently appropriated in foreign aid legislation.

Source: Prepared by the Agency for International Development, June 29, 1964.

As has been said here, it is hard to exactly measure this matter of fund requirements, but let us bear this in mind. My friend from Louisiana keeps talking about this program in the last 18 years having cost, including the interest on the public debt, about \$125 billion. What did we get for it? All of Western Europe was saved. This is valuable beyond estimation. What did we get for the \$125 billion? Well, we stopped Russia from obtaining warm-water ports in Greece and Turkey, and we did not permit them to make the Mediterranean Sea a Red lake, which would dominate Africa and dominate southern Europe. Was that worth anything?

The foreign aid program has had an important part in preventing world war III. Is that worth anything? World war III would cost 20 times in money what foreign aid has cost in the last 20 years. It would certainly cost more in money and it could cost a half billion lives in the contest.

It may be that as expensive as foreign aid has been and as objectionable as it has been to many of us, it has been almost chicken feed when compared to what the situation would have been had we not invested this money in national defense and American security.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. To put it another way, the amount contained in this bill would not carry us for 3 days in a war.

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

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

Mr. GARY. There has been talk about the carryovers from year to year after the congressional cuts in bills for previous years. Is it not a fact that we cut this bill so deeply last year that the estimated carryover for this year is the lowest since 1956? It is only \$53,100,000. The committee bill appropriates approximately the same amount, or less than was appropriated last year.

Mr. MAHON. If we want to abandon Nationalist China and if we want to quit helping support troops in Greece and Turkey and other areas of the world where we are helping to pay for troops, then this could be done. But we dare not do it.

I am sure many Members of the House, while they do not agree with everything involved in foreign aid any more than I do, if their vote meant that there would be no program and meant complete abandonment to communism of key areas of the world—those who in the past have voted against foreign aid would now stand up and say, "Yes, I now vote for it." We have to have some kind of program and that is just what we are working on here today.

Now, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], as I said, probably knows more about the intimate details of foreign aid budgetary justifications than anybody in the legislative branch. But

he is not called upon to use or administer this program. He has never felt the muscle of foreign economic or military aid in a contest where the stakes were war or peace. He has not felt the muscle of it because he is in the legislative branch. But when our President is required to sit down and talk to the representatives of Greece and Turkey and to try to prevent the beginning of what could become world war III, he, the President, feels the muscle of military and economic assistance to other countries and he knows whether or not the program is an instrument for peace and security.

Only the President really understands this. Mr. Johnson as a U.S. Senator supported foreign aid reluctantly upon some occasions and voted for some cuts while in the Senate. When he went to the White House he must have discovered that this program was an ally, that it was a weapon, it was a tool which had been given to him to help him succeed in preventing world war III and spare the lives of American citizens.

Yes, and these people who have had the experience of dealing with the program from the standpoint of negotiating with foreign countries—and under the Constitution the President is our spokesman as to our foreign policies and is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces—seem to favor it strongly.

What have they done and said about it? What did Mr. Eisenhower do? With all of this partisan talk being reported in the New York Times, what did Mr. Eisenhower do? He felt so strongly about the importance of continued and adequate support of a foreign aid program—of course, he conceded that Congress can do as it thinks best—but as a private citizen he said he felt a program of foreign aid of \$3.5 billion—and I quote—"represents a level of mutual assistance that cannot be drastically reduced without damaging the vital interests of the United States." That comes from the highest authority who administered our foreign policy for 8 years.

This is not a partisan program. It has not been a partisan program before. But there have been those who have been seeking here in recent days to make it a partisan program. Tomorrow, when the vote comes, those who have voted for much higher figures in recent years on the other side of the aisle, I hope will vote for the lowest figure that has been presented in the last 9 years and so give to President Johnson, who apparently has the confidence of the people, a chance to do the job. The President has the job to do. He has asked for the tools. We made some changes and reductions. But substantially let us give him the chance to perform for freedom and for the American people.

I, for one, will be voting for this bill and against further amendments.

The President cut \$1 billion. We cut \$200 million and put an additional \$300 million on the shelf. I shall not go further. And I have as my authority such men as President Eisenhower, who used to administer the program, and our own President at this time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of our full committee, for the wonderful message that he has given us here today. I would like to make two observations. I am not going to answer many of the things that the gentleman from Louisiana has said here. But he opened up his statement by stating the ones who signed the minority report were the ones who were in attendance most at the committee. This is a dastardly lie. I was at that committee and the gentleman from Kentucky was at that committee as long as anyone on that committee. We sat there patiently, along with the gentleman from Arizona, day in and day out. Of course, the attendance was bad—one of the poorest attendance records in the Congress. The major reason was because members could not stand the tactics of the chairman of that committee and the way he carried on day after day.

And there is one other point that I would like to make. He mentioned two books. One of them was a small book of 1956 and the other was a voluminous book of 800 hours.

Let me tell you the name of the chairman for that small book. John Taber. No greater chairman ever came out of the Congress of the United States. John Taber could say more in 5 words than the gentleman from Louisiana could say in 10 weeks.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I wish to say that I also was in attendance at those meetings. I was certainly present when every principal witness testified. For a chairman of a subcommittee to come on the floor and condemn the members of his own subcommittee—well, that is all I will say.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. It is my personal opinion that the new chairman of the committee, in attempting to assess the value of foreign aid around the world in the past few years, has been looking in the looking glass of the adventures of Alice in Wonderland, written by Lewis Carroll.

Mr. Chairman, a long time ago a man by the name of Lewis Carroll wrote a book entitled "Adventures of Alice in Wonderland."

I have watched and listened to the arguments being advanced by the advocates of the theory how to buy friends and make enemies. If Lewis Carroll were alive today, I believe he could write a sequel to "Alice in Wonderland" and it would be entitled "Alice in Congress," for what we are doing here today must surely find a thousand parallels in Wonderland. What strange things are happening to the English language. What

were shameful and extravagant handouts last year are prudent, moderate, minimal needs today. I thank heaven that men like George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry were neither "prudent" nor moderate," but were so radical and so extreme that they dared pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for matters of deep principle. But then King George III had no "rose garden" to tempt their favor.

The Mad Hatter in Lewis Carroll's fictional story wore only one large hat, but concealed beneath it were 17 smaller hats. So it is here today. The one massive hat concealing \$3.3 billion in new foreign aid appropriations which it is alleged will strengthen the free world. But remove the big hat and a whole Pandora's box reveals itself, handouts of every size and description for three-fourths of the nations of the world. And if we include the additional countries that will benefit from the funds in this bill for the special U.N. programs such as the Special Fund and the expanded technical assistance program, we must conclude that most of the remaining fourth also will go to the trough provided by our taxpayers.

And I cannot escape the parallel between the tea party in Wonderland and the attempt to engage in meaningful debate here. For even while we talk and while the issue is debated, we know full well that no matter what arguments are presented, no matter what logic is brought forth, the heavy hand of politics and political pressure has predetermined a substantial number of votes. The empty seats in this Chamber reflect that obvious fact just as there were many empty seats at the Mad Hatter's tea party.

And what parallels can be found between the bizarre events in Wonderland and the inconsistencies that mark our deliberations here today.

We have a national debt which exceeds the debt of all the countries in the world, and yet we are asked to approve the largest foreign aid program of any country in that same world.

In our own earthquake-ravaged State of Alaska, according to correspondence I have received from a Democrat who represents that State in the other body, it is impossible to obtain an SBA Government loan at an interest rate of less than 3 percent. And yet in this bill we are approving loans for friend, foe, and wishy-washy neutral, which charge no interest at all up to 10 years. If its for over 10 years the country fortunate enough to be designated, "underdeveloped," pays only 2 percent—1 percent less than the citizens of Alaska must pay in order to borrow back their own tax dollars to help rebuild their shattered economy.

American men are fighting and dying for their country as advisors in Vietnam. And yet, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out yesterday, wheat which we sell under our foreign aid program to Mexico and France eventually ends up in Red China and Vietnam where it sustains and strengthens the very hands re-

sponsible for our rising casualty rates in southeast Asia.

We hear a great lament from the White House about the poverty which afflicts one-fifth of our population, and yet we are asked to bestow on the poverty stricken in other countries over three times the amount advocated to be spent here. I doubt whether the \$3 billion in this bill will cure poverty overseas any more than the \$1 billion will cure it here.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take part in our foreign aid tea party. I will not cast a vote in favor of dispensing tax dollars from the hard-working citizens of southwest Missouri over the four corners of the world, including 99 nations and 9 territories.

I will vote against this appropriation bill and in favor of all amendments to reduce it. If there are any in this Chamber who can resist the temptations of the rose garden, or the Hatter's party, I urge them to do the same.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some of the remarks, during which the gentleman from Louisiana cited himself as the outstanding authority in the House, and remarks about there not being too many people who know very much about this program.

I have just listened to the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

In the past we who serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee have held voluminous hearings, taking many days and many hours, yet in references to us it has always been said, "Well, you do not really understand the program."

But we do understand the program. When we have witnesses before our committee we listen to them and we read the hearings.

This year I read the hearings of the gentleman from Louisiana's subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The distinguished chairman of the appropriations Committee, Mr. MAHON, just made one of the most outstanding talks I have ever heard on this very vital question.

One of the reasons why the subcommittee has not had an opportunity of acquiring the information, perhaps, which we acquire, has been the fact that the witnesses have never had much of an opportunity to talk. It is sort of like a lawyer who only asks questions and refuses to allow answers but urges that the witness be convicted for not being responsive. Perhaps the House would find of interest some notes I made.

I should like to point out that Mr. Macomber, Assistant Administrator of AID, is the chief authority for the area where a predominant amount of this money goes, the Near East and south Asia. Mr. Macomber, in the committee hearings, had 1,665 lines to say.

Assistant Secretary of State Talbot, who is entrusted with making policy in this area, had 256 lines to say.

Mr. Tennant had 96 lines to say. He is Comptroller of AID.

Mr. Walsh 44 lines. Mr. White 15 lines.

Mr. Funari, legislative programs coordinator, the gentleman who has been the liaison between the White House and the Congress, who appeared as a witness, had two lines to say.

This was all they could get to say, even though these people were available for weeks and weeks. These people were entrusted with supplying information and answers to questions. They were the people called to testify.

How many lines did the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] have? He had 3,388 lines to say.

This was the time it took to ask the questions. All of these witnesses were given an opportunity not to testify but to listen.

I might say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who is a very knowledgeable man, a man who is a student of the program, and who, I might add, felt as strongly about the program when he fought for the program under President Eisenhower in which we joined, is certainly entitled to his beliefs for what he feels is in the best interest of the United States.

We made a little compilation of this whole thing. All the witnesses combined were allowed 2,078 lines. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], total lines in all these hearings were 3,388 lines, about 1,300 more than all these witnesses who appeared before that subcommittee.

There are many people in this House who know the program and who have worked for the program and who support the chairman's Appropriations Committee to the hilt. He thinks that we must entrust the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs to the President, and so do we. He thinks that this program serves the best interest of the United States, and so do we. If we share this concern then we should support the bill proposed by the very able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I am anxious to know who had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] had the floor.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from New Jersey had the floor?

Mr. HALLECK. I did not hear anybody yield time to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. As much time as he required.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, we are told that our foreign aid is saving the world from communism. This is not true.

The United States is supporting and aiding communism by money, by food,

by arms, by moral support, by trade, by cultural exchange, by giving them our military and nuclear secrets. We are pretending that communism and Communists mean no harm. We are aiding them as they aid other Communists and eliminate any vestige of freedom in the subjugated countries.

Why? Because there is profit to be made by some businessmen in foreign aid, military expenditures, and big government spending.

We now jeopardize the very currency of our country. In 5 years, 1958 to 1963, we gave \$12½ billion to 57 countries who promptly bought \$7 billion of our gold with the dollars we gave them.

Now we propose to give them \$3.7 billion more. Already foreign governments hold \$26 billion in money which can be redeemed in our gold, except we have only \$15½ billion gold left to give away.

Further, there are \$7 billion now in the "pipeline" of unexpended accumulated funds, whether we appropriate any more now or not. Here is all of this money earmarked for specific expenditures. As a matter of fact large amounts can be deobligated and spent for new and other programs.

I want to commend the members of the subcommittee who joined in the minority report, and I share their views. Part of these views I would like to include at this point as a part of my own views:

MINORITY VIEWS

We, the undersigned, firmly believe that the accompanying bill would provide funds far in excess of the real needs of many of the programs which it funds. The bill does not reflect the facts that were brought out in the long and searching hearings. In our opinion, the appropriation of funds in the amount carried in the bill is, very definitely, not in the best interests of our Nation.

The limited time available for the preparation of minority views does not permit documentation in great detail. However, such detail is not necessary to illustrate the validity of the foregoing statements.

The foreign aid program is an amazing program. It is hard to believe, but it is true, that we are financing over 4,000 foreign aid projects scattered all over the fact of the earth. This includes prime, sub, and related projects. It is hard to believe, but it is true, that there are now 71,416 people, including participants, on its payroll—an increase of 7,000 during the last year. It has reached such proportions that even the confusion is confused.

The foreign aid program has no counterpart in any other program operated by the U.S. Government. The legislative authority specifies that funds shall be spent for programs which are outlined in the broadest possible terms. While funds are authorized and appropriated for these purposes, up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated for any purpose may be used for other purposes. In addition, a contingency funds is provided which the President may use for any purpose authorized under the act. Military assistance also has its own contingency fund provided by law in the amount of \$300 million.

The foregoing facts would serve to bolster the statement that "This is the most flexible program known to man." But there are other factors than flexibility which have caused the program, in the words of Chairman PASSMAN, to be "uncontrolled and uncontrollable." The executive department

justifies its request for appropriations on an "illustrative" basis. In other words, it tells the Appropriations Committee what it intends to do with money when it is appropriated. However, it can do something entirely different with the funds, once it comes into possession of them. For instance, it would be entirely possible for the Agency to justify the appropriation of money for the construction of a dam in Tunisia, and then use it to build a bridge in Iran.

Any budget prepared for the foreign aid program must, of necessity, be an estimate of the wildest sort. From start to finish, it is based on conjecture as to (1) the number and extent of projects which will be approved by our Government and the host governments, (2) development of worldwide situations, and (3) the physical ability to spend money appropriated. Further, it is impossible for the Appropriations Committee to ascertain with any degree of accuracy the amount of unobligated funds which are left at the end of the fiscal year. It has been stated that these figures for any fiscal year are not available until October of the following year. Since it has been the custom of the Appropriations Committee to ask the House to reappropriate unobligated funds for this program, this factor adds uncertainty to the proper level of appropriations in the following fiscal year.

With these uncertainties, vagaries, and other built-in flexibilities of this program, it seems strange that each year the Executive attempts to tell people of the country that unless a certain figure is appropriated by the Congress that (1) the foreign aid program will falter and die, (2) our foreign relations will be damaged irreparably, and (3) we will be known as a tightwad around the world. Instead, it should be obvious that the matter is a guess at the very best and that there are only a few people who have gone into the matter well enough to be thoroughly informed. Not all of those people are in the executive department. In fact, the chairman of this subcommittee, the Honorable OTTO PASSMAN, has spent over 800 hours in this program during 1963 and over 300 hours in calendar year 1964 in research and in conducting hearings, and he has given the same dedicated service to the subcommittee for the last 10 years. Over the years all of the members who have signed this minority report have been regular and diligent in their attendance at the hearings.

In other words, we feel that as legislators (1) we are disinterested judges, looking only at the facts as we see them; (2) we are interested in saving money for the taxpayers of the United States; and (3) we are interested in furthering the purposes of the foreign aid program as set forth in authorizing legislation, because it is the law of the land and not necessarily because we are advocates of it.

GOLD OUTFLOW

We are concerned about the "gold outflow" problem. Even though the latest Treasury reports indicate that the outflow has been somewhat arrested, our gold stockpile stood at only \$15,596 million on December 31, 1963. This compares with the gold stockpile of \$22,857 million on December 31, 1957. Against this gold stockpile, which is the source of the strength of the dollar, there are short-term due bills held by foreign nationals, and by foreign governments which use them as support for their own currency, which is estimated to be in the neighborhood of approximately \$26 billion. Consequently, it is within the power of our oversea friends to literally bankrupt the U.S. Treasury.

The table below is an updating—through December 31, 1963—of the gold outflow chart contained in the committee report of last year.

Net sales of U.S. gold to foreign aid program recipients

[In millions of dollars. Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures represent net purchases]

Country	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	Total
Algeria.....						-\$15.0	-\$15.0
Argentina.....			-\$50.0	-\$90.0	+\$85.0	-30.0	-17.8
Austria.....	+\$67.2	-\$82.7	-1.1		-142.5	-32.1	-342.6
Belgium.....	-329.4	-38.5	-140.9	-144.4	-63.0		-716.2
Burma.....			-3.8		-20.9		-24.7
Cambodia.....			-12.0	-3.1	-1.7	+3.2	-13.6
Cameron Republic.....						-1.9	-1.9
Central African Republic.....						-7	-7
Ceylon.....		-7.5					-7.5
Chad.....						-7	-7
Chile.....	+3.0	-1.3	-2.0	-6.6			-6.9
Congo (Leopoldville).....						-3.1	-3.1
Costa Rica.....				-2.3	-5		-2.8
Cyprus.....				-2.0			-2.0
Dahomey.....						-8	-8
Denmark.....	-17.0	-15.0	-15.0	-35.0	+15.0		-67.0
Dominican Republic.....				-3.0			-3.0
Ecuador.....					-3.2	-2.3	-5.5
Egypt.....			-7.5	-7.8	-1.2	-2.2	-18.7
Country A.....		-4.7	-3.0				-7.7
France.....		-265.7	-173.0		-459.1	-517.7	-1,415.5
Gabon.....						-7	-7
Germany (West).....			-33.8	-22.5			-56.3
Ghana.....			-5.6				-5.6
Greece.....		-15.0	-47.0	-10.2	-19.1		-91.3
Guinea.....						-2.8	-2.8
Honduras.....			-8				-8
Indonesia.....		-11.0	-24.9				-35.9
Iran.....	-2.3		-4	-16.1		-5.9	-24.7
Iraq.....			-29.8				-29.8
Israel.....		-4.4			-10.0	-7.0	-21.4
Italy.....	-348.8			+100.0			-248.8
Ivory Coast.....					-1.5		-1.5
Japan.....	-30.1	-157.4	-15.2				-202.7
Korea.....		-1.6					-1.6
Laos.....				-1.9			-1.9
Lebanon.....				-21.0	-32.1		-53.1
Mauritania.....						-8	-8
Mexico.....		-30.0	-20.0			-4.0	-54.0
Morocco.....			-21.0				-21.0
Netherlands.....	-260.9	-29.9	-249.4	-24.9			-665.1
Niger.....						-8	-8
Nigeria.....				-20.0			-20.0
Pakistan.....			-12.5				-12.5
Peru.....		-10.0	-15.0	-5.0	-6	-10.6	-31.2
Portugal.....	-20.0						-20.0
Saudi Arabia.....			-11.3	-47.5	-12.6		-71.4
Senegal.....						-1.7	-1.7
Somalia.....					-1.9		-1.9
Spain.....	+31.7		-113.7	-156.2	-146.1	-130.0	-514.3
Sri Lanka.....	-2.5		-2.5		+2.5		-2.5
Syria.....			-2.1		-1.3	-4	-3.8
Tunisia.....			-5		-5		-10
Turkey.....			-6.1	-2.5	-1.1	+2.0	-7.7
United Kingdom.....	-900.0	-350.0	-550.0	-305.7	-387.0	+329.3	-2,163.4
Upper Volta.....						-8	-8
Yugoslavia.....		-1.5	-15.9		-1.5	-1.9	-20.8
Net sales of gold.....	-1,893.3	-1,026.2	-1,585.8	-827.7	-1,204.9	-439.9	-6,977.8

The 57 countries included in the above table have received \$12,436,400,000 in military and economic assistance from the United States during the period covered by the table. During the same time—January 1, 1958, through December 31, 1963—these 57 countries purchased \$6,977,800,000 of our gold.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES

The table below indicates the "pipeline" of unexpended funds under title I on hand at the end of each of the last 5 fiscal years:

	Amount of funds in pipeline
1960.....	\$4,830,600,000
1961.....	5,975,400,000
1962.....	6,629,500,000
1963.....	7,044,200,000
1964 (estimate).....	6,613,762,000

The following table is a breakdown by program of the estimated unexpended funds for 1964:

Unexpended funds, June 30, 1964

TITLE I	
1. Military assistance.....	\$2,050,751,000
2. Development grants.....	324,856,000
3. American schools and hospitals abroad.....	20,080,000
4. Surveys-investment opportunities.....	1,420,000

Unexpended funds, June 30, 1964—Con.

TITLE I

5. International organizations and programs.....	\$99,640,000
6. Supporting assistance.....	308,723,000
7. Contingency fund.....	170,052,000
8. Chilean reconstruction.....	9,765,000
9. Alliance for Progress.....	1,232,507,000
10. Development loans.....	2,106,694,000
11. Administrative expenses, AID.....	11,929,000
12. Administrative expenses, State.....	865,000
13. Acquisition of property.....	3,284,000
14. Investment guarantees.....	273,196,000
Subtotal, title I.....	6,613,762,000

TITLE II

15. Peace Corps.....	\$52,041,000
16. Army: Ryukyu Islands.....	3,200,000
17. State: Migrants and refugees.....	4,743,000
18. HEW: Cuban refugees.....	6,875,000
19. Inter-American Development Bank.....	200,000,000
20. International Development Association.....	252,840,000
Subtotal, title II.....	519,699,000
Grand total, titles I and II.....	7,133,461,000

Theoretically, these funds represent firm obligations for goods and services on order but not yet delivered. However, the table below indicates that both the economic and military assistance programs have been able to deobligate or dereserve these so-called firm obligations in an amount sufficient to cause considerable concern:

Fiscal year	Economic assistance deobligations	Military assistance and dereservations and/or deobligations	Total deobligations
1956	\$111,000,000	\$395,000,000	\$506,000,000
1957	127,800,000	188,700,000	316,500,000
1958	144,078,000	206,000,000	350,078,000
1959	153,260,000	222,900,000	376,160,000
1960	160,970,000	208,300,000	369,270,000
1961	69,532,000	120,600,000	190,132,000
1962	93,211,000	240,700,000	333,911,000
1963	83,019,000	250,000,000	333,019,000
1964 ¹	91,800,000	127,700,000	219,500,000
Total	1,034,670,000	1,959,900,000	2,994,570,000

¹ Estimated.

SPENDING MILLIONS ON PROJECTS NEVER PRESENTED TO CONGRESS

The committee has had confirmed this year, as it has in prior years, the "illustrative" nature of the entire foreign aid program. During fiscal year 1964 the AID initiated 60 projects throughout the world

which were never presented or justified to the Congress. The fiscal year 1964 cost of these 60 projects is \$7,202,000, and the cost to complete them is presently estimated to be \$21,967,000. A table showing the distribution, by area, of these unjustified projects follows:

Area	Number of unjustified projects	Fiscal year 1964 cost	Present estimate of cost to completion
Africa	26	\$3,044,000	\$9,169,000
Far East	2	271,000	407,000
Near East and south Asia	6	973,000	5,104,000
Latin America	26	2,914,000	7,287,000
Total	60	7,202,000	21,967,000

Cambodia recently requested that we withdraw our aid program from that country. We have done so, but the committee was surprised to find that the AID on April 29, 1964—5 months after we had been requested to get our aid program out of the country—obligated funds to continue the training of Cambodian participants through fiscal year 1968 at a total cost of \$1,650,000.

HISTORY OF FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

The following table sets forth the last 9 years' budgets for foreign aid and the action of Congress thereon:

Total economic and military assistance

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Passed House	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage appropriation below budget estimate
1956	\$3,266,641,750	\$2,701,275,000	\$2,703,341,750	—\$563,300,000	17.24
1957	4,859,975,000	3,425,120,000	3,766,570,000	—1,093,405,000	22.50
1958	3,386,860,000	2,524,760,000	2,768,760,000	—618,100,000	18.25
1959	3,950,092,500	3,078,092,500	3,298,092,500	—652,000,000	16.51
1960	4,429,995,000	3,186,500,000	3,225,813,000	—1,204,182,000	27.18
1961	4,275,000,000	3,584,500,000	3,716,350,000	—558,650,000	13.07
1962	4,775,500,000	3,657,500,000	3,914,600,000	—860,900,000	18.03
1963	4,961,300,000	3,630,400,000	3,928,900,000	—1,032,400,000	20.81
1964	4,525,325,000	2,801,700,000	3,000,000,000	—1,525,325,000	33.71
Total	38,430,689,250	28,589,847,500	30,322,427,250	—8,108,262,000	21.10

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE ONLY

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Passed House	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage appropriation below budget estimate
1956	\$2,141,641,750	\$1,996,275,000	\$1,998,341,750	—\$143,300,000	6.69
1957	1,859,975,000	1,690,120,000	1,749,070,000	—110,905,000	5.96
1958	1,786,860,000	1,274,760,000	1,428,760,000	—358,100,000	20.04
1959	2,150,092,500	1,563,092,500	1,783,092,500	—367,000,000	17.07
1960	2,829,995,000	1,886,500,000	1,925,813,000	—904,182,000	31.95
1961	2,275,000,000	1,784,500,000	1,916,350,000	—358,650,000	15.76
1962	2,890,500,000	2,057,500,000	2,314,600,000	—575,900,000	19.92
1963	3,461,300,000	2,330,400,000	2,603,900,000	—857,400,000	24.77
1964	3,120,325,000	1,801,700,000	2,000,000,000	—1,120,325,000	35.90
Total	22,515,689,250	16,384,847,500	17,719,927,250	—4,795,762,000	21.30

MILITARY ASSISTANCE ONLY

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Passed House	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage appropriation below budget estimate
1956	\$1,125,000,000	\$705,000,000	\$705,000,000	—\$420,000,000	37.33
1957	3,000,000,000	1,735,000,000	2,017,500,000	—982,500,000	32.75
1958	1,600,000,000	1,250,000,000	1,340,000,000	—260,000,000	16.25
1959	1,800,000,000	1,515,000,000	1,515,000,000	—285,000,000	15.33
1960	1,600,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,300,000,000	—300,000,000	18.75
1961	2,000,000,000	1,800,000,000	1,800,000,000	—200,000,000	10.00
1962	1,885,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	—285,000,000	15.12
1963	1,500,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,325,000,000	—175,000,000	11.67
1964	1,405,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	—405,000,000	28.83
Total	15,915,000,000	12,205,000,000	12,602,500,000	—3,312,500,000	20.81

All who have followed this program through the years will recall that, in the 9 years set forth above, the administration then in power has, without exception, reacted with horror at the mention of a significant cut in the budget estimates, and has predicted the direst consequences to our Nation and the free world if such action were to be taken by the Congress. Without exception, these nine budget were cut. As is docu-

mented in the preceding material, there also were no exceptions to the fact that the amount appropriated by Congress proved to be excessive to actual needs. Congress has saved \$8 billion by not being taken in by the cries of "wolf." We do not intend to be taken in this year, and trust that will be the reaction of the majority of the Members of Congress.

We have history on our side. We have the current facts on our side.

OTTO E. PASSMAN.
GEORGE W. ANDREWS.
JOHN J. RHOODES.
GERALD R. FORD.
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we proceed with the reading of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further requests for time? If not, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

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 the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, namely:

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11812, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD today on the foreign assistance appropriation bill and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may be permitted to include a table in his remarks and that other extraneous matter may be included in the RECORD by the Members.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) entitled "An act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates."

CONCURRENCE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 7152

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 789, Rept. No. 1527), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 7152) 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 public facilities and public education; to extend 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 the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby agreed to.

TO GRANT ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 792, Rept. No. 1528), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to carry out the committee's statutory responsibility for legislative oversight of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, by designating and directing not to exceed five members and not to exceed two employees of the committee to conduct studies and investigations of operations under Public Law 480 between the dates of July 5 and July 20, 1964, in Brazil and while en route to and from Brazil in such other Central American and South American countries as the chairman may direct.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for overseas travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (on behalf of Mr. ASPINALL) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research

at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

AGITATORS HIT BY GRAHAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a United Press article, datelined New York (UPI), which appeared in the Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, Miss., Saturday, June 27, 1964. The article which was captioned "Agitators' Wisdom Hit by Graham," states:

Evangelist Billy Graham said Friday he doubts the wisdom of civil rights workers going into the South this summer to help Negroes gain equal rights because of the present situation.

"I'm not sure this is the proper method of dealing with racial attitudes," he said.

The evangelist spoke to newsmen in the auditorium of the Billy Graham Pavilion at the World's Fair where Billy Graham Day was observed. Asked to comment on the disappearance of the three civil rights workers in Philadelphia, Miss., the evangelist said he has been "praying that these people will be found alive." He said the Nation should not "convict Philadelphia" until all the facts are in.

Graham said that since he arrived in New York on Tuesday he had read of at least three murders.

"I don't convict New York City when I read of crime," he said. He said that civil rights workers going into the South were idealistic.

Mr. Speaker, if this statement by Dr. Billy Graham, one of the great religious leaders of this country, had been derogatory to Mississippi, it would have been widely quoted on radio and TV and in the northern press. I have personally failed to find any reference to the Billy Graham statement in any newspapers in this area, nor have I heard it mentioned on radio or television. This, however, should come as little surprise to those of us who have viewed the hour-long television programs since the so-called civil rights workers have gone, or have been sent, into Mississippi and since the incident which is alleged to have happened in my hometown, Philadelphia, Miss. I especially call attention to the hour-long television program by the National Broadcasting Co. last Saturday evening in which the Governor of Mississippi, the ex-Governor of the State and one other citizen were given 7 or 8 minutes to present the viewpoint of our State. I believe you will agree this was the most ridiculous and prejudiced report ever to be presented to the American public. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we will have trouble in this country as long as NBC and the other network stations continue to be so warped in their reporting. Under these conditions there is no way on earth for the true facts to be known to the people of the country.

The citizens of Philadelphia and Neshoba County are peace loving. The white people have long worked together in harmony with the Negroes and the Choctaw Indians for the welfare of all three races. It is indeed a bitter pill to swallow to have to tolerate the activities of agitators and troublemakers who are invading my State for the apparent purpose of creating disturbances and, in my opinion, to take the attention of the American people away from deplorable situations which exist in such places as Vietnam, as well as in New York, Chicago, Ohio, and California. The integrity of the citizenry of my hometown and county, as well as that of the law enforcement officers, has been questioned by the northern press and on network programs. I would like, therefore, to call on anyone in the United States to come forward with any information relative to the missing trio which might be helpful to the law-enforcement officials in my hometown, or to the Governor and other officials of the State of Mississippi.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Captive Nations Week proclamations issued each year by the President as a result of a resolution passed by Congress in 1959 which I had the honor to introduce in the House of Representatives, and which was passed in the House by a unanimous vote of Democratic and Republican Members, is a matter of great significance and importance.

The proclamation designating this year the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week, helps keep alive the hopes and confidences of tens of millions of persons in the countries named in the Joint Resolution of 1959, and hundreds of thousands here and elsewhere throughout the world of the ultimate independence of their respective countries and restorations of their liberty.

In my remarks, I include the proclamation of President Lyndon B. Johnson, designating the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

As President Johnson eloquently said in this year's proclamation:

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1964—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States

of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations: Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 138th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

RETIREMENT OF LT. GEN. A. T. McNAMARA, DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the longstanding interest in supply management of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, I would like to say a few words on the occasion of the retirement of an officer who has done outstanding work in his field. I refer to Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, U.S. Army, first Director of the Defense Supply Agency, who retires on June 30 after more than 36 years of distinguished service.

According to my information, General McNamara became Quartermaster of the II Corps in North Africa during World War II, where he was awarded the Legion of Merit for exceptional service in providing supplies to fast-moving U.S. forces in Tunisia.

He was named Quartermaster of the First Army in September 1943, winning the Bronze Star Medal for his part in planning Quartermaster support of the invasion of Normandy. For directing quartermaster operations of the First Army during its drive across France, Belgium, and Germany, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

He was commended for developing a system to reclaim and adapt captured enemy materiel for use by U.S. forces, and for personally directing evacuation of a huge U.S. supply dump only 1 mile

ahead of the advancing enemy during the German counteroffensive in December 1944.

Following a series of increasingly important assignments during the next decade, General McNamara became the Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army on June 12, 1957. After 4 years of service in this key position, he was designated Deputy Commander of the Eighth U.S. Army in Korea. On October 1, 1961, he became the first Director of the Defense Supply Agency.

My subcommittee has reviewed the conditions in military supply management and the steps leading up to the establishment of the Defense Supply Agency in several reports during the 86th and 87th Congresses, the latest of which was "Defense Supply Agency," House Report No. 2440, 87th Congress, 2d session. The DSA took over the military single manager agencies for food, clothing, medical and petroleum supplies, and transportation, and later added general, automotive, industrial, construction, electronics supplies, and logistics services. In later stages, automotive supply was returned to the Army, and an industrial plant equipment center and the Defense Documentation Center was added to DSA's assignments. The assimilation of these units into one organization and the constant change and expansion has required strong, confident leadership.

Under General McNamara's direction, a fine spirit of cooperation was nurtured between the Military Departments and DSA which resulted in increasing economies in supply management. He participated in the effort to achieve integrated management of common services and supplies. His expert leadership in this difficult and complex area has been aimed at making more efficient the response to the material needs of our armed forces, and at the same time at saving many millions of dollars for the taxpayer. During his tenure of almost 3 years, a large number of significant decisions on supply installations, procedures and items have had to be made on a coherent basis in order to mould DSA into an effective organization.

As an indication of the Defense Department's confidence in his command, DSA has just been assigned a new and major mission. It will be in charge of administering contracts of all military services. I hope to have our subcommittee review the significance of this assignment in the near future.

On his departure, General McNamara leaves behind a well trained staff of military officers of all four military services and civilian personnel. In Rear Adm. Joseph M. Lyle, Deputy Director, who has been nominated for Vice Admiral, the Agency has a worthy successor to step up as the new Director of the Defense Supply Agency.

SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point

in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, June 26, 1964, the various branches and services of the Defense Department paid a richly deserved honor at a joint service review at Fort McNair upon our beloved and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

At the review, and at the order of President Johnson, the Distinguished Service Medal was conferred on Chairman VINSON.

For his 50 years of dedicated service to our country in the Halls of Congress, there is no person who deserved this honor and medal more than CARL VINSON of Georgia.

As I recently said, and I repeat:

CARL VINSON is a man's man, an American's American, a legislator's legislator. He's Georgia's notable contribution to the great men of American history.

I hope someday some qualified person will write the life of CARL VINSON; such a book would be an inspiration for all others to follow.

While CARL VINSON will retire from Congress at the end of the 88th Congress, his wonderful spirit as a human being, and his dedicated service as a legislator for a half a century will always be an integral and important part of American history.

In my remarks, I include an article on the joint service review honoring CARL VINSON written by Ruth Dean, and appearing in the Washington Star of June 27, 1964.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, June 27, 1964]

THE MILITARY JOINS IN SALUTE TO VINSON (By Ruth Dean)

The slight, familiar figure of a Southern gentleman who has served his country for 50 years stood alone in the sunlight yesterday, his hand over his heart as they played the national anthem, surrounded by the military might he helped build for the Nation and now paying him a farewell tribute.

Later, speaking from the reviewing stand from which he had witnessed an unprecedented joint-service military review in his honor, Representative CARL VINSON said: "I shall treasure the memory of this evening, all the days remaining to me."

SECRETARIES AND CHIEFS

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff co-hosted the review at Fort McNair honoring the 80-year-old Georgian, chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, who is retiring at the end of this session of Congress.

For Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Ambassador-designate to Vietnam, it was his last military review as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for his successor, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, as Army Chief of Staff.

Senate confirmation of their new appointments is expected within a week, both officers revealed at a reception after the review, and General Taylor hopes soon after to be on his way to Vietnam.

The armed services pulled out all the stops yesterday to honor the Congressman

whose concern for their welfare has commanded their respect and affection.

Service rivalries and differences which had been thrashed out many a time before that House committee were forgotten in a united effort to show "Uncle CARL" (as he is known to secretaries, congressional colleagues, and servicemen alike) how much they'll miss him and wish him a happy retirement.

Secretary McNamara led the tribute with presentation to Mr. VINSON of the Distinguished Service Medal "at the order of the President."

"We meet on an occasion such as this primarily to honor our great men. CARL VINSON is a great man," the Secretary declared. "He leaves us wiser than he found us."

Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance read the citation accompanying the Distinguished Service Medal which hailed Mr. VINSON's "knowledge of military affairs without parallel" and his championing of "legislation which has progressively strengthened the Armed Forces of the Nation."

SOME HUMAN TOUCHES

The review had something more to it than the customary ceremonies. It had heart.

As Mr. VINSON arrived in a limousine at the Fort McNair gate with Secretary McNamara, the first sight to greet him was the mounted ceremonial detachment from Fort Myer. This was in deference to the now-famous stand he took when former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson banned horses from the Army. He won his plea "to keep some horses, because I can't bear to think of all those service people being buried in Cadillacs."

As the limousine proceeded slowly toward the receiving stand, the honoree's next sight was of an Armed Forces honor guard of soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen, who lined the route on both sides with bayoneted rifles at parade rest.

Once again at the review's end, in respect to Mr. VINSON's wishes to keep horses in the Army, he and Mr. McNamara were transported to the reception at the officer's club in a horse-drawn carriage. Leading the procession was the colorfully clad 3d infantry fife and drum corps, dressed in Revolutionary War red coats and tricorne hats. They had played a band concert before the parade along with the Air Force pipe band and the U.S. Marine drum and bugle corps because Mr. VINSON's favorite music is band music.

Special tape recordings of these service bands were later presented to him along with a number of other gifts from the services, including a color film of the review and a huge scrapbook containing letters, some of them illuminated scrolls of tribute, from the major service commands.

The parade itself also had some surprises. When the moment came to review the troops, two army jeeps drove up to transport Mr. Vinson, Secretary McNamara, General Taylor and Maj. Gen. Phillip C. Wehle, commanding general of the military district of Washington, around the parade ground. There also was a 17-gun salute for the honoree.

RECEIVES SERVICE FLAGS

One of the review's heart-warming moments was the presentation of the flags of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to Mr. VINSON. As Army Secretary Stephen Altes expressed it best: "This is a gift rarely given, but the giving signifies the esteem and high respect in which the Army holds you." Similar sentiments were expressed by Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert and Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze when they presented the flags for their service departments.

Appropriately the parade ended with the Navy Band playing "Auld Lang Syne."

Only one thing was missing—the flyover of planes from the Air Force and the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps air arms. It was later revealed at the reception that Mr. VINSON himself had vetoed this "because it would cost the taxpayers too much."

Top officials from the military and Capitol Hill, past and present, attended the afternoon's events, including House Speaker and Mrs. John W. McCormack, former Secretary of the Army and Mrs. Robert Stevens, who came down from New York; former Chief of Naval Operations and Mrs. Arleigh Burke, most of the 37 members of Mr. VINSON's committee and their wives as well as legal counsels for the committee, Gen. and Mrs. Omar Bradley and former Army Chief of Staff George Decker.

A small boy walking away from the parade and his father, an Army general, best expressed the feeling of the afternoon, "It was a good show, Dad," the boy said. His father replied: "Anyone who's served in Congress for 50 years certainly deserves it, son."

RESOLUTION DESIGNED TO PROHIBIT FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION OVERSTEPPING ITS AUTHORITY WITH REFERENCE TO THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution designed to prohibit the Federal Trade Commission from overstepping its authority and interfering with the tobacco industry in a manner that should be reserved only to the Congress.

The Trade Commission's ruling that every package of cigarettes must bear a label warning that smoking is a health hazard is to me one of the most outrageous regulations ever issued.

It condemns without proper consideration one of our most important sources of revenue, a highly developed tobacco leaf which has played a major role in the survival of this Nation even from its earliest years.

I deplore the action of the Commission as premature, for scientific research has yet to prove that smoking is a cause of cancer, but I resent it more because it is an obvious grab for power. If this agency is permitted to exercise such sweeping authority, no industry will be safe from its domination.

Under the legislation I propose, the Commission would be enjoined from enforcing any requirement calling for the labeling of cigarettes with respect to their effect on human health.

No person is more aware than I of the security involved in keeping our people healthy, but the findings to date involving hazards in the use of tobacco are not comprehensive and conclusive enough to point such an accusing finger at cigarettes as this labeling would imply. If tobacco is found a definite health hazard, then proper steps should be taken for the protection of the public, but these steps should be decided on by Congress and not by an agency of government.

While health is important, there is another side that deserve serious consideration before any action, however inconsequential or however drastic, is taken. That is the effect upon our economic pattern.

Today, tobacco is grown in 21 of our 50 States. Hundreds of thousands of farm families earn a major portion of their income from growing tobacco. Throughout the Nation, 96,000 workers in 550 factories are engaged in the manufacture of tobacco products. One and a half million businesses in every State earn some portion of their income from the sale of these products. Taxes on them amounted to \$3.3 billion in 1963. The United States led the world last year in the export of cigarettes.

From these facts it may be seen that such an important element of our industry deserves a fair and exhaustive trial. Before the industry is condemned and trampled as the FTC would trample it, let us give the research program now in progress a chance to produce definite evidence, if such evidence does exist. And then let the Senate and the House of Representatives do the deciding as to what is in the best interest of the public.

IS COMMUNIST WORLD LIBERALIZING?

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, daily we see more evidence of the basic administration policy of coexistence and accommodation of the Soviet Union. The folly of this policy should be clear to all of us but for short-term political purposes and even more so, because of compatibility of philosophy, the administration is intent on moving closer and closer to deals with Communist governments.

The question we must ask is, Is the State Department correct when it states that the Communist world is liberalizing?

I submit as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the April 17 edition of the New World, the Chicago Catholic archdiocesan paper, which tells of the persecution of the church in Lithuania:

NO CHURCH PERSECUTION? ASK THIS REFUGEE

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—Communist publications circulated here boast occasionally that the Soviets do not prohibit religious worship, nor are churches, synagogues and mosques closed in Russia.

When that happens Zita Kaulius, 70, smiles wryly. Her memories and a packet of tear-stained letters, smuggled somehow through the Iron Curtain, tell another story.

Mrs. Kaulius, is now a Canadian housewife. She was born in Kenkimai, Lithuania, a farming community. When she married Adam Kaulius, they moved to Kartena where he was a policeman.

She remembers well June 17, 1940, when Russian troops and tanks swept into Kartena.

The stunned people watched while the Soviets in a matter of hours took over all privately owned stores and set up one collective state controlled store; when Adam Kaulius lost his job as a Russian police force took over; when church property was confiscated, schools and universities were taken over by the Reds and religion courses banned; when banks and lands were nationalized; the press Sovietized, civil marriages replaced church ceremonies.

Mrs. Kaulius remembers well that in a country 83 percent Catholic, a systematic course of persecution began with the advent of the Russians. And by mid-July 1940, the Soviets completed the grab of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania as a result of the 10-year "peace" treaty negotiated between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany.

She remembers that she and her husband hid in the home of non-Catholic friends and escaped the first deportation of 40,000 Lithuanians to Siberia. The "peace" treaty lasted just a year, then the Nazis invaded Lithuania.

"The Germans were angels compared to the Communists," Mrs. Kaulius said. "Persecuted Christians came out of hiding. My father, who had been arrested, was released by the Germans. He came home with his hands raw.

"The Communists had tortured him by plunging his hands into pots of boiling water until the skin came off like gloves."

Zita Kaulius remembers, too, watching with a group of townspeople while the Germans excavated a mass grave of 66 Lithuanian civil leaders, police officials, shopkeepers, and other "enemies of the people" slain by the Reds.

Some of the victims had their tongues slit for refusing to talk before they were killed. Searching also disclosed bodies of men who had been tied to trees and burned to death.

She remembers that other graves were uncovered and more than 5,000 Lithuanians were found slain in the factory district of Pancvezys—that documents were found which disclosed Soviet plans to transport 700,000 Lithuanians, a fourth of the country's population, into Russian slave labor camps.

Mrs. Kaulius said the Reds succeeded in sending 200,000 into Russia replacing them with Soviet citizens so the overall population would show no decrease.

After 3 years of Nazi rule, the World War II tide changed again.

Russian tanks and troops, in 1944, rumbled toward Kartena. Adam and Zita Kaulius with their two children piled clothing and some household articles into a wagon, and followed the retreating Nazis. Mrs. Kaulius remembers that Russian bullets and shrapnel hit the wagon, tore into the bedding.

At the Nemunas River on the German border, thousands of refugees waited to cross a narrow bridge. Among the last to cross was the Kaulius family before the Nazis blew up the bridge.

The Kaulius family lived for 6 years in a displaced persons camp in Bavaria, Germany. In July 1949, Adam Kaulius got a chance to come to Canada. Zita Kaulius and their two children followed in March 1950, and the family began life anew here.

The tear-stained letters tell the story of Lithuania's continued persecution under the Soviets. The letters tell of relatives murdered, of priests and bishops slain and persecuted, churches turned into museums, seminaries closed.

One letter related that in 1961 funds were raised in the United States to build a church dedicated to Our Lady of Peace in Klaipeda.

The pastor, Father L. Povilonis, had obtained Soviet permission for the building. In January 1962, when the church was com-

pleted, the pastor and his assistant were arrested, the church seized by the Reds and turned into a movie theater.

So when Zita Kaulius hears Communist boasts of no religious persecution in Russia, she smiles wryly. Her memories and the tear-stained letters tell a different story.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the March 23 edition of the Knoxville Journal, which I have held in my files in order to test its accuracy after passage of time, and it especially dramatizes the issue today as it did 3 months ago:

DON'T OFFEND THE RUSSIANS

Under the prodding of the then President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Congress was moved several years ago to enact an annual resolution deploring the plight of the captive Communist nations in Eastern Europe and holding out to these oppressed people some hope for their ultimate liberation. The first of these resolutions was passed subsequent to the barbarous slaughter of Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956 and in successive years during the Eisenhower regime. As a matter of fact, Congress had passed one of these resolutions shortly before the U-2 incident, a fact that was believed to have contributed to Khrushchev's torpedoing the Paris summit conference in a fit of rage.

Since 1960, or since coexistence or appeasement became the official Washington policy, such notice as the captive nations have received by congressional resolution has been of the milk and water variety. "Don't offend the Russians" has been the viewpoint pushed by the State Department and acceded to by Congress.

Now there are reports that the State Department has under consideration to actually exchange ambassadors with some of the more important Communist satellites of Russia, including Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. This action is contemplated even though prior to World War II no diplomat higher than a legation officer was ever sent to these countries. Now if we send ambassadors, our action may be cited as an enhancement of the standing of these countries under their Communist oppressors.

Hearing these reports, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER some weeks ago addressed a letter to the State Department asking if they were true. The response to that letter from a State Department officer read as follows:

"The British and French and certain other European governments have recently raised the level of their diplomatic missions in Bucharest, Budapest, and Sofia to embassy status, and most other governments maintaining diplomatic missions in those capitals are also represented by ambassadors. The United States," the letter continued, "does not rule out the possibility that circumstances at some later stage might render such a step desirable in one or more of these countries."

The "later stage" referred to will no doubt on an occasion in the future when the State Department determines that some further appeasement of the Communist is, in its judgment, desirable.

If the captive nations of Eastern Europe feel that they have been deserted by the U.S. Government, if not by the people of this country, it would appear they have every justification for holding such an opinion.

I wish to point out to the Members that the legitimate spokesmen for the oppressed victims of communism are their political leaders in exile, who truly represent their people, in contrast to the Soviet-imposed dictatorships of Eastern Europe. I include here as part of my remarks a resolution adopted by Coun-

cil of the Republic of Poland relative to free speech in that country:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN POLAND

The publication abroad of the letter of leading Polish scholars and writers addressed to the chief of the Warsaw regime has once more presented to the free world the fact that Poland, along with other countries thrust into the Soviet colonial empire, is governed by means of a totalitarian Communist dictatorship depriving the citizens of liberty in their material and intellectual life. The different ways of resistance put up by the population of Poland are a proof of the moral health of the nation and must be encouraged. This resistance thwarts to some extent the totalitarian oppression and sometimes enforces temporary tactical concessions, but it does not change the nature of the Communist system of governing. Above all, however, this attitude of the nation and especially of its intellectual leaders forces the Communist masters of Poland to abandon the hypocritical pretence of false liberalism and to show their real identity as stooges of the Moscow totalitarianism.

The Council of the Republic of Poland, mindful of the thousand-year-old tradition of Polish liberty and rights of citizens, most solemnly protests against the oppression and chicaneries to which the scholars and writers are subjected in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, the dubious value to the United States of subsidizing the Rumanian Communist Government is recognized by all but the blindest partisans of the State Department. I wish to include as part of my remarks an article from the June 6, 1964, edition of the Shreveport Times on this subject:

ON BRIDGES TO THE EAST

In late summer of 1944, Soviet Communist troops occupied Rumania in Eastern Europe. The Russian troops brought with them Rumanian prisoners of war "retrained" in Moscow to act as a puppet government, but the Red army ruled. Rumania thus passed from the brown tyranny of Nazi-dominated dictatorship to get the Red tyranny of Communist dictatorship. There was no real difference.

After the war, several democratic, non-Communist parties in Rumania struggled to assert themselves, but by 1947 they were crushed and Rumania was firmly integrated into the Soviet East European Empire. In Churchill's words of that same year, an Iron Curtain had clanged down over Rumania and the rest of that part of the world.

This week, the United States extended liberal trade terms to that Communist regime in Rumania and agreed—soon—to up the level of representation between the two countries to the ambassadorial level. That will amount to outright American recognition of a nation, Rumania, won and held by Russian troops.

The arguments for such a move were put forth first under the Kennedy administration and have been elaborated upon by President Johnson: U.S. "bridges to the East" will somehow weaken Moscow's grip on the captive nations, encourage an independent policy on their part, and ultimately lead to their final liberation. As a matter of fact, the State Department no longer refers to Eastern European countries as "satellites."

The fact is that, despite small concessions, these often withdrawn shortly after their inception, Rumania remains as devotedly Communist—and as tightly controlled by the Kremlin—as it was 20 years ago. The same can be said of the other captive nations of Eastern Europe. Surely nothing could be

more indicative of Soviet control than the presence of Soviet troops.

The idea that Rumania has loosed its Kremlin collar a bit may satisfy some liberals who believe in Marxist economics anyway, but a tiny measure of national autonomy does not alter the fact that the Rumanian Government is Communist and is a dictatorship.

No doubt the American trade terms will benefit the Red government of Rumania. The satellite regimes share the economic difficulties of their masters in Moscow. Russia will gladly acknowledge any American aid to Eastern Europe; it's that much less out of Moscow's pocket.

The real effect of the U.S.-Red Rumania agreement will be upon the Rumanian people. For those frustrated patriots who still hope for a free and non-Communist Rumania, the deal with their masters perhaps will mark the end of hope. And these patriots do exist, despite State Department hints that the Red government has the confidence of the people.

Less than a year ago the magazine *Current History*, in an authoritative study of Eastern Europe, made this comment about Poland, which supposedly is more "liberal" and independent than Rumania:

"The current regime in Warsaw seized power with the aid of the Red (Russian) army and continues to be dependent upon the U.S.S.R. for its very existence. . . . Even today Gólmulka's (ruler of Poland) position would be endangered if Soviet power declined or retreated."

The same can be said for Rumania and the rest of Eastern Europe. A withdrawal of Soviet power would spark a series of "Hungaries" that would bring down the Moscow-dominated regimes in blood and ruin. But American recognition of those Red regimes can only dilute the spirit of 1956 and strengthen the Communists in power.

If such American recognition is a cup of bitterness for Rumanian anti-Communists, it could be the final push into the Communist maw for the indifferent generations, reared on Red propaganda, oblivious to any brief heritage of freedom and national pride.

For all purposes, the American-Communist Rumanian agreement confirms the Red grip on Eastern Europe. It says we accept communism there; that we approve the savage Red takeovers of the immediate postwar years; that we uphold the Red dictatorships forced on once free peoples.

But Rumania is not the beginning of Washington's acceptance of Communist dominance in large areas of the world—nor is it the end of such acceptance. Is it logical to think that an America that officially sanctions illegal Communist rule—indeed rewards it with trade and aid—will long fight a war in southeast Asia against another batch of Communist aggressors with a different name?

Mr. Speaker, the country in the last 3 years has witnessed the tragic deterioration of our foreign policy and the people of the United States have witnessed an administration which deliberately embraces a colonial power that is determined to destroy us. How shortsighted can we be?

TARAS SHEVCHENKO—UKRAINIAN FREEDOM FIGHTER

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was not possible for me to attend the unveiling of the statue of Taras Shevchenko a few days ago, so I would like to pay my respects now to this great fighter for freedom.

The Congress recognized the greatness of Taras Shevchenko when it passed Public Law 86-749, authorizing the erection of a statue. President Eisenhower approved the legislation on September 13, 1960.

Taras Shevchenko was a man of many talents, not the least of which was his ability as a poet. Through his poems, he expressed the longing of the Ukrainians for their lost freedom and statehood.

More than a century ago, he advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington," believing that the Ukrainian people, then under the rule of czarist Russia, would obtain freedom and emancipation under such a leader as was our George Washington.

Shevchenko remains today a symbol of freedom for 45 million Ukrainian people who are under the domination of Soviet communism.

His statue will stand for all time as a rallying point for friends of freedom. It will also serve to remind us how fortunate we are to live in a democracy.

A PORTRAIT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, there is a portrait of a Russian writer, Zhukovsky, painted by Vryulov in 1838. It is a modest portrait, a man seated with hands folded on his lap. It is indeed as undistinguished as 10,000 other portraits are, for seldom does the mere picture of a man in painting arouse more than a passing interest in us. With your eyes open you will see only the colored canvas, the face, the body, the hands, the chair. But if you close your eyes there is a glow, a golden glow, and forever men will point to that portrait with a certain solemn awe. For it was a portrait that was sold to free a man from slavery. It was part of the price paid to give a man his soul, so that out of that soul the whole world should become richer. It was part of the ransom that gave all of us a painter, a poet, a patriot, a man—Taras Hryhorovich Shevchenko.

He was born to death, a serf, a slave. He was worth slightly more than a poor dog, far less than a good horse. He owned neither himself, his family, nor the land of his birth. He was owned, the property of a master, a piece of human chattel whose worth would be measured only in terms of service to that master.

The name of that master was Pavel Vasilyevitch Engelhardt. We remember him today only because he was the master of Shevchenko.

It would be pointless to recount the whole life story of Shevchenko. He grew as a serf, but his mind was a restless mind. He tended the cares of his master by day, but in the night he pored over the paintings and etchings he saw all about him, and laboriously copied what he saw—until he was fogged for daring to aspire to that great art. He was discovered by a fellow Ukrainian, Ivan Soshenko, and when the friends of Soshenko realized what a talent there was in this serf, they raised the unbelievable sum of 2,500 rubles to buy his freedom.

He was free to live and to paint. He studied at the Imperial Academy of Arts at St. Petersburg. He was brilliant, distinguished in painting, and graduated with honor in 1845. But he had learned more than painting. He had come into the lives of men who were filled with learning, with poetry, with music, and he drove himself day and night to give himself the education he had been denied. Then, having filled himself with the learning, with the language, with the magic of literature, having proven himself a painter of first magnitude—he began to write poetry.

It was nostalgic poetry at first. He remembered the fields of the Ukraine and was filled with the hunger of the homeless for the land he knew so well. He wrote sad poems to the old tunes he had learned as a small boy. He remembered most of all the good things, and all the evil was hidden in a veil of nostalgia when he remembered the evil. He named the book of verses after the wandering singers of the Ukraine, "Kobzar."

From its first publication the book was a major literary contribution. The old songs of Ukraine had been brought to a new life, and a bridge had been built across the countless ages of Ukrainian folk songs to the literature of Shevchenko's own day. He was the Burns, the Longfellow of his land. Through his voice, the voice of a major poet, the old songs became the new, and a whole world of possibilities was opened in Ukrainian literature.

But he was not to live and to die in nostalgia. He returned to his old home, and there the evils of serfdom were real, were terrible. He sat down in the midst of the terror and wrote of it. He rebelled against every institution in Ukraine, and his "Three Years" became a rallying cry for everyone who sought freedom in Ukraine.

He paid a price. He was arrested in 1847 and Tsar Nicholas I took personal pleasure in sentencing him to serve as an ordinary soldier in a penal battalion in Novopetrovsk. But though the 10 years were terrible, desolating, he came out of servitude the same courageous man he was when he was arrested. He wrote a bitter poem comparing the Tsar to Nero—a most apt comparison.

He continued to write until he died. The volume of his prose and his verse is enormous, and is just now being translated into English, as it has been trans-

lated into so many other languages of the world. We will be richer for his words when all of us can hear them, even in this language.

He died in 1861. He had lived only 47 years, and had lived in freedom only 13 years. But in those 13 years he had set in motion not only a new spirit of revolution, of freedom, but a whole new language. His position is secure, not only as a father of Ukrainian poetry, but as a father of Ukrainian prose.

There is a nobility about this man that is towering. He was purchased from slavery and was given a life of ease, where he could have enjoyed the friendship of the mighty and the adulation of the intellectuals for his great talent in painting. He chose to put this behind him. He chose to speak in words, not merely in pictures, knowing that death or prison would wait for him if his words displeased. He spoke, and saved his greatness in the prison that closed around him.

It is somewhat sardonic to think of his grave. For years the Tsars kept the people away from it, lest it be a rallying point for the independent spirit of the Ukrainians. Today the Tsars are forgotten, and the grave of Taras Shevchenko is honored.

We have honored him with a monument, and this is fitting. But long after the metal and stone of that monument have crumbled, the true monument will last—his words, his poems, his prose. The world will save and long remember the cry for freedom that he sounded. As long as freedom lasts, so too will last the name and the memory of Taras Shevchenko.

INTERNATIONAL CROSSROADS SUNDAY MORNING BREAKFAST

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak of a subject which is of special interest to many of my colleagues here today. I refer to the International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast of the YMCA here in Washington. My interest in this unique organization is well known as I have spoken of its work before this body each year for the past 4 years. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are just as much interested and have given liberally of their time and talents to address the breakfast sessions and answer questions on the important issues confronting our world today. It is the best hope of many that additional Members of the House will assist in this effort as their time and energy permits.

It is important that these young men who come here should be received with hospitality and given an opportunity to see and understand the better side of

America. I am thinking of America as the great bastion of freedom of thought and action—where a boy of humble beginning may rise to his highest potential—where an idea has a chance to grow, compete, and possibly excell. These are the seeds of greatness that lead to a more perfect fullness of life on this earth.

The International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast has on May 3, 1964, celebrated its 18th anniversary, which is a remarkable achievement for an organization conducted entirely by voluntary leadership. Every Sunday for 939 consecutive sessions there has assembled around the breakfast table an average of 50 to 60 interesting personages whose very presence is a contribution to better understanding and appreciation of the best in others.

About half of the visitors at an average session are from abroad and represent the more promising of the rising generation, who will have a great deal to do with the decisionmaking in the years ahead. Friendships have been formed with almost 16,000 persons of 122 geographical countries. Contact is maintained by correspondence with about 1,500 members who have returned to their homes abroad. Many of these have sent expressions of appreciation and encouragement to the 18th anniversary celebration. These were read or narrated by W. L. Robinson, an official of the American Automobile Association, who was assisted by Juan Villaverde, of Argentina; Raya Helou, of Venezuela; Henri Ellenberger, of Canada; Harold Linder, of Sweden; Ahmad Mir Hakkok, of Iran; John R. Thompson, of England; and Nubar Bohceli, of Rumania.

Others who spoke briefly were Dr. Harry W. Seamans, organizational liaison officer, Department of State; Dr. Raymond W. Miller, president, Public Relations Research Associates and public relations lecturer at Harvard University; Alfred C. Rogers, General Secretary of the Metropolitan Washington YMCA; and Allen Shimmel, my administrative assistant, expressed my greetings and encouragement to the committee of voluntary workers who have so faithfully maintained this important crossroads of world contacts. The chairman of this committee is Paul L. Brindle, a Washington attorney, who has over the years given an increasing proportion of his time to the organizing and high-level consummation of each weekly session, and he is surrounded with others of equal dedication.

You will be interested in the many splendid expressions and heart-warming messages coming from these fine forward-looking persons in other countries and observe their great contribution to human betterment. A number of representative extractions from the many messages received at the 18th anniversary are as follows:

From Jacques C. J. Dunselman, a textile engineer of Arnhem, Holland: "Through the help of Eric Freeborn of England and yourself, I have started an exchange of thoughts by correspondence. I am writing now with two French breakfast members. I strongly believe that we as breakfast members have to

keep contact with each other, and by exchange of thoughts by writing we will have a better understanding in the world. If we could set up such a thing, we will gain a lot. I believe that we have to consider the breakfast as a spark, that ignites the friendship between thousands of people of all nations, but that correspondence will keep the fire burning. I send my congratulations to the 18th anniversary of the International Breakfast Club. God bless you and the work you are doing."

From Hans Joachim Hollander, of Danischenhagen, Germany: "I am sure nobody will forget your International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast, who has felt this real welcome, has taken it home as one of the great traditions of the American people. On my whole 30,000-mile trip around the United States, I have never had such a nice meeting on Sunday morning. When other people sleep, you are in activity and I wish these meetings could go around the world. Wherever youth is meeting youth there's no problem to discuss everything. But the youth needs the initial activators, men like you."

From Dr. Manuel C. Magboo, surgeon and member, National YMCA Board of the Philippines: "I would like to congratulate you personally on the achievements that the International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast has reached around the far corners of the world. It really would be nice if chapters could be developed in other places, but it is quite difficult to start and take the job seriously."

"In our YMCA in Manila, we have a semblance of your crossroads. We have the Manila breakfast group, which meets every Wednesday morning, with speakers from our cosmopolitan group speaking on various subjects."

From a young man from New Zealand, Maurice McGregor: "Leadership was the theme of the Honorable L. J. BURTON's talk on the morning I attended the breakfast. Two things he said particularly impressed me. They were, that a leader should not be afraid of right, and he should be a builder and not a wrecker. Not only was I impressed by his talk but I was challenged by the statement that both the speaker and the chairman made that we, who had the privilege to travel, also have the responsibility of leading our respective countries in whatever field of work we were engaged in. None of us sitting around the table that morning discussing the role of leaders in the changing generation could have foreseen that in a month's time President Kennedy was to have lost his life so tragically, and that countries like mine were to wonder about the future role of the United States as a leader in the Western World. It is good that these doubts are now dispelled."

"Back home here in Christchurch, New Zealand, the memory of the sadness of those November days is lightened by the memory of the friendliness of the people I met while in the United States in such places as the ICMB in Washington."

From Ephraim D. Nyange, Veterinary Department, Mombasa, Kenya: "I am happy to learn that I was registered a life member abroad for the breakfast, and would like to give my personal appreciation in stating how the breakfast applies to my life today."

"This now gives me a clear picture of the organization's performances in trying to bring men together in His name; and it's a very notable service to God."

"Through such occasions, I agree that there is a big chance of understanding between men and better cooperation in His name."

"I remember on the 24th of January 1963 when we sat for the breakfast, I had a wonderful experience of meeting the people I

never expected, and as our speaker, Dr. Raymond W. Miller emphasized more on communication of ideas as was the topic, I came to the light of understanding the value of such occasions which try to gather us together in His name and give us closer understandings.

"I therefore pray God the Almighty to give you more power and will in your hard job and make it a success."

From Oswaldo Vianna, of the Ministry of Education, Rio de Janeiro: "Unhappily it will be so difficult for me to be there but at this day at 9 a.m., I will be begging God for the happiness of all of you and particularly of this great association that is the YMCA."

From Dr. P. G. Gollerkeri, professor of bacteriology, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, India: "Usually your sincere, heart-warming letters are a rare joy to the soul to receive, the inner conviction becoming more and more confirmed, that we are all one human family under our skins—white, brown, black, or yellow."

"It is over 12 years that we could meet briefly for a few days, and yet your letters continue to bring back the enduring memories of the goodness that you and your people showed to me wherever I went in your great country. This opinion is confirmed by my two children: my son, who returned from the States about 8 months ago, and my daughter, who went there about that time. The latter is a medico. Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti R. Rao is now in Boston, Mass., and her husband, Dr. B. R. Rao, M.S., Ph. D. (Harvard), a research scientist (nonmedical) at Harvard University. Mrs. Rao is enrolled as a postgraduate student of pediatrics, in the Children's Hospital and Medical Center of the same university at Boston, Mass."

"However, in spite of our long personal distance (12,000 miles) for so many years, it is amazing how the heart refuses to forget character, personality, and the good human nature from the handwritten letters of yours to me during these several years. But there is still a possibility, though somewhat remote, of my being able to visit the States in about a year's time. This time my visit, if it materializes, would be a sort of cultural one, unlike my last short professional one; I may even be beholden to you and other cultural organizations like the YMCA to make the 3 months' program a spiritual success of international friendship, good will, and mutual uplift of our two countries."

From Robert M. H. Chen, of the Taiwan Power Co.: "During the last several years we had some friends from Vietnam, Thailand, Okinawa, and some new countries in Africa to visit us for observation training in industry, education, agriculture in Taiwan. We are trying to set up an organization something like 'Washington International Center' here in order to provide warm welcome and general information of China for those people from far away. You must be glad to hear that the spirit of the crossroads is extending to the other corner of the world with your encouragement."

From Dr. Ugo M. Colombo, director of public assistance, city of Milan: "On writing to you my heart is full of joy, encouragement, and appreciation because I remember with a strong feeling of sympathy the morning when I had the pleasure to meet with so many distinguished fellows coming from everywhere in the world and I would have the possibility to come again as soon as possible."

"Highly appreciable is indeed every initiative, as yours is, which implements cohesion, solidarity, and comprehension among people of different race and opinion. Whatever may be the personal situation of each one of us, unique is the faith in the justice and in the universality of God and in the supremacy of spiritual values."

From John Rooney, general secretary, YMCA, Durban, South Africa: "On Sunday,

May 3, I shall be thinking of you gathered together from all parts of the world with the common purpose of peace and good will among men. May your example be copied in many parts of the world and your efforts richly blessed."

John L. Handley, a student of Birmingham, England, who made a special trip to return for the 16th anniversary, writes for the 18th anniversary: "The world today is changing with a rapidity that would have dismayed our forefathers, and bewilderment is not uncommon among young men and women. Consequently, we must examine all sincerely held views critically and sympathetically which may point the way toward international understanding and cooperation. Prejudice is a great danger which we must all be on guard against, nor should toleration of an opposing point of view be necessarily regarded as a sign of weakness."

"Through the time-honored process of discussion and argumentation, as exemplified by those great democratic assemblies, the U.S. Congress, and the House of Commons, let us confidently expect decisions formulated for the 1960's. In this respect, I believe the Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast provides an essential service in the great work of promoting international friendship. My thoughts will be with you on May 3, 1964."

From Lt. Col. G. M. Safdar (retired) of Kohat, Pakistan, who wrote last year from the Congo where he was commanding the Pakistan troops, and has since gone into business: "The news that you are going to celebrate your 18th anniversary has thrilled me. How I desire to be physically with you on that auspicious occasion. As it is well nigh impossible, I am soul and heart with you mentally on that grand day. The need for understanding human beings was never so great as it is today. And I am proud that your association is doing its best to fulfill that. I feel proud to be a member of that organization. Dear sir, consider me to be beside you at this juncture and I request you to convey my heartiest felicitation to all the members around you. I wish you luck and Godspeed in your stupendous task."

From Zee Sheng-Shee, of Taiwan, China: "Your organization is benefit for all people around the world, if he or she has a chance to visit Washington, D.C. A mutual understanding will be achieved."

"I had a chance to attend the breakfast table meeting several years ago. It is a good day in my life. I sincerely hope I could have another chance to attend such meeting in the near future."

From Dr. J. B. Barclay, of the University of Edinburgh: "On May 3 at 2 p.m., our time, in my home in Scotland, I shall remember you all and visualize the room with its map and everyone sitting down to breakfast. My visit to your International Breakfast, was one of the highlights of my American visit."

"International brotherhood has been a theme we have dreamt of in Scotland for a long, long time and has, of course, been expressed so well by our national poet, Robert Burns, in that song whose last verse may not be so well known as the first:

"Then let us pray that come it may
As come it will for a' that,
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth
May bear the gree, and a' that.
For a' that, and a' that
It's comin' yet for a' that
That man to man, the world o'er
Shall brothers be for a' that."

"And with this prayer of brotherhood I think we ought to couple the other two great phrases that we repeat so often but so often fail to appreciate fully: 'Thy Kingdom come: Thy Will be done.'

"May your anniversary be a blessing to all present and to all of us who shall remember."

From Rev. Jonas Villaverde, D.D., president of the Lutheran Church in Argentina: "May our Lord continue blessing your heart and your work and give you many satisfactions in your laudable efforts for the better understanding between the peoples."

"It would have been a great pleasure and honor for me to be able to attend the Crossroads' 18th anniversary but the distance is too great—I mean the territorial distance; in my mind and in my prayers I will be with you on May 3."

"The Crossroads is now in its 'blooming teens' and I am sure its grownup years will be still more fruitful and better remembered by all those many thousands who have had the deep satisfaction of participating in its activities in various opportunities."

From Michael K. Belshaw, student engineer of Northern Ireland: "When I read your list of 1963 speakers and their subjects, and know firsthand of the uniting bond experienced at the Crossroads, I cannot but congratulate you and the committee on this achievement. The fact that the Crossroads Breakfast has continued for 18 years is surely sufficient proof, if proof be needed, that it is valuable and fills a need. I hope it may long continue."

"Perhaps my most vivid impression was the awareness that someone was interested enough in helping others to care for, as it were, the strangers in their midst. In addition to the Crossroads satisfying the body, it strengthens the spirit and stimulates the mind. For many visitors, including myself, it was a personal oasis in a desert of impersonalism. It is very encouraging to know that scattered through the world are members of the Crossroads, and I would certainly hope that because of this the causes of world peace and prosperity for all peoples, through Christian action, will be furthered. I send you my good wishes, and ask that God shall prosper your work."

From Santiago Rodriguez Mendez, general secretary of YMCA at Mexico City: "I cherish the memory of my experience when I attended one of your forum breakfasts during my visit to Washington, D.C."

"It was greatly inspiring for me to meet the persons from different parts of the world who, on that occasion, shared the ideals and purpose of the YMCA. When members of this association plan to visit Washington I highly recommend that they attend your meetings if they have the opportunity."

From C. S. Parthasarathy, official of Planning Commission, Government of India: "Memories of my visit to the International Crossroads early in 1957 are still fresh and green as ever and often come floating on the surface of my mind. I need hardly express how immensely charmed and delighted I was to be in the midst of you all that Sunday morning at Washington, D.C. It has been of very great value to me and one which I have no doubt would in the years ahead assist me. My only regret is that it has not been possible to see more of you all and your wonderfully beneficial activities there. My heart will be there when you celebrate the anniversary on May 3, 1964. Your report on the anniversary celebration will be eagerly awaited by me as usual."

"May God bless you and the Crossroads on the pursuit of your high ideals and noble endeavors, that you and your organization may keep growing with an ever-increasing measure of success and satisfaction."

From Edward Booth Hadwen, a water engineer of Halifax, England: "My attendance at the Crossroads was on July 21, 1963, when the meeting was addressed by the Honorable WILLIAM E. BROCK, III, who gave his impressions of a 'freshman in Congress.' American politics to an Englishman are, to say the least, bewildering—so it was with the greatest of interest that I listened to the Congressman for enlightenment. I found that the Americans were just as anxious to know

about our own ideas, as we who attended the Crossroads were anxious to know about America and the American people. This healthy curiosity among people must lead to better relations among the various national groups, and it pleased me a great deal to know that this curiosity is not only alive at your breakfast table, but throughout your great country."

From R. N. Chawla, Director of Flood Control, India: "My appreciation for you and for the purpose has increased with the years when I think of the steadfastness with which this program is being pursued week after week. You would be the first person I would like to meet, if and when I happen to visit the United States of America again."

"Keep on, Paul. You and your colleagues are doing a good job, with a good purpose. This fits in very well with God's designs. I am sure this work brings peace of mind to you and your colleagues."

From Olindo Parachini, national secretary of YMCA of Italy, at Rome: "I remember with pleasure the Sunday morning breakfast of August 25, 1963. As a matter of fact, it was the best introduction I could expect to your country's Capital and its YMCA. I have given a detailed report on your program to my colleagues of the Italian staff and to lay leaders of our movement. All best wishes to you and to those who help you keep alive the breakfasts, on the occasion of your 18th anniversary. I hope to have the privilege again of sitting at your table."

From John Schwarzenbach, professor of mechanical engineering, the University at Leeds, England: "May I wish you at the breakfast another even better year. If any of our students or staff are going to the United States of America, I will mention your meeting."

From Akira I. Ohsawa, high school principal in Tokyo: "Time is like a mist which hinders sometimes our sights and makes me miss the shape and form of things. In 1960, on September 11, I took for a first time an honorable seat at the International Crossroads Morning Breakfast table. Years are now long enough for us to forget its excitement and happiness."

"Your personal letter, however, calls back its memory. It is now so heart touching and it breaks pressure of time. As Mount Fujiyama, which I can see, can show her gorgeous style above the horizon, so the memory of it becomes clear even in the mist of time. I whisper to myself and friends and my students as follows, celebrating the 18th anniversary of ICSMB:

"So may honor of it be shown,
As the top of Mount Fuji is seen
In the mist of spring morn."

From Henrico Jorger, of Switzerland, a student of automobile engineering in London: "I always remember the 11th of November 1962, when I was a visitor at Crossroads Breakfast. I think it was very nice how each person individually introduced himself to the others by saying a few words. I said: 'I come from Switzerland and my name is Henrico Jorger, I work for a Swiss travel agency in New York City. Since I was a boy I wanted to go to America and now with 23 years of age my wish came true.'"

From Toshihiko Suzuki, of Japan: "I have been a distribution section foreman of Kansai Electric Utility Co. since last June. I have 25 people in my section, and have realized how difficult it is to understand individual persons. I applied to my section your ICSMB's spirit of mutual understanding, and our section is doing very good business. We really hope all the people in the world must endeavor hard to understand each other. It is no doubt that the morning breakfast is sharing a big portion for this purpose. We now live in Nara, one of the ancient capital cities of Japan and famous as

well as Kyoto. We shall be very happy to introduce our city when you or your friends visit our country."

"I pray to God the day will come soon when we can meet again."

From Princess D. Narendra, Sawan Ashram, Ruhani Satsang, Delhi, India: "I thank you for the welcome you gave His Holiness Sant Kirpal Singh Ji and us, on our visit to the States. It was really very heart warming and brought us, the people of India, to the people of America closer through the ties of friendship which you showed us."

"* * * This organization is most helpful to bring better understanding among all nationalities. The psychological effect of being a member of an 'international' organization is very effective, and on top of that your love for everyone was very relaxing in which the strangeness of meeting strangers was taken away by your sincere welcome to all."

From Dr. S. V. Desai, Agronomist, Bombay: "When I became a member of the ICSMB I had not visualized the far-reaching effects it would have in fellowship of international good will and the happy thought of being remembered by someone with a feeling of love is one of the precious assets of life. The good will with which the members of the ICSMB meet and the memories they cherish are almost unique, and the good that can result from these feelings of mutual esteem even in a few cases is a sufficient reason for continuing the activities. Even after 17 years I feel happy to remember my association with the institution and its active members."

From Prof. Dr. von Rauchhaupt, professor of space law, Heidelberg University: "I had been to your Sunday morning breakfast once before, in autumn of 1961. Last month I came to the U.S.A. in order to continue our space law studies. As a guest of the Georgetown University, I gave an introductory lecture on space law in their law center, and following an invitation by Prof. Wernher von Braun I visited the world famous George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., and the John F. Kennedy Space Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Cape Kennedy, Fla. Everywhere we had the liveliest intercourse of technical and scientific questions and answers. The technical and scientific achievements are marvelous. It really is a marvel before our eyes that the astronauts, as pioneers of all mankind, can be shot through the thick layer of air into the airless space and whirl like small moons round our mother earth and soon even further toward the moon, and safely come back to our earth. These daring undertakings are most expensive, but at the same time these moneys increase the output of the industry, because 90 to 92 percent of the material and machines needed will be ordered from the big firms. All the people included in the performance of these imposing works are very modest. They live in the spirit of the duties that are their part. I deeply admire the work done and the men and women who are privileged by their participation in its production. I only wish that these centers of space research were not so far away and could be reached quicker from the crossroads, and even more so from our national homes."

From Atelio Romero, pharmaceutical chemist, Caracas, Venezuela: "Again my thoughts go to you, wishing this time a very happy 18th anniversary of a marvelous movement that Sunday after Sunday is creating invisible ties among people of good will from all over the world. Warm-hearted congratulations to you and all the friends who are attending the Sunday morning breakfast on May 3. I am sure you will keep in your hearts, as a treasury, the serene emotion of this significant event of human confraternity."

From C. Rajagopalan, professor of geology, Alagappa College, Karaikudi, India: "In my professional capacity, I had to go to Madras quite frequently. During these visits I often call on the American Information Service and the people with whom I had been in contact all these years. Looking back, it is such contacts with people that make personal and international relations happy. Being one of the most frequently visited countries, I am happy to see that you have this crossroads breakfast meeting, where everybody gets the much-needed opportunity to meet people and exchange viewpoints. In the ultimate analysis, it is the people who count. I am happy you are continuing this good work. My one and constant prayer is that God should give you long life for this venture, so that on my next visit to the United States I shall again have the pleasure and privilege of meeting you and taking part in the crossroads breakfast meetings."

From Leonard E. Taylor, civil engineer, London, England: "It is now nearly a year since I left London for a month's visit to the United States and my brief stay in Washington was one of the highlights of a memorable month."

"Your international breakfast is an example of the unity that the world so sorely needs and which our Lord must surely wish to see."

From Daniel Trajtenberg, certified public accountant, Buenos Aires: "I want to send you my kindest congratulations and best wishes for your 18th anniversary."

"Really, during my short visit on June 16 last I could appreciate better something I already knew—how good it is to feel the warmth and kindness of friends when you are far from home. I am quite convinced that such weekly meetings help people from all countries to better understanding which is so necessary and important nowadays."

From Hans-Joachim Kohler, student of philosophy, Tübingen University, Germany: "I know from my own pleasant experiences how much good your organization has been doing during all these years, and how badly we need this opportunity to sit down and try to understand each other's language while different ideologies tend to make communication between people from different countries exceedingly difficult."

"To you and to all the other people of good will, who may be present in Washington when these lines arrive there, I extend my best wishes for many more years of fruitful work ahead."

"To close this message, let me quote President Kennedy: 'Let them know—friend and foe alike—that the torch has been passed.' Let's all of us accept the torch of open-mindedness and carry it on in our race toward the common goal of mutual friendship, freedom, and the well-being of all nations."

From Raymond Issid, a Lebanese graduate in engineering from the University of Montana, teaching at Khartoum, Sudan:

"Mysterious but of common nature is the 'small spirit' of God existing in every human being in every land on this earth. The ground is fertile of men of good will; even the evil man could become good because there is still a trace of this 'small spirit' of God—once directed he could regain the right way that leads to the door of Heaven. This could be accomplished if there were more new centers like that one directed by the famous Paul Brindle, of Washington, D.C.—new centers starting in every country to share the fellowship and the study for the better understanding among all nations, and serve mankind to the best under the shadow of the Great Creator."

"Of course, there shall be other 'Paul's' and other ICSMB's in many countries that will follow the same steps of the mother one of Washington, D.C."

"If any move shall be taken in this direction I shall be the first to serve under your instructions for the good of all mankind."

From Robert H. Orgill, electrical engineer, electronic engineer and inventor, inventor of the Orgill Aircraft Safety Unit, Perth, Australia: "It does not seem like 5 years since I visited the International Crossroads Breakfast. I remember your saying to me in Washington, D.C., one day that if I find the right key, the lock will open easily in connection with the invention of the aircraft-safety unit.

"I am about to make the front page again, since I have invented and technically perfected a musical invention whereby it is possible to reproduce steel or nylon strings in any stringed instrument, such as the steel guitar, guitar, violin, cello, harp, piano, etc. It will reproduce not only the nylon strings but also in multichannel stereo sound (six channel).

"The May 3 anniversary will be a gathering of young men from all parts of the world, and I only hope on this day my letter will be of great encouragement to other inventors, who will eventually pioneer other inventions for the good of all mankind."

From C. S. Rao, scientific officer, Department of Atomic Energy, India: "While sitting in calm and cool surroundings in a tropical country like mine, my thoughts have traveled 7,000 miles away to Washington. The picture of your Sunday breakfast gathering with its elite is before my mind's eye.

"True, your assemblies are the gathering place of God's men from different parts of the world. These meetings can achieve much more than what governments of the countries can, in fostering the brotherhood of man. It is given to few to organize and continue such good work, and I am really happy that you have not only taken this lead but are continuing to maintain the same tempo with ever-growing enthusiasm.

"I wish your Sunday Morning Breakfast 18th anniversary all success and pray God to give you many more happy years of life to continue carrying on this self-imposed sacred task of bringing all such men from many parts of the world together under one roof."

From K. M. Bashir, of New Delhi, who was present at both 16th and 17th anniversary celebrations: "It is nearing a year since I left the United States. I was treated with warmth, affection, and consideration throughout my 16 months' stay in your great country. I have made friendship with many and still in touch with a few. Of all the persons whom I came across in the United States, two persons stand out whom I greatly respect. They are Paul Brindle and Mr. Lloyd A. Procknow, of the BLS. As regards international understanding, no single individual has done as much as yourself.

"I still remember vividly how I stumbled upon you on one Sunday morning. It was my first week in Washington. The American way of life was still unknown and I was trying to do as the Romans do. The previous day I got a room on F Street. On Sunday morning I was on the lookout for a drugstore to have some breakfast. When I saw the YMCA I just walked in with the hope of finding some canteen, and there came a man with open arms and an inviting and infectious smile, and invited me for the breakfast meeting. At first the word 'breakfast' alone interested me. I thought of suffering through the meeting for having the breakfast. When more and more guests came, as if from all corners of the earth—the atmosphere began to change. From indifference I became curious. While the function was going on, many thoughts passed through my mind. It had become a real crossroad—visitors from all corners of the world who hold strategic positions in different cultures converge and pass through.

Here is a man who is instrumental for this crossing—crossing of mind. Week after week he does this. He brings to this crossroad the best from American society: politicians, social workers, university professors, etc. Unless there is a passion for service, unless there is an inner compulsion, it is not possible to keep up the spirit and vigor of the crossroad meetings. These were the thoughts that went through my mind on that day. Like Goldsmith's 'Village Parson.' 'Those who have come to scoff remained to pray.' I went with that feeling. As you know, I participated in the Sunday breakfast meeting many times.

"I don't know what message I can find for such a dedicated soul like you, except 'May God bless you with a very long and active life for promoting international understanding and happiness. I wish every success for the 18th anniversary of the ICSMB. From this distance let me send my heartiest greetings to all the participants.'"

From Mats Blom, Norrköping, Sweden: "I sincerely hope you can keep up with the high standards you have for your crossroads activities.

"Here in Sweden things run very well and we enjoy a commercial and industrial boom. We have no real unemployment and have what we call overemployment. That means lack of labor and, which you probably cannot believe, two Swedish car factories have received contingents of skilled auto workers from the United States of America who come here to work on a 2-year contract. There used to be a proverb: to carry coal to New Castle. Unemployment is an evil but overemployment is too, as it forces inflation very much."

From Dr. Carlos Henrique Mayr, physician and secretary of the International College of Surgeons at Rio de Janeiro: "I was going to make you a real surprise by being present at the commemoration of the anniversary of the crossroad breakfast. Unfortunately, due to our political situation in Brazil, my trip to the United States was delayed and I will not be able to be present at your wonderful celebration.

"Will you please, in my name, give a message of happiness, friendship, and loyalty to the YMCA.

"When, on the beginning of my career as a doctor I went to the United States for postgraduate studies, the first positive reaction was to find a group of friends at your Sunday morning breakfast. This was then the beginning of an everlasting friendship toward others, and the fact that the time was connected with Christmas and the new year made me overcome the sense of loneliness, being away from wife and children, by finding people with the same ideals and forward-looking persons.

"I strongly recommend that any professional who goes to the United States start in a surrounding like yours. It will tighten the links between the English-speaking population and make you feel as being one in a big family."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. MOSHER. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today, for all to read, the resolution adopted by the National Catholic Youth Organization, at

their convention in November 1963. This was just received by me and sent by the executive secretary, National CYO Federation.

Anyone saying the tide is turning against an amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools is out of touch with the people of this country.

I am also inserting, following the above resolution, another one adopted by 540 ministers of the Assembly of God Churches of Pennsylvania and Delaware. This resolution was just adopted at their convention held May 14, 1964. This was a convention of the Eastern District Council of the Assemblies of God.

Both resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas several proposals for amending the United States Constitution to permit the traditional right of prayer in public schools have been submitted to the Congress; and

Whereas all such proposals are currently in the hands of the House Judiciary Committee for consideration; and

Whereas the House Judiciary Committee has not called for public hearings on any of the proposed amendments; and

Whereas proponents of the proposed constitutional amendments explain that a discharge petition signed by 218 Members of the House of Representatives will release the proposals from committee and send them to the House for debate and a vote: Be it

Resolved, That members of the National CYO Federation be urged to ask their Congressmen to sign the Becker discharge petition, in order that the proposals be taken out of committee and brought to the floor of Congress for action.

Whereas civil government is ordained of God, and He requires the Nation to acknowledge Him as the source of its authority, and His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the One through Whom His blessings are bestowed (Psalms 2, Psalms 9: 17, Romans 13: 1); and

Whereas this country was founded by Pilgrims, who believed in God and framed their compacts of civil government, submitting themselves, their lives and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords; and

Whereas in our Declaration of Independence we appealed to "the Supreme Judge of the world * * * with firm reliance on the protection of divine providence"; and

Whereas God and Christianity are not once acknowledged in our National Constitution, although it is itself "the product of a Christian civilization and purports to represent the mind of a Christian people" (William Strong, Associate Justice of U.S. Supreme Court, 1871); and

Whereas the Supreme Court, as the result of this "unnecessary and most unfortunate omission," in a recent decision has ruled that Bible reading and prayer in the public schools of the land are unconstitutional; and

Whereas that decision, favoring a very small minority of citizens, denies the great majority of Americans their constitutional right to express in our public schools their belief in Almighty God, the reading of the Bible and prayer, and forbids the public schools from teaching that ours is a nation "under God"; and

Whereas atheists are seeking to eliminate all Christian practices from our government, basing their efforts on the above-mentioned omission of any acknowledgment of Almighty God in our Constitution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Eastern District Council of the Assemblies of God go on record as

approving the Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., We further encourage our ministers and churches to support it in every way possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the Eastern District Council of the Assemblies of God memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and adopt the proposed Christian amendment (H.J. Res. 57, H.J. Res. 61, H.J. Res. 235, H.J. Res. 314, H.J. Res. 325, H.J. Res. 332, and H.J. Res. 341), thereby giving legal support to the many Christian practices of a public nature which are being undermined or ruled illegal because of the Supreme Court's recent misinterpretation of the first amendment.

C. EUGENE BELL,
District Secretary.

THE KING CITY COUNCIL SEEKS HELP

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter directed to the President deserves reading by every Member of Congress. It is from all of the elected members of the City Council of the City of King in my congressional district. These men represent not just farmers—they represent city people, farmworkers, workers in all industries dependent upon farmers, union members, transporters, retailers, wholesalers; they also know the problems related to education, government, welfare, and the consumer.

They can only look to Congress for help. They, and their constituents, are desperate. They are speaking up for and on behalf of every worker and consumer in America. These councilmen know, as well as any public official in America, the problems and the prospects.

If you really want to know what the discontinuance of the bracero program will mean to agricultural America, please take a few minutes to read this knowledgeable and informative letter:

THE CITY OF KING,
King City, Calif.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As of now, after December 31, 1964, this State, and many others, will no longer have braceros to help them raise and harvest their costly and highly perishable crops. They are thus faced with problems and prospects frightening not only to those employing braceros, but to all of us, especially their fellow citizens in the smaller agricultural communities. This fact compels us, the elected representatives of this city, to address ourselves directly to you.

The discontinuance of the bracero program, in continual existence, in one form or another, since 1942, is based on the assumption that the unemployed of this Nation, if only paid better than braceros, would do the work now done by braceros. The whole idea stands or falls with that assumption, even though now braceros can be employed only when and where the local labor is not available.

The development of agriculture during the last two decades in the States using braceros has been predicated upon their availability. The crops now grown are

highly perishable and agricultural operations during their raising, especially harvesting, must be done within a very short period of time. Time thus is of the essence and a steady supply of able, willing and reliable labor is indispensable. So far only braceros have filled these requirements. The unemployed in these parts of the country have—almost without exception—shown that their stoop work is of short duration. Replacements are costly, hard to get, and impossible to get fast enough to save crops.

Economically, the elimination of braceros would, in agriculture, turn the clock back. The farmers would have to switch back to cheap crops not requiring stoop labor—the only work braceros are allowed to perform—and the end result would be a net increase in unemployment; people now employed directly in connection with braceros or indirectly in hauling, processing, distributing the fruits and vegetables grown or harvested with the help of braceros will all have nothing more to do. New varieties of vegetables, now harvested by stoop labor, would be developed that can be mechanically harvested. Mechanization and automation in agriculture, even where uneconomical, would be speeded up, thus still further eliminating the jobs now occupied by local labor. They would increase the already high investment in equipment necessary for efficient farming, increase the minimum acreage that can be farmed successfully and thus eliminate thousands of small, but now efficient, successful and independent farmers. In addition, the housewives throughout the Nation will have to pay so much more for fresh fruit and vegetables, so essential in the diet of everybody that many poorer families would have to manage without them, which again would affect the national health.

Socially, problems would be created that challenge imagination. Braceros come as single men and stay only as long as they are needed. The unemployed of the Nation, who are supposed to replace them, would come with their families, bringing thus problems of accommodation of whole families instead of single workers, of education for their children, of hospitalization for their sick, of welfare assistance and police protection for numbers of people that would exceed the total population of the majority of the towns concerned, and the additional, less palpable, but even more important and less soluble question of adjustment of two large and different groups of people living together, yet too big to assimilate one another.

Financially, with or without Federal and State assistance, the burden of building housing to accommodate double the number of present population of small agricultural communities, of building and staffing new schools, hospitals, police stations, etc., of supplying welfare funds for 8 to 9 months of the year when there is no work, the stress of adjusting and myriad of other big or small problems attendant upon any mass movement could only lead to financial ruin and general chaos and an end to the present way of life in hundreds of small communities. And that is more than should be asked from any community for any cause, let alone for, at the best, an untested and untried one. The consequences, in their many ramifications, are impossible to foresee and might—in the light of subsequent experience—make the whole plan unwise and unworkable. Why then try before more is known?

The magnitude of the proposed undertaking is such that it is felt the fullest caution before its implementation is imperative. The replacement of braceros cannot be achieved with local labor, it would have to be done by bringing people from distant parts of the Nation, with no guarantee that they would want, or even be able, to settle in the new

communities. There is a great risk of creating a huge quagmire of humanity moving on wheels, stragglers everywhere, home nowhere any longer.

No compelling, or even valid, reason has been advanced publicly so far why a pilot or test project of the whole idea should not, or could not, be made first. A small, representative area could be selected where no braceros would be allowed and all ideas now mentioned in connection with their replacement put into operation. It would show whether local labor is willing and able to replace braceros and under which conditions it would work best. It would save us all many mistakes and unnecessary expense in time, thought, and money. It would show, beyond argument, before the full implementation would take place, whether braceros are indispensable and, if not, under which optimal conditions they can be replaced.

It would go beyond the immediate scope and the specific concern of this council to mention the international aspects of the bracero program and the Public Law 78, bringing Mexicans to this country to see, learn, admire and—let us hope—adopt both political institutions and economic practices which made this country both great and stable. And all that, at no expense to the taxpayer of our country and a great deal of free foreign exchange to theirs.

We urge you, therefore, to delay the elimination of braceros—by extension of the Public Law 78 or some other adequate legislation guaranteeing the necessary supplemental foreign labor under present conditions—until such time that more is known of the ways and possibilities for their replacement and the attendant problems and their solutions are better thought over, discussed, and especially, tested in practice.

Respectfully yours,

EMIL C. MEYER,

Mayor.

WILLIAM J. CLARK,

J. A. PETTIT,

W. C. GOENNE,

DUSAN M. PETROVIC,

Councilmen.

LOTTERIES IN AFRICA GROSS OVER \$4 MILLION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we, in the United States, close our eyes to the fiscal advantages of a Government-run lottery, almost three-fourths of the nations of the world legally recognize, accept, and capitalize on the gambling spirit of its people.

Throughout the globe, 81 foreign nations, young and old, utilize government-operated lotteries not only to tap this source of revenue but to cope with the instinctive gambling urge of its people.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to list seven comparatively new African nations which recognize that gambling is a fact of life and that it should be regulated and controlled for the public good.

In 1963, out of the seven countries, listed below, five of them took in gross receipts of over \$4 million. The net income to the government came to over \$1 million, which was used for welfare

purposes, development programs, the poor, medical research, and other good purposes.

Why can we not face up to the fiscal facts of life and also capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of the American people? Why can we not be as smart as these new African nations which recognize the fiscal advantages of government-operated lotteries?

Why can we not make the billions of dollars now gambled in the United States work for the public good rather than against it? A national lottery in the United States can painlessly pump \$10 billion into our own Treasury. Is it not time we stopped being reckless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery? When are we going to get smart?

dent is assassinated or in the event he is unable to act for other reasons.

We have been skating on thin ice in both these areas for many years. The office of Vice President is vacant for the 16th time. The illnesses of Garfield, Wilson, and Eisenhower should remind us of the fact that Presidents are subject to the same disabilities as other mortals.

Accordingly, I am today introducing a constitutional amendment providing as follows:

First. In the event of vice-presidential vacancy, the President will nominate a Vice President subject to approval by both Houses of Congress.

Second. If the President declares his own disability, the Vice President becomes acting President.

Third. If the President is unable to declare his disability, the Vice President with concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet can determine that the President is disabled in which event the Vice President becomes acting President.

Fourth. If there is a dispute between the President and the Vice President on the question of disability, then it is referred to the Congress and a two-thirds majority will be required to declare the President disabled.

The stakes are too high and the challenges too great to permit further procrastination. I do not maintain my amendment is the only solution or the perfect solution—only that it is a logical, workable plan that will serve the national interest.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY TO MY FRIENDS OF THE PAN AMERICAN AIRWAY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the many friends of Pan American in congratulating such an outstanding airline on the 25th anniversary of transatlantic air service.

I am proud to claim Port Washington—the takeoff point of the Pan American clipper—as part of my congressional district.

May Pan American have many more fruitful years of service to the world. It is a glittering example of American private enterprise at its best.

A STATUE IN WASHINGTON OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO, EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used
1. Cameroon ¹			
2. Ethiopia	\$1,340,000	\$300,000	Welfare purposes.
3. Ghana	1,274,000	560,000	General fund.
4. Libya	840,000	280,000	Poor.
5. Nigeria	369,490	100,812	Medical services and development programs.
6. Republic of Congo ²			
7. Sierra Leone ³	440,000	154,000	Development programs.
Total	4,263,490	1,094,812	

¹ Legally established Sept. 17, 1963. No figures available.

² Started March 1963. No figures available.

³ 1963 1st year of operation.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which proposes to amend the Constitution. It provides that States would have the authority to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population.

Enactment of this resolution and subsequent ratification by the States could nullify the Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, but only after the people of each State had a chance to vote on apportioning one chamber of their legislatures.

The decision provides that in both bodies of State legislatures, every member must represent substantially the same number of people. The Court decided this issue under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

I disagree with the decision of the Court. I think this is a further example of the Court legislating, thus usurping the power of Congress.

My bill is an attempt to reverse the Court's position.

There is a comparison, I feel, between membership in Congress and membership in State legislatures.

In the House of Representatives, membership is primarily on the basis of equal representation for all people. Redistricting will soon provide more exact equality.

In the U.S. Senate, each State has two Members regardless of population.

This arrangement has brought balance to Congress and has prevented, in many instances, one sector of the population being too influential and thus causing harm or unfairness to others.

The Supreme Court calls for apportionment on the theory of "one man, one vote." This is a slogan which can-

not take the place of logic in the case of State legislatures.

It is proper that one body of a State legislature represent the general interests of the majority. On the other hand, one body should protect the interests of minorities and geographic areas.

Some people may live in areas of high employment, others in depressed areas with high unemployment. Some may be lumbermen, miners, fishermen, or farmers. Some may be of one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration from those of another religion or national origin.

Some may live in rural areas or small towns while others live in metropolitan areas or suburban expanses. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways while others are more concerned about rapid transit systems. Some may require priority consideration of irrigation projects while others demand consideration of water systems.

Between each group, conflicting interests of varying degree develop, with each producing a majority and a minority. Certainly the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to adequate representation.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY AND VICE-PRESIDENTIAL VACANCY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation can no longer indulge in the luxury of inaction on the subjects of vice presidential vacancy and presidential inability.

In this age of pushbutton war, when 12 or 15 minutes may make the difference between survival and destruction, we must have a Vice President fully briefed and competent to act in case our Presi-

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a very imposing statue of Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero, has been erected here in Washington at 22d and P Streets NW., and was appropriately dedicated last Saturday, June 27, 1964. It is fitting that we in the Congress of the United States should take note of this auspicious occasion.

Former President Harry Truman is honorary chairman of the national sponsoring committee, which includes 58 of our colleagues in the House of Representatives, 15 U.S. Senators, and a number of Governors and mayors.

We may ask, Why is this such an important event? Is it not the erection of another monument in a city full of memorials? The reply to such queries can be found in the pages of world history and in the annals of great literature.

This statue is not just a likeness of a man carved in stone, it is far more. It is more than just a memorial to a truly great man. It is more than a reminder of someone who lived in a far country more than a century ago. It is, in fact, a lasting source of inspiration for all who hold freedom dear. It stands as evidence of American recognition of a kindred spirit who espoused the cause of freedom of his people against the tyranny of a czar, Nicholas I of Russia. It will stand as the symbol of man's fight for freedom to millions of people now behind the Iron Curtain.

Taras Shevchenko was born in the Kiev district of Ukraine on February 25, 1814. At an early age he became interested in paintings, and after he was released from serfdom he completed formal studies at the academy of art. His fame and, indeed, world renown was won by him not in the field of painting, but in poetry.

From his earliest writings, Shevchenko was the patriot of Ukraine. The sad fate and misfortunes of his unhappy people under the Russian yoke of the czar was the motivating factor behind his writings which made him the national poet of his native land.

The importance of Shevchenko cannot be overemphasized. He was the first writer purely and thoroughly Ukrainian, who dared to dream of a Ukrainian language and literature apart from the hated Russian. His great writings have indeed made him the immortal poet of the Slavonic world for he aspired for freedom of all enslaved non-Russian nations.

Ukraine is a land of over 40 million people, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, the second largest nation within the U.S.S.R. itself.

It is of special interest to us that Shevchenko was inspired by George Washington. In a poem entitled "Jurodyvj," he wrote:

When will we receive our Washington
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will some day.

The entire world acclaimed Shevchenko as Eastern Europe's champion of liberty and as a gifted and talented writer.

Because of Shevchenko's heroic efforts on behalf of his country, the Russian authorities moved savagely to suppress

him. Out of the 47 years he lived, he had only 9 years of freedom. He was a serf for 24 years, in the Russian Army for 10, and was under strict police supervision for 3½ years. On February 26, 1861, he died.

Shevchenko's works are still a source of genuine inspiration to all mankind. This statue, which was authorized by Public Law 86-749, is tangible proof of our sympathies for the people of Ukraine. We join with them in the fervent hope that in the not too distant future their land will be liberated and become a member of the world's family of free and independent nations.

THE NEW FRONTIERS OF EDUCATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during this period of graduation ceremonies throughout the Nation, many Members of the Congress have been invited to participate in such exercises and lend their encouragement to our youth as they prepare themselves to meet the problems of the years ahead. The importance of adequate educational preparation for our young people and for our country cannot be overemphasized.

I had the privilege on June 15 of speaking at the graduation exercises of the Wawaloam School in Exeter, R.I. I was impressed by the quality of instruction and the promise of the boys and girls whose clarity of expression was most gratifying. The compositions of David Lewis, Linda Rudgers, and Lucille Thornley were extremely interesting and provide an example of the high value placed on education by these youngsters.

I would like to call attention to the presentations of these three young people and my speech on "The New Frontiers of Education," as given at the Wawaloam School:

OUR NEXT STEP

(By David Lewis)

A group of persons could not live together peacefully for any length of time unless they agreed to act in a certain way. The process by which they learn to act in these ways is education. In today's world, people could not exist without being educated, and the more the people are educated the more the world would prosper. In fact, the knowledge of the people of any country of the world depends on education. We began our education when we learned to talk. We learned words and then sentences. Tonight's graduation signifies that we have completed the first step of our education. In September, we will start our second step. After high school and college we will still learn things that we didn't know. You have heard the old adage, "You learn something new every day." This proves that you are never too young or too old to learn.

If the whole world was educated there wouldn't be any fighting or quarreling. A person learns better when he understands the

reason for learning. If two countries were fighting and they were looking for a way to stop war, a good suggestion would be to spend 5 minutes a day for a week jotting down all your enemy's good traits. Then see how silly war is. The young people of this and the following generation to come should be told about the world and that peace is the answer to a more friendly nation.

When we leave here tonight we will be looking forward to enlarging our education. In time of war we should let our conscience be our guide and direct our minds and make peace. Tonight we are all friends—why couldn't the whole world be like us? By furthering our education a new nation will be found—a peaceful nation.

THE HISTORY OF OUR CLASS

(By Linda Rudgers)

In September of 1956, we the class of 1964, boarded our schoolbuses for the first time. Some of us were eager to try this new way of life; others were reluctant to leave home for the first time.

We soon settled down to the routine of school life and found that our years of grammar school were passing quickly.

The number of students has greatly increased since we entered school. In 1958, we added four rooms to our school which have now become overcrowded, and the use of this auditorium as classrooms has become necessary.

Also, while we have been here, great improvements have been made on the school grounds. Such things as audiovisual equipment for classrooms, playground equipment, shrubs, the grass surrounding the school, and the hardtop have been added. Even though all these things have been added, there is still much needed.

And now we come to September 1963. We returned to Wawaloam for our final year. At last we were the eighth grade, and this would be our year. In the fall we met to decide where we would go for our class trip. We set our sights high. We would be the first class able to attend a world's fair. Our next problem was how to begin raising money for such a project. We thought a good way to do this would be to sell candy, and sell candy we did. (I wonder how many of our parents still have several pounds of candy stowed away?)

On June 5, 6, and 7 we took our planned tour of the World's Fair and had the time of our lives.

And now we come to the time we all have awaited—our graduation.

Important as it is to us tonight, we know that our education is just beginning. Ahead of us all is high school and, for some, college.

We can look back on these past 8 years as but another step in the "stairway to the stars."

Our class would like to thank the town for making our use of this school possible and for sending us to high school in the next few years.

EDUCATION—OUR "STAIRWAY TO THE STARS"

(By Lucille Thornley)

We could say that education is our "stairway to the stars." Every one of us have dreams of what we'd like to be when we get older. In this country most children have an opportunity of achieving their goal. But some of the children of the United States because of the color of their skin or the way they talk aren't given the same opportunity. In England your family name and wealth determines how far you can go. In Africa it is even more difficult. There over half the children aren't even given a chance to go to school.

Most children in the United States can choose what they'd like to be and if they work hard enough they can achieve their goal. Even if they come from the most backward part of town. Take, for example,

Abraham Lincoln, who was born in a log cabin. He had less than a year of schooling. So that he could learn more he would walk miles to borrow some books. Through his hard work he rose to become President. Abraham Lincoln took advantage of the opportunity offered to him.

If only everyone in this country had the same opportunity, this would be a better place to live in. I can see the day when everyone, no matter what color skin or no matter how they talk, will have the same and equal opportunity. When that day comes everyone will be able to climb their "stairway to the stars."

My address on "The New Frontiers of Education" was as follows:

THE NEW FRONTIERS OF EDUCATION

I am glad to be here tonight to talk for just a few minutes to the graduating class of this exceptional Wawaloam School. It is always a pleasure to speak to the young people who are going to inherit the problems which my generation will inevitably leave behind. We have shown the way. But you will have to solve the problems of poverty, pollution, overpopulation, urban planning, automation, and a host of others. You will succeed simply because you must if mankind is to survive and prosper.

You will have many new tools in your war against ignorance, ugliness, poverty, and discrimination. These tools are being forged in the libraries and laboratories of the world. Mankind is on the march for knowledge. Our mental frontiers are expanding even more rapidly than our new physical frontier in so-called outer space. Knowledge is like a candle in the darkness: the brighter the light, the greater the perimeter of the unknown which is revealed. There seems to be no limit to what can be found out by the mind of man. Each new fact triggers the discovery of additional facts in an unending chain reaction.

Nowadays, in fact, knowledge is piling up so fast that even the experts can't keep up with it—though they have a lot of fun trying. This process is most obvious in science, but it is happening in many other areas of scholarly work. We need tens of thousands of educated people just to assimilate this new information and make it available to those who need it. There is more room in the job market for writers, teachers, and librarians as well as for the social and natural scientists who reveal new truths and the engineers who apply them.

But there is no room for anyone who is not willing to work harder with his brains than anyone has ever had to work before. That's something we often forget in this age of leisure and automation. There is going to be fierce competition just to master the new knowledge I've been talking about, let alone apply it on the job. Our high schools are becoming tougher and more selective all the time. So are the colleges. Twice as many young people will be applying for college 10 years from now, yet many will not be able to get in because they will not have prepared themselves by diligent efforts in the high school classroom. Don't forget that college admissions officers pay more attention to your high school record than anything else in deciding the merits of your application.

Is college really important or is it just fashionable? I think it is genuinely important.

In the old days education was an option—a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. Unless a boy or girl were going to be a doctor, lawyer, or teacher, it really wasn't necessary to know much more to get a job or be a good citizen than how to read, write, and count. A fine grade school education such as you have received was enough. However, times have changed. These days a high school diploma is the very minimum to get any kind of a

decent job, and college training of 1 or 2 years is necessary for most technicians' and semiprofessional jobs. What's more, if you want to get a professional position in business, science, engineering, or government, you must usually have at least one college degree.

As 8th grade graduates, therefore, you are beginning the most crucial period in your lives. You must take learning seriously, because it will determine your future income and your effectiveness as citizens. Most important of all, what you learn will determine what kind of persons you become, and whether you can release the potential that is within you.

At this point you may be asking, "What is education all about and what do they mean when they say someone is an 'educated man'?" Well, of course, an educated man is one who is well informed about the facts. But he knows much more than dates in history or quotations from the "experts." The educated person knows how the facts relate to each other and what they mean when viewed as a whole. He is not so much a warehouse full of mental goods as he is an analyst of everything around him. Like the prophets of the Old Testament, he is a conscientious critic of himself and of his society.

The educated man is also openminded about new developments. He finds that his ideas change with the passage of time. He discards the beliefs which do not work and gives more weight to those that do. In other words, he tries to be objective. He does not accept anything on hearsay or because it is handed down to him as an unquestioned inheritance from the past. At the same time, he doesn't let his obligation to keep an open mind prevent him from reaching conclusions and acting in practical matters where action is required.

But the importance of education goes even beyond the need to be knowledgeable or openminded. The educated person should be creative; that is, able to put the facts together to reach new conclusions, to see things in new ways, and to question what everyone else takes for granted. The educated man should also be able to communicate his findings to others. This is how human societies are held together. The ability to communicate in verbal or mathematical language is what distinguishes man from the animals and accounts for most of his extraordinary power over nature.

Your knowledge of English is particularly important and will determine your future more than anything else you study in all your years in school. Only slightly less vital in this day of scientific research and instantly applied technology is an ability to communicate with mathematical language. If you master these two languages—the English language and the language of mathematics—you will benefit from unlimited opportunities. You will be prepared for the widest possible variety of civic and intellectual roles. This level of performance is not easy to achieve, but it can be attained and it is worth almost any sacrifice.

Of course, none of these desirable goals can be reached unless your elders give education top billing on our list of national priorities. However, I think they will. Brains are going under forced draft everywhere in the world because they are the most valuable national resource. Everybody is going to have to learn more just to survive in an age of automation, let alone to ensure the further progress of civilization.

Education already ranks second as a major human activity. Only working for a living takes more of our time. Sixty billion dollars are being spent on world education every year and more than 300 million people are in school or taking courses. As technology shortens our working hours, education is going to become our principal activity. In

an age of science, as the philosopher Whitehead put it, there is "no appeal from the judgment . . . pronounced on the uneducated."

I know you will make the best of the new world that is opening up for you. My congratulations on your commencement and my best wishes for a successful career in school and at work.

CAPT. GEORGE S. BULLEN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Capt. George S. Bullen, an outstanding naval officer and dedicated American, retires today as Director, Congressional Inquiry and Liaison Division, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret to see the Navy lose this capable and highly regarded officer.

I have known him for the past 5 years and scarcely has a day passed but that his efficient services have been of benefit to my office.

Though quiet and unpretentious, George Bullen typifies the kind of officer whom we are proud to know. In his official capacities, he rendered excellent service; in his personal relationship with members of my staff and other congressional offices, he effected such a warm regard for himself that his retirement will be marked with deepest regret and more than a few honest tears.

You could call on George Bullen at any time of the day or night and he was always ready and willing to be of assistance. In my opinion, his work reflects very favorably on the Navy and the office of legislative liaison.

And, I am quite certain, the high regard George Bullen holds for the Congress is equally returned. No member of the Congress who has had occasion to know George Bullen fails to respect him.

Though often unnoticed in the whirl of activity on Capitol Hill, this type of naval officer should not go unsung and I would like to personally congratulate him for his excellent work and to wish him well in the future.

In closing his distinguished naval career and his work for the Congress, Capt. George S. Bullen more than deserves the Navy's traditional "well done."

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week a number of my colleagues spoke on the need to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and introduced legislation to this effect, including H.R. 11761 and similar bills. I commend these colleagues for their vigor in giving support to specific industries they believe deserve modifications in the 1962 trade act. I regret that I cannot join them in their proposed amendments to that act. I supported the Trade Expansion Act when it was passed by Congress, in 1962. Perhaps it needs some modification, but I believe H.R. 11761 goes so far as to defeat the main purposes of the act.

I have sympathy for those industries which fear that tariff negotiations might jeopardize their domestic or foreign markets. Both capital and labor have interests which must be considered in any revision of tariff schedules. In our efforts at achieving the great goal of free trade we must recognize the importance of proceeding with prudence and caution. We are a nation of consumers, and consumers have an interest in lower tariffs, but we are also a nation whose consumers derive their purchasing power from the profits of production. The two go hand in hand.

In my district, the Second Congressional District of Arizona, copper is becoming increasingly important. Southwest of Tucson today one finds the world's most important new copper mining area. Northeast of Tucson is one of the world's largest copper mines, a marvel of modern technology. What the copper industry is doing in developing these great new properties illustrates how important it is that we "make haste slowly" in adjusting or revising our tariff structures.

Several of this Nation's largest copper companies have invested huge sums in this one small area in the past several years. Only recently new expansion plans have been announced. These plans are going forward in order to meet the increasing demand for copper and copper products in this country and throughout the world. However, I think we can be misled by all these signs of prosperity. The delicate balance between profit and loss is critical in this industry, which mines the lowest grades of copper and pays the highest wages of all the world's copper producers. Hasty and ill-considered tariff revisions could upset that balance.

There are two highly significant factors relative to the copper industry which deserve our attention.

First, I want to speak of the price of copper. This is no industry trying to get what the traffic will bear. On the contrary, leaders of the copper industry realize that they will be hurt in the long run if copper prices rise too sharply or too far. They are working now, not to push the price of copper higher, but to keep it down to a level where it is competitive with other materials. Thus, imports actually are a help to our domestic industry by helping meet excess demand.

The second factor I want to mention is the record of the copper industry in the payment of wages to its workers. It

is a commendable record. A report recently issued by the Arizona Employment Security Commission confirms this. For example, last year, in Arizona, copper miners averaged \$133.81 a week compared to \$129.29 a week in 1962 and \$64.20 a week in the base period of 1947-49. The report reveals that hourly wage rates in the copper mining industry in Arizona have increased annually at a much greater rate than the consumer price index, tribute to improved technology and advances in employee productivity and the benefits they produce.

This is an outstanding record, and I trust we will continue to see this pattern of wage gains in the years ahead. But this will happen only if the copper industry remains healthy and free from disruptive forces which might be precipitated by unwise or hasty tariff revisions.

What effect a downward revision of our copper tariff might have would be hard to predict. However, I think it is significant that in the last several years there has been a trend toward increased imports and decreased exports of primary copper. In 1961, imports amounted to approximately 39 percent of U.S. production. Last year, they had advanced to more than 44 percent. This is not a frightening or astronomic rise, but it is a trend to be watched.

Mr. Speaker, I do not endorse sweeping changes in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, but I do join in the expression of concern that tariff negotiations proceed with caution, prudence, and attention to the interests of America's producers as well as its consumers. Among these producers the copper industry stands high for responsibility and attention to the interests of this Nation.

HIGHWAY DISASTER

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the Members of the House today on one of the saddest missions of my life in public office.

This past Friday morning—at approximately 4:10 a.m.—a trailer loaded with explosives blew up on a heavily traveled highway in my district. It took the lives of six persons and seriously injured three others. It caused property damage estimated at nearly a million and a half dollars.

I spent all of this past Saturday afternoon in the area where the explosion occurred and I tell the Members of this House today, without equivocation, that nothing I saw as a member of the Armed Forces during World War II was more terrible and more tragic than the scenes of devastation and havoc which resulted from the occurrence in Monroe County, Pa., early last Friday morning.

The loss of life was unbelievable for an accident of this kind—but the sober-

ing thought is that it could have been worse—much, much worse.

For this accident occurred in a sparsely populated region of our area. If it had happened just a few scant miles further west, it would have blown up a large section of the boroughs of East Stroudsburg or Stroudsburg and dozens of persons would have been killed and scores of human beings injured.

Three of the men who were killed Friday morning were members of the Marshalls Creek Fire Co., one of the best of its kind in the State of Pennsylvania, with an outstanding record of safety throughout its long years of service to the eastern end of Monroe County. Despite the thousands of hours of service they have given to their communities, incidentally, this is the first time since 1890 that a Monroe County fireman has lost his life in the line of duty.

On Saturday I visited the homes and the families of the three firemen who were killed.

Nothing I could say then—nothing I can do now—nothing this Congress can do or say, will return Earl Miller or Leonard Mosier or Edward Hines to their wives and their families.

But we can—and we do—recognize the extraordinary courage and valor of men such as these, who are volunteers, who lay down their lives, day after day, night after night, in service to those who live around them—and, who, far too often, give up their lives in the aftermath of someone else's negligence and callous disregard for the safety of human beings.

These three men were experienced firefighters. They were men who were noted for their devotion to public safety. They were not the kind of men who took unnecessary risks, either with their own safety or with the safety of others.

They are dead, today, as a result of one of the most tragic—and, I believe, senseless—manmade catastrophes ever to strike a quiet, peaceful community.

Three others are dead, also.

One of these, apparently, was the man who stopped at the scene of the abandoned trailer to turn in a fire alarm so that others might be protected. He was Joseph J. Horvath, Jr., of Lackawanna County, Pa. He was 24 years old.

The blast killed John Regina, 23, of Marshalls Creek, the son of one of my good friends, Theodore Regina, who is the owner and operator of a small hotel near the scene of the explosion. John Regina was a teacher in the Middletown, N.Y., public schools. He was to be married in a few weeks.

The sixth—and, hopefully, the last—death as a result of the explosion was Mrs. Lillian Paesch, 33, of Baltimore, Md. Mrs. Paesch was en route to a vacation with her husband. They happened to be passing the scene of the disaster at the time the explosion occurred.

Three other persons were seriously injured. Two of them were firemen. I talked with both of them last Saturday and I want to testify on the floor of this House today that I have never encountered greater and more inspiring examples of personal courage and dedication in my years in public life.

I speak here today, in their behalf as well as that of the dead. For it is to Robert Heid and Richard McDonough that we owe every bit of vigilance, as well as to the dead firemen and the others and to Mrs. Marion Sherman and Mrs. Ruth Livingston, both of whom were also injured in the catastrophe.

I want to say, now, on the public record, that I believe the investigators assigned to this case by the Interstate Commerce Commission have done an exemplary job of collecting evidence under the most difficult possible circumstances.

When I tell you that only the smallest bits and pieces of the exploded vehicle were visible when I toured the area, I must say, at the same time, that I have every confidence the ICC will be able to put together an accurate and possibly damning reconstruction of what actually happened last Friday morning on Route 209 in Monroe County.

For purposes of the record, I want to point out that this tragedy need never have taken human lives at all.

The fact is that the driver of this vehicle left the scene of the accident, allegedly to get help in changing two rear tires which he states had blown out on the trailer. The driver has been identified as Albert Koda of Port Carbon, Pa. He is an employee of the American Cyanamid Co. of Pottsville, Pa., to whom the tractor-trailer loaded with explosives belonged.

The trailer Koda was driving is reported to have contained 6,000 pounds of nitrocarbonitrate and 4,000 pounds of 60-percent gelatin dynamite, according to State police investigators on the scene. There are also reports, which have not been officially confirmed, that the trailer was also carrying a quantity of blasting caps.

Whether or not there were, in fact, blasting caps on board the trailer is a matter we must wait for the ICC hearing to clear up.

I am delighted, today, to say that the Commission has moved rapidly to expedite those hearings. They will be held on July 23 and 24 in the main courtroom of the Monroe County courthouse at Stroudsburg, Pa.

Commissioner Rupert L. Murphy will be in charge of the hearings which will be conducted, and Mr. Henry Vinskey will be the official hearing examiner.

When the hearings open, I am fully confident that the examiners will have the widest possible collection of information and evidence. The field investigation team, under the direction of Mr. Frank W. Doyle, the acting district director of the ICC office in Philadelphia, has been on the job at Marshalls Creek since a scant 4 hours after the blast occurred.

The hearings will present—and, I hope, clarify—matters of grave concern and serious consequence for all American citizens who use our public highways and live near them. It will be of the utmost importance, also, to many of our most vital manufacturing industries who use, and must continue to use, those highways to transport commodities safely.

No one who has studied this case can escape the astonishing and deadly similarities between it and what happened in Roseburg, Oreg., nearly 5 years ago.

On that date—August 7, 1959—a tractor-trailer loaded with almost the same identical commodities—nitrocarbonitrate, dynamite and blasting caps—but in much smaller quantities—completely devastated eight city blocks when it was left unattended near the scene of a fire and exploded.

In the court hearings which resulted from that explosion and the ICC investigation, the court found that the ICC did not have full enough jurisdiction, within the framework of the enabling laws passed by the Congress, to prosecute.

This legal flaw was remedied, however, with the passage of Public Law 86-710 on September 6, 1960. Under provisions of that law, a fine of \$10,000 and a sentence of 10 years in jail can be levied when death results as a consequence of proven negligence.

It is now against the law for the driver of a truck loaded with explosives to leave it unattended, no matter what the circumstances may be. If he has a helper with him, he is allowed to leave the helper behind while he goes for assistance.

But, under no conditions whatever, is an explosives-laden trailer to be abandoned.

The law seems absolute on this point.

Yet there is no provision in ICC regulations that such loads must be accompanied by anyone other than the driver, himself.

This, it seems to me, is a shortcoming in present regulations and should be quickly remedied.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not embarking on any irresponsible tirade against the responsible shippers who use America's public highways. Nothing could be further from my mind.

The shipment of explosives on public highways is an economic factor which has become an absolute necessity in our Nation. Two years ago there were 632 million pounds of explosives handled by trucks on public highways.

Explosives are used in countless ways by virtually every heavy and advanced industry known in our economy today.

We cannot restrict their use or their shipment without adequate investigation and proper precaution.

We can, however, insist that the shipment of any explosive be carried out with the absolute maximum amount of security and the greatest possible safety precautions.

We do not want—and we must not have—a recurrence of what happened in Marshalls Creek, Pa., last Friday morning or what happened in Roseburg, Oreg., 5 years ago.

I do not care how great the amount of care which goes into shipments of this kind. The protection and salvation of human life should be, and must be, our first concern in the Congress and in the regulatory commissions which it authorizes to take steps to protect the American people.

I urgently suggest that this body undertake a thorough review of existing laws governing the shipment of explosives on public highways. There should be room in such a study, also, for a review of the relationships which exist, or do not exist, between the laws of the sev-

eral States and the Federal regulations covering explosives shipments.

In Pennsylvania, for example, the Public Utility Commission has no regulatory power over private carriers transporting explosive commodities, but does maintain some controls over hired carriers used for this purpose.

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission has been invited to sit in on the hearings which will be conducted next month in Stroudsburg and I am personally hopeful that they will avail themselves of the opportunity.

I shall look toward the hearings with great anticipation.

I believe, with all my heart, that the Interstate Commerce Commission, in these proceedings, will have an opportunity to perform one of the greatest and most signal public services in its long and distinguished history.

If those hearings do not produce the recommended actions and the evidence which should be forthcoming, I feel that the Members of this Congress must join together in a unified effort to place upon the law books the kind of regulations which will make a repetition of the Marshalls Creek disaster absolutely impossible.

I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues for your patience in this matter.

Nothing I have experienced in my lifetime has so deeply moved me as the terrible tragedy in my own district this past weekend.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause in these closing days of June to pay tribute to the memory of Taras Shevchenko, illustrious Ukrainian man of letters and freedom fighter. This weekend his statue was unveiled in our city, so that our children and visitors from all nations might be reminded of this great man, and of the causes to which he dedicated his life.

Shevchenko lived in an age of political and social turmoil. Always in the main stream of the drive for human and constitutional rights, he, like other deeply concerned and oppressed Europeans, took a leading role in the revolutions which rocked that continent at midcentury. His immediate, personal goal was Ukrainian independence. The year of his death, 1861, marked a watershed in the history of the causes he defended, for it was in that year that the Czar Alexander finally liberated the Russian serfs.

In this era, when we are acutely aware of the plight of millions of our fellowmen held captive behind the Iron Curtain, the example of Taras Shevchenko stands out as a symbol of the continuing struggle for human liberty throughout

this world. That the Shevchenko Memorial Committee has so honored him reaffirms our understanding for the people of Eastern Europe, though they may be separated from us by walls of states and oppressive governments.

Taras Shevchenko's genius was many sided; he is remembered as a model Ukrainian patriot, a pioneer who rekindled and revitalized the Ukrainian national spirit in poems, songs, and stories about Ukrainian national heroes. A man of the arts in the fullest sense, he was recognized in his lifetime as the bard, the poet laureate, of his people.

The hold of Taras Shevchenko on the descendants of his countrymen—on the 2 million Americans of Ukrainian origin—is so well illustrated by their determined, longstanding effort to establish a memorial in his honor in their National Capital. This attachment and veneration led more than 50,000 of them to assemble here in Washington this weekend to celebrate the heritage of this towering 19th century human being—the principles of individual dignity for which he fought, and the enriched Ukrainian culture which he left as a legacy to future generations.

I congratulate the Taras Shevchenko Memorial Committee for erecting this historic monument, and I say to the people of his native land that, with more men like Taras Shevchenko among all of us, we may unite our ideas and efforts to make the freedom he sought a present reality.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this weekend witnessed a most touching series of events that showed the affection and esteem with which Ukrainian-Americans regard their national hero, the great poet Taras Shevchenko. Many thousands of them marched to the memorial site here in Washington to watch the dedication of his statue. They came from all over the United States. Some of them had helped realize this memorial.

One might ask, why a statue to Shevchenko in our Capital? The answer is simple. Shevchenko was more than just a local patriot fighting for his people's liberation. Shevchenko was and is today a universal figure that personifies the struggle for freedom and democratic rule which is and has been waged by so many suppressed nationalities. His writings and his actions inspired many other peoples who along with the Ukrainians found themselves under a foreign autocracy.

One hundred years ago Ukraine was part of the Russian czarist empire. Ukrainians had no freedom and no democracy. Shevchenko deeply felt their crying need and set about to remedy the

situation. For his efforts he was sent to Siberia in the Russian Army and forbidden to write. Even after his return he was never really a freeman.

Today the Ukraine and many other lands still find themselves under foreign domination. This memorial reminds us of this injustice and also reminds us that there are men like Taras Shevchenko who are working to realize their nation's freedom. As shown in the erection of this statue, our hearts are with them. Long may the spirit of Shevchenko live on.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLAIMANTS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the decision to allow television cameras to record the verdict in the trial of Jack Ruby served to revive heated controversy over whether or not to allow TV in a courtroom.

During a recent appearance on the WNBC radio program, Speak Up, Jacob D. Fuchsberg, president of the National Association of Claimants Counsel of America—NACCA—the Nation's largest trial bar association, presented a spirited argument against permitting televised courtroom trials, contending that this could serve to deprive participants of their right to privacy which is the basic liberty of individuals living in a democracy.

Here is the substance of the remarks of Mr. Fuchsberg who is considered to be one of the most articulate spokesmen for his profession:

If millions were looking in through the medium of television, the search for justice could be impeded, regardless of how well equipment could be obscured from view, in that litigants would be reluctant to discuss highly personal matter in the glare of TV.

The constitutional guarantee of a public trial is intended for the benefit of those involved, and it is the protection of their interests which must be the primary concern of our courts.

In an accident or a divorce case, personal and sensitive subjects frequently must be revealed and allowing millions of people to observe the proceedings could do irreparable harm to a litigant or a defendant charged with, but not yet convicted of a crime.

Moreover, if trials were televised, the reputation of many people could be damaged, regardless of the outcome of a trial, in that countless viewers might form an incorrect opinion of an individual, based solely on what they see in their homes.

Mr. Fuchsberg stressed that he was not questioning the right of a free press, the integrity of broadcasters, nor their ability to make electronic equipment as unobtrusive as possible.

He said that if a witness, or a juror, however, is aware of the fact that he is "on camera," his behavior is likely to be affected, in some cases to the detriment of justice.

NEGROES STAGE RAMPAGE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if most people in and around Washington heard of a recent race riot in Chicago, since the Washington Post condensed the story into a squib and hid it under a story of manufactured violence in the South.

As usual, one has to turn to one of the responsible newspapers to get the true story. I happened to find it in the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, although I hasten to add that the story is the Associated Press story, not one written by a southerner for southern consumption.

The story of about 50 Negro teenagers running wild in the streets of Chicago, ravaging stores, assaulting police, and civilians alike, pillaging and stabbing and, in fine, reverting to savages, is a sickening tale to read. Hiding it from the public, however, is not the answer.

This is the whirlwind the Nation will reap after passage and signature of the so-called civil rights bill. By enacting into law the platform of the 1928 Communist Party of the United States, we can expect no less.

The full story of the savage rampage in Chicago follows:

NEGROES STAGE RAMPAGE—NINE PERSONS ARE ASSAULTED IN CHICAGO

CHICAGO.—A group of about 50 North Side high school students started their summer vacation Friday with a 2-hour rampage in which they assaulted at least 9 persons, including 2 police officers.

Police said the victims were treated and released from a nearby hospital.

Police seized 17 persons, 6 of them juveniles. All those arrested were Negroes, but police said the attackers included Negro, Puerto Rican, and white boys. The victims were all white.

Detective Joseph Bongiorno said there appeared to be no racial reason for the assault.

"They were just looking for kicks," he said.

The melee began following dismissal of classes at Waller and Cooley High Schools for summer vacation.

The gang first descended on a grocery store, where police said they tossed groceries and pop bottles on the floor. They fled with \$40 from the cash register.

The students then split into smaller groups and fanned out in the area.

Linden Pillath, 23, said he was struck from behind and beaten and kicked by eight of the youths. He apparently suffered a broken jaw.

CUT IN ABDOMEN

Victor Sawczenko, 17, suffered a minor knife wound in the abdomen when he was attacked in an underpass.

Stanley Pliwowski, 15, said about 30 gang members "surrounded us and we couldn't get out."

"They started kicking and one guy grabbed me by the hair," he said. He suffered a bloody nose and a bruised left arm and lost a portable radio.

Policeman Raymond Kappel was burned on the face with a flipped cigarette when he tried to stop a group of youths from throwing pop bottles at a bus.

Another policeman, Joseph Trifone, 32, suffered a cut right index finger as he attempted to break up the disturbances.

Two other youths, Terry Schlott, 15, and Kenneth Lavorate, 18, were beaten and their radios were stolen. Ben Maggio, 17, was struck several times.

Charles Tilson, 27, was threatened by 15 youths while he was changing a tire in front of his home. He said he was hit by a brick thrown at him.

Asked to explain the riot, one policeman said, "They were just going around looking for something to do."

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

MR. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it was a great honor for me to be designated a congressional adviser to the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland. I surely appreciate having this opportunity to learn firsthand the operation of this organization, to gain a better understanding of international organizations, to promote the ideals of the United States, and to discuss firsthand with representatives of various countries of the world the problems which confront each one in particular in their own country and generally as serious crises affect us all.

I attended the early part of the Conference leaving Geneva on July 24. The Conference continues through July 29, but I felt it was unwise to leave the work in Congress for more than a week to 10 days.

The big issues confronting the ILO Conference while I was in attendance were: First, apartheid, which is a carry-over from previous years and was especially noteworthy last year when the African delegates walked out when a South African delegate attempted to speak in the plenary session; second, the erosion of the tripartite structure as it is practiced by the Western World; third, the efforts to give the Conference dominance over the governing body and the Director General; and fourth, the new alliance of 75 developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The main purposes of the ILO are to work out recommendations or conventions for various nations designed to establish standards for working conditions, health and safety codes, freedom of association, special employment problems of women and youth, equality of opportunity, and the recognition of basic human rights. The ILO itself administers programs of industrial and rural development, vocational training, and technical assistance. The ILO supposedly does not concern itself with political issues, but leaves these to the United Nations. However, as the four issues which I have just mentioned imply, a great deal of political controversy and propaganda are injected into the

discussion of the Conference. This is usually generated by the Communists.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The ILO was organized in 1919 under the League of Nations. However, the United States did not become a member until 1934. Presently, there are 110 members. It has a permanent office in Geneva, and the Director General is David A. Morse, an American. It is under his supervision that the program is carried out throughout the year. If we were to compare the ILO to a parliamentary form of government, he would be in the position of the prime minister. The parliament or legislative group is the governing body which changes its chairman each year. This year Emilio Calderon Puig, of Mexico, is Chairman; last year, Alexandre Parodi, of France; the year before that, Shambhu T. Merani, of India, and in 1960-61, George C. Lodge. The governing body is selected by the ILO Conference and consists of 10 government members from the 10 most industrial nations and the other 14 selected at large from the remaining member nations. There are also 12 worker and 12 employer members elected. Again, using the parliamentary system for an analogy, the annual Conference tends to be the constituency of the governing body.

STRUCTURE

In the Conference there are one employer delegate, one labor delegate, and two government delegates for each member nation. This works exceptionally well in all countries where a free labor union movement flourishes, where a free private enterprise system dominates the economic system, and where the government is responsive to the will of the people. Our Government representatives to the ILO Conference this year are the Hon. George L-P Weaver, Assistant Secretary, International Affairs, Department of Labor; and Mr. George P. Delaney, special assistant to the Secretary, Department of States. The employer delegate is Mr. Richard Wagner, chairman of the executive committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; and our labor delegate is Mr. Rudolph Faupl, international representative, International Association of Machinists. These four men were delegates last year, and as I watched them perform their duties, I could tell that they were experienced with the ILO process and their exceptional ability enabled them to represent the United States very well.

Backing these men in an advisory capacity for the Government were: Mr. John F. Skillman, special assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce; Hon. Roger W. Tubby, Ambassador, U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations and other International Organizations; Hon. Pat McNamara, U.S. Senate; Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senate; Hon. Adam C. Powell, House of Representatives; Hon. James Roosevelt, House of Representatives; Hon. Robert P. Griffin, House of Representatives; Hon. Albert H. Quie, House of Representatives; Mr. John L. Hagan, Office of International Conferences, Department of State; Mr. John E. Lawyer, Acting Director, Office of Inter-

national Organizations, Department of Labor; Mr. Irvin S. Lippe, attaché, U.S. Mission, Geneva, Switzerland; Mr. Edward B. Persons, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State; Mr. Harold D. Snell, labor attaché, American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon; Mr. Robert W. Grant, Chief, Division of International Cooperation, Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor; Mr. Alfred L. Green, executive director, Division of Employment, Department of Labor, Albany, N.Y.; Mr. James M. Nabrit, president, Howard University; Mr. John P. O'Neill, Division of Programming and Training, Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor; Hon. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor; Mr. Donald L. Ream, Chief, Workmen's Compensation Branch, Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor.

Serving in an advisory capacity to the employer delegate were: Mr. Arthur W. Brown, manager, employee relations department, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza; Mr. Richard P. Doherty, president, Television-Radio Management Corp., Washington; Mr. Harry J. Lambeth, labor attorney, labor relations and legal department, U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Philip D. Moore, manager, Management Development and Employee Relations Services, General Electric Co., New York; Mr. Edwin R. Niehaus, director, industrial relations, the Great Western Sugar Co., Denver; Mr. George J. Pantos, international representative, commerce and foreign policy department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Mr. Charles H. Smith, president, the Steel Improvement & Forge Co., Cleveland.

Serving in an advisory capacity to the worker delegate were: Mr. George H. Harrison, chief executive officer, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Cincinnati; Mr. Edward J. Hickey, attorney, Mulholland, Hickey & Lyman, Washington; Mr. John McCartin, assistant general president, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, Washington; Mr. James McDonald, directing business representative, International Association of Machinists, District Lodge No. 8, Chicago; Mr. George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington; Mr. Ralph Rieser, president, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, Columbus, Ohio; Mr. Bert Seidman, European economic representative, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Geneva, Switzerland; Mrs. Maida Springer, representative, international affairs department, AFL-CIO, Washington; and Mr. Miles C. Stanley, president, West Virginia Labor Federation (AFL-CIO), Charleston, W. Va.

ISSUES OF THE CONFERENCE APARTHEID

Due to the publicity caused by the walkout of the African delegates in the 1963 Conference, similar emotional action was expected in this session. However, South Africa did not send a delegate to the Conference, and therefore, a de-

cision over seating was not necessary. The whole question of apartheid is before the United Nations and at the time of the beginning of the Conference, the U.N. Security Council issued the following resolution:

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON SOUTH AFRICA, JUNE 9, 1964

The Security Council recalling General Assembly resolution 1881XV (xviii) of October 11, 1963, which condemns the Government of the Republic of South Africa for its failure to comply with the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly and of the General Council and it requests it to abandon the arbitrary trial in progress and forthwith to grant unconditional release to all political prisoners and to all persons imprisoned, interned, or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid; and

Further recalling that the Security Council in its resolutions of October 7, 1963 (S. 5386), and December 4, 1963 (S. 5741), called upon the Government of South Africa to liberate all persons in prison, interned, or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid; and

Noting with great concern that the arbitrary Rivonia trial instituted against the leaders of the anti-apartheid movement has been resumed and the imminent verdict to be delivered under arbitrary laws describing long terms of imprisonment and the death sentence may have very serious consequences; and

Noting with regret that the Government of South Africa has rejected the appeal of the Secretary General of March 27, 1964: (1) Urges the South African Government (a) to renounce the execution of the persons sentenced to death for actions resulting from opposition to the policy of apartheid, (b) to end forthwith the trial in progress instituted within the framework of the arbitrary apartheid laws, (c) to grant an amnesty to all persons already imprisoned, interned, or subjected to other restrictions for opposing apartheid and particularly to the defendants in the Rivonia trial; (2) invites all states to exert all their influence in order to induce the South African Government to comply with the provisions of this resolution; (3) invites the Secretary General to follow closely the implementation of the resolution and to report thereon to the Security Council at the earliest possible date.

Discrimination on the continent of Africa by Europeans was an issue, however, to Portugal with regard to Angola and Mozambique. The seating of delegates sent by Portugal was in appeal at the time when I was in attendance, and there may be objection later on in the Conference. Either they would be seated or if denied participation, the delegates from Portugal would rise to speak in opposition—a demonstration of delegates from African nations could easily be forthcoming.

Two committees are presently functioning to first, draw a resolution or declaration concerning apartheid; and, second, propose a constitutional change providing for expulsion. It is hoped that these two would give a member nation an opportunity to appraise itself and take whatever action is necessary within the prerogatives of the structure of the ILO.

PROPOSED DECLARATION CONCERNING THE POLICY OF APARTHEID OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Whereas all members of the International Labor Organization have, by the Declaration of Philadelphia embodied in the Constitu-

tion as a statement of the aims and purposes of the Organization, solemnly affirmed that "all human beings irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity"; and

Whereas by an instrument of ratification of the Constitution as amended in 1946, signed by the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa at Pretoria on June 12, 1947, the Government of South Africa has undertaken "faithfully to perform and carry out" all the stipulations of the Constitution; and

Whereas the constitution provides that the International Labor Organization exists for the promotion of the objects set forth in the Preamble thereto and in the Declaration of Philadelphia; and

Whereas the Government of the Republic of South Africa has not merely failed to cooperate in promoting the objects set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution and in the Declaration of Philadelphia but has adopted discriminatory policies wholly incompatible therewith, thus creating an alarming situation; and

Whereas the Declaration of Philadelphia affirms that the principles set forth therein are "fully applicable to all peoples everywhere" and recognizes that their progressive application is a "matter of concern to the whole civilized world"; and

Whereas the application of the principle of equal opportunity for all human beings, irrespective of race, has therefore ceased to be solely the domestic concern of the Republic of South Africa; and

Whereas the Republic of South Africa persistently and flagrantly violates this principle by means of legislative, administrative, and other measures incompatible with the fundamental rights of man, including freedom from forced labor, freedom of association, and freedom of choice of employment and occupation; and

Whereas such persistent and flagrant violation of the principle has been established by the International Labor Organization by inquiries relating to forced labor, freedom of association and freedom from discrimination in respect of employment and occupation; and

Whereas for instance, the United Nations-International Labor Organization Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor has found that there exists in South Africa "a legislative system applied only to the indigenous population and designed to maintain an insuperable barrier between these people and the inhabitants of European origin," that "the indirect effect of this legislation is to channel the bulk of the indigenous inhabitants into agricultural and manual work and thus to create a permanent, abundant, and cheap labor force" and that in this sense "a system of forced labor of significance to the national economy appears to exist in the Union of South Africa"; and

Whereas, moreover, the Freedom of Association Committee of the governing body has found that the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation Acts and Native Labor (Settlement of Disputes) Act involve discrimination against workers on grounds of race which is incompatible with the principle that workers without distinction should have the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organization concerned, to join organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization and that all workers should enjoy the right of collective bargaining; and

Whereas the committee of experts on the application of conventions and recommendations has likewise found, on the basis of information furnished by the Government of South Africa and the relevant legislation, that the legislation and practice of South Africa establish extensive discrimination in

employment and occupation on grounds of race; and

Whereas the International Labor Conference, by a resolution adopted on 29 June 1961, condemned the racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and called upon the Republic of South Africa to withdraw from the International Labor Organization until such time as the Government of the said Republic abandons apartheid; and

Whereas South Africa, having declined the invitation of the International Labor Conference to withdraw from membership of the Organization, has by continuing her membership maintained, but continues to violate, her undertaking to respect the right of "all human beings irrespective of race, creed or sex" to "pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity"; and

Whereas the United Nations declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination has called for an end to "be put without delay to governmental and other public policies of racial segregation and especially policies of apartheid as well as all forms of racial discrimination and separation resulting from such policies"; and

Whereas the Security Council of the United Nations by resolutions S. 5471 adopted unanimously on December 4, 1963, expressed "the firm conviction that the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination as practiced by the Government of the Republic of South Africa are abhorrent to the conscience of mankind and that therefore a positive alternative to these policies must be found through peaceful means" and condemned the noncompliance by the Government of the Republic of South Africa with the appeals contained in the resolutions addressed to it by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The general conference of the International Labor Organization,

Determined to fulfill its responsibility to promote and take its part in securing the freedom and dignity of the people of South Africa,

Acting as spokesman of the social conscience of mankind.

Reiterating that a government which deliberately practices apartheid is unworthy of the community of nations but nevertheless making another appeal to the Government of South Africa to abandon its disastrous policy and to cooperate with employers' and workers' organizations in placing the relations between the various elements of the population of South Africa, and the relations between the people of South Africa and the rest of the world, on the basis of the equality of man, justice for all, good neighborliness and mutual respect:

1. Emphatically reaffirms its condemnation of the discriminatory racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa which are incompatible with fundamental human rights and with the aims and purposes of the International Labor Organization.

2. Calls upon the Government of South Africa to recognize and fulfill its undertaking to respect the freedom and dignity of all human beings, irrespective of race, and to this end,

To renounce the policy of apartheid and repeal all legislative, administrative and other measures incompatible with the freedom and dignity of the people of South Africa and the principle of the equality of man,

To promote equality of opportunity and treatment in employment and occupation irrespective of race,

To repeal the statutory provisions which provide for compulsory job reservation or institute discrimination on the basis of race

as regards access to vocational training and employment,

To repeal all legislation providing for penal sanctions for contracts of employment, for the hiring of prison labor for work in agriculture or industry, and for any other form of direct or indirect compulsion to labor, including discrimination on grounds of race in respect of travel and residence, which involves racial discrimination or operates in practice as the basis for such discrimination,

To repeal the statutory discrimination on grounds of race in respect of the right to organize and to bargain collectively, and the statutory prohibitions and restrictions upon mixed trade unions including persons of more than one race, and so to amend the Industrial Conciliation Acts that all workers, without discrimination of race, enjoy the right to organize and may participate in collective bargaining.

3. Invites the governing body to exercise its constitutional power under article 19(5) (e) and (6) (d) of the Constitution by requesting the Government of South Africa to report annually the position of its law and practice in regard to the matters dealt with in the Forced Labor Convention, 1930, the Abolition of Penal Sanctions Convention, 1955, the Abolition of Forced Labor Convention, 1957, the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948, the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949, and the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention and Recommendation, 1958.

4. Decides to consider each year a special summary of such reports to be submitted to the conference by the Director General in pursuance of article 23 of the Constitution or, in default of such reports, such information as the Director General may be in a position to assemble and submit by any other procedure approved by the governing body and any recommendations which he may submit therewith, and on the basis of such consideration, to recommend such further action as may be appropriate.

5. Reaffirms its resolve to cooperate with the United Nations in seeking and guaranteeing freedom and dignity, economic security and equal opportunity for all the people of South Africa.

**AMENDMENT OF ILO CONSTITUTION TO PERMIT
EXPULSION OR SUSPENSION FROM MEMBERSHIP
OF ANY MEMBER WHICH HAS BEEN EXPELLED
OR SUSPENDED FROM MEMBERSHIP OF
THE UNITED NATIONS**

6. The general conference of the International Labor Organization may, at any session in the agenda of which the subject has been included and by a vote concurred in by two-thirds of the delegates attending the session, including two-thirds of the government delegates present and voting expel from membership of the International Labor Organization any member which the United Nations has expelled therefrom or suspend from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership of the International Labor Organization any member which the United Nations has suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership; suspension shall not affect the continued validity of the obligations of the member under the constitution and conventions to which it is a party.

It was interesting to note the reference to apartheid, the use of slave labor and the abolishment of colonialism in the speeches of the delegates from Communist bloc nations. The Communists are the colonialists of today and surely do not permit the freedom of labor and labor organizations which we enjoy in the Western World.

TRIPARTITE STRUCTURE

The very basis of the ILO has been its tripartite structure. There are particular and peculiar interests which workers have and they express them through their free trade unions. We make very certain in the United States, as do countries of Western Europe, that worker delegates are never interfered with and can freely express their views on various things which the ILO does. This is also the case with employer delegates where free enterprise and private enterprise flourish.

When Communist nations become members of the ILO, we found that representatives in all three parts of the ILO have a common authority—the Communist Party itself. Since the party and the government are completely intertwined, there was no objection to the seating of these delegates by our Government delegates.

While the labor delegates object to the fact that trade unions are merely the Communist Party in the industry in Communist countries, they have permitted the worker delegates from Communist countries to be seated feeling that they can constantly outvote them. Employer delegates, however, from the Western World have strenuously objected to the seating of employer delegates from Communist nations.

When the ILO organizes each year, the employer delegates in the organization leave out the individuals whom Communist countries attempt to have seated as employer delegates. The Communist nations then appeal and their proposed delegates are finally seated. This certainly does violence to the tripartite structure and whereas we find the labor delegate, employer delegate, and government delegates from free countries are divided on many issues, the worker, employer, and government delegates from the Communist nations always vote together giving proof to their monolithic authority. As a good example of the willingness to flaunt the traditional concept of employer, I can quote from the plenary speech of Mr. Kucherov, employer delegate from the Ukraine. He claims that "the employers' group in the governing body expresses the social structure of the world as it was at the beginning of this century, if you like, but not at all today's structure."

He continues:

The capitalist employers trying to justify their discriminatory attitude toward the socialist employers generally refer to the fact that the socialist employers are in the service of their governments. Well, I am proud that I am serving a people's government, that I am serving my people, and the profits of the undertaking that I manage go to meet the needs of the sole proprietor, the people. At the same time, I am free to earmark part of these profits to extending the enterprise, and to improving the living conditions of the workers. I feel legitimate pride when I see how happy the workers are when they move into their new apartments that have been constructed out of the profits of our factory. I am happy that thousands of children of our workers are brought up in the crèches and kindergartens, and rest in Black Sea health centers also built out of the

profits of our plant, this plant which my people's government has put me in charge of. My joy and enthusiasm can only be understood by people who have themselves experienced these emotions, but you so-called free employers will never understand this.

That is why production must be developed, and not in order to give employers the freedom to exploit the workers and act without control. The socialist employers have an undoubted advantage over private capitalist employers in that they are free from greed for gain. The very fact that we directors represent here in the ILO the most progressive socioeconomic system, the socialist system, explains why the representatives of "free enterprise" are prepared to bar the way to the governing body in order to keep out the legitimate representatives of socialist management. However, whether or not the representatives of private enterprise like it, public, nationalized, socialized, expropriated, call it what you will but state-controlled industry is the thing of the future.

The state sector in industry is characteristic not only of the Socialist countries but of many developing countries as well. Progress is following the line of nationalization of industry, the setting up of a decisive state-controlled sector and transformation of society. The facts demonstrate clearly that nationalized industry is the industry of the future, because only nationalized industry makes for the economic and social flowering of a nation.

In the process of adapting the ILO to modern conditions, it is necessary radically to change existing practice with respect to the composition of the employers' and workers' groups in the governing body and in other organs of the ILO.

All one has to do is to look at the industrial and productive strength of the Atlantic community to know what free private enterprise and free trade unions have been able to do for the betterment of not only the peoples in their own countries but also other peoples all over the world. You can tell by this one quotation the difficulty which we have in an organization like the ILO where the Communist countries participate.

Another example of the breakdown of tripartite structure occurs in some of the new and developing nations. The comments of Mr. Diarra, government delegate from Mali, show this. Mali is one of the new Socialist countries of Africa. He stated that 100 percent of the people of Mali are workers. As a government delegate he could just as well be present in the conference as a worker delegate since he is a worker and a member of the Mali Federation of Trade Unions. The employers in Mali are directors of nationalized industry, and therefore, there is no difference in point of view between the employer, worker, or government delegates from Mali.

I can see a consistent erosion of tripartite structure in ILO, and if the present trend continues, it is doubtful that a majority of nations would look on free labor unions and private enterprise the way we do.

As we consider the future of the ILO and the possibilities of delegates having different views finding unity of purpose, I think it is well for you to read the speech of Willard Wirtz, our Secretary of Labor, as he addressed the plenary

session of the International Labor Conference on Friday, June 19.

Mr. WERTZ (Secretary of Labor, United States). Many years of infinite, if remote, respect for the ILO contribute to the personal feeling which attends now my entry upon its living tradition.

How very far the ILO has come since that organizational meeting in Washington in 1919, 45 years ago. It was then that President Woodrow Wilson said: "I am intensely interested in seeing that the First International Labor Conference under the league shall be a complete success. The Labor Conference is in the nature of the first breath of this newborn babe." If he were here today it would be to say: "My, how that baby has grown."

One of the footnotes to that 1919 record is that there was, then unknown, an Assistant Secretary of the Navy who did a good deal to make that meeting possible at all. His name was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

You will permit me one other personal note. The distinguished Director General of the ILO and I came to our present responsibilities through the same office of the Under Secretary of Labor. I was the beneficiary in that office of the distinction with which he had endowed it. It is a pleasant confusion today to be not quite able to separate the formalities of official comment upon the report of the Director General from the impulse to hail the work of a close and valued friend.

The United States subscribes fully to the central proposal in the director general's report that the ILO action be concentrated so as to be made more effective on a limited number of comprehensive program areas. The areas identified—human resource development, labor relations, a policy for incomes, and technological change—correspond with the structure of our own current national concern.

It is in response to the director-general's emphasis on the development of a strategy for human resources development that we urge favorable consideration by the general conference of a resolution, which we have submitted, which would have the ILO assume even more active leadership in this critical area. There are 45 years here of cumulative understanding of the application in peoples' lives of the ideals of social justice, human freedom, and the integrity of the individual.

The members of the U.S. delegation return to this 48th session of the International Labor Conference with a searing lesson—how a nation finds in its hour of ultimate crisis the elements of its essential continuity. We came to know in last November's anguish, neighboring on disbelief and even bitterness, that these elements are leadership and loyalty—but that both leadership and loyalty are vital and sufficient only to the extent that they have deep roots in the life-giving soil of great and honest faith in unifying ideals and principles.

History will conjecture and perhaps wonder how it was that there were enacted in the United States, during her period of mourning, three companion pieces of legislation, larger in their moment than any since our depression of 30 years ago; a tax reduction—and jobcreating—bill, which is already effective; a civil rights bill on which the critical vote was taken in the Senate of the United States last week; and the economic opportunity, or "war on poverty" bill, which is moving forcefully through Congress.

Part of the explanation lies in the magnificence of John F. Kennedy's inspiration and the extraordinary effectiveness of Lyndon B. Johnson's implementation. But part of it lies, too, in the fact that at that moment of unbalancing shock last November, the United States was intent on the purposes of perfecting the human ideal, of developing human resources. Had there been at

that time basic divisiveness within our Nation, serious alignments of conflicting interests, I do not know how we would have met our testing.

I speak of this only for its larger meaning. Most of the world's development has come from the clashing and competition of adverse interests. Yet, a beloved Washington clergyman was to say, several years ago: "The world is rapidly becoming too dangerous for anything except the truth, and too small for anything except brotherhood."

Only part of the past is relevant prolog. It is a basic issue in contemporary world dynamics how far the previous assumptions regarding diversity and difference have been made obsolete by a technology that is often reckless, by a swelling population, and by an awakening of human hopes.

This issue abides at this conference. The agenda is heavy, and the process of decision-making clogged, with divisive subject-matter.

So far as this reflects continued unresolved basic differences of principle and belief, no one would have it otherwise. We mean to put conflicting notions strongly against each other, without using gloves, which would only prolong the dispute by softening the difference. Freedom and equality and opportunity, as well as security and peace, are human desires, and they have the same essential meaning for humans everywhere. They involve truths as universal as those of natural science. The free forum is our laboratory, and argument our catalyst. There are not necessarily two right sides to every question. We want no false peace in the arena of ideas.

Yet, disagreement between honest, informed and independent men and women—tough-minded enough to be independent even of their own bias—can only be temporary, transient.

We understand the director general's report to suggest the taking of an inventory of ILO processes to assure that they are effective not only in exploring difference but in catalyzing agreements when its elements are present.

We endorse the various suggestions that research procedures should serve more directly to uncover the areas in which agreement is most likely to lie.

We assert the importance of carefully conserving the process of the ballot. Voting is no substitute for persuasion. Arrival at a consensus, at a sense of the meeting, is infinitely superior to a sharply divided vote. Even a majority is capable of tyranny. There must be finality in our decision-making process, but that process will be weakened if the discussion which precedes it is aimed from the start at winning a vote, rather than finding the area of common acceptance of what is true and what is right. But principles will always be more important than process, for one is a matter of ends and the other a matter of means.

We urge that the debate of the Conference proceed from the suggestions in the report to a clearer identification of the principles that unite us.

It is appropriate here only to suggest the areas in which these principles lie. One involves the reconciliation of the importance of economic and social development. This was best put in Luis Muñoz-Marín's inaugural address in 1949 as the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico. He stood there that day amidst poverty; his was the authentic voice of those in want. He said, on the one hand: "A political status * * * does not exist in an economic vacuum. * * * If a community does not develop an economy which is founded, or has hopes of being founded, on a victorious productive effort, it will see other forms of its life and liberty impeded, or decayed, or destroyed. * * * It is not a mere material convenience to be free from want." Yet, he asserted, "above

all," the need exists in all people for "a high ideal of the spirit," a readiness and a desire "to create an understanding of deep and clean human fraternity. * * * To give root to attitudes that lead man to be more creative than acquisitive * * * and to destroy bitterness of race, language, and culture."

In addition to the revolution in the world today for human dignity and fundamental freedoms, there is the persistent cry for the development not only of the human spirit, but of economic man as well.

Surely it is essential to develop social values tough enough and right enough to match and control the results of technological advance. Our understanding must keep up with our knowledge. It must be completely established that one human being's rights are as important as another's. Where there has been discrimination because of the in-human relevancy of race, belief, or color, the obligation is not just to stop overt acts of discrimination; it is to compensate for the disadvantage which is the accumulated fall-out effect of decades of discrimination. No longer is it enough to assert that all men are created equal. The obligation today is for men to neutralize the inequalities which man created and which too many children draw in as their endowment with their first breath.

I suggest in conclusion our pragmatic recognition, as we seek to state our common purpose, that the future is often clearer today in the soft lantern light of faith than in the glaring headlight of reason. Eternity has already shrunk, in the illumination of logic, to a matter of minutes: that little time that can run while men live their lives a single spark away from ultimate destruction, their knowledge of power daily outstripping their wisdom about its use.

Yet to care about the future only as it will see the ascendancy of human over material values is to watch with a fascination that fights against fear a generation of machines, maturing more rapidly than any generation of human beings ever has, so that at any moment now some clanking robot in one of our countries may pull itself erect and announce: Cogito, ergo sum. Yet we remain children of unfathomable mystery, surrounded still by secrets that dwarf to insignificance what is so far known.

The only dangers, except for cataclysmic accident, are that we shall build our syllogisms too much on experience and too little on vision; that we shall forget that "the inevitable is only what we don't resist" and the unattainable only what we don't attempt; that we shall stumble and fall and be destroyed on the sword of our own stupidity. It is not the stupidity of the ignorant that threatens so much as the stupidity of the successful—who seek to protect their petty conceits behind Maginot lines of race, religion or geography, content with the little innovations of their own dubious piety, fighting change because the status quo has been good to them. The divine right of the successful is as false a notion as the divine right of kings.

We look ahead knowing the future is still infinite if we will stretch our minds far enough and fast enough to keep ideals abreast of ideas; if we will reassess, under technology's pressure, the revolutionary new relationship between war and peace and between work and leisure; if we will seize that sense of the future that will let us stand on a clear night and look up at a heaven full of more stars than the number of all the men and women who have ever lived, and realize that those stars are now very close to our reach and are part of our children's future.

The charge upon the International Labor Organization was put to us in Washington last year by President Radhakrishnan of India. "We must remember," he said, in a

phrase that I shall never forget, "that man is an unfinished being."

The question arises as to how much dialog should the worker, employer, and Government individuals from the United States engage in. I believe it would be possible for the U.S. position to be developed with more communication between these three groups. Even though we strongly oppose monolithic authority and want to protect the individual initiative of free trade unions, representatives of private enterprise, and the representatives of the Government, an effort to find areas in which they are united, which I believe are more prevalent than the differences, would not necessarily harm the tripartite structure of the ILO. Along this line, I would especially want to quote from the speech of Secretary Wirtz which already has been placed before you:

We assert the importance of carefully conserving the process of the ballot. Voting is no substitute for persuasion. Arrival at a consensus, at a sense of the meeting, is infinitely superior to a sharply divided vote. Even a majority is capable of tyranny. There must be finality in our decisionmaking process, but that process will be weakened if the discussion which precedes it is aimed from the start at winning a vote, rather than finding the area of common acceptance of what is true and what is right. But principles will always be more important than process, for one is a matter of ends and the other a matter of means.

We urge that the debate of the Conference proceed from the suggestions in the report to a clearer identification of the principles that unite us.

With the difficulty the United States is having with the Communist nations in particular, some people recommend that we withdraw from the ILO. I think this would be unwise. No matter how difficult we find the going in international organizations like the ILO, I think it is important that we remain a member and aggressively promote our views and beliefs. In this regard, I should point out that the National Association of Manufacturers has withdrawn from participation in the ILO due to the admittance of employer delegates from Communist countries. The chamber of commerce has chosen to continue to participate. I believe this is the wise action to take since the developing nations can be compared to children who many times seem brash in finding their way in the adult alliance of nations.

CONFERENCE DOMINANCE OF THE GOVERNING BODY AND THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

As I pointed out in the historical background, the Conference meets for 3 weeks once each year to develop resolutions, elect members to the governing body, and act as a general discussion and debate organization for representatives of the 110 members of the ILO. The main work of the ILO is done by its executive officers under the direction of the Director General and policy considerations throughout the year are determined through the assistance of the governing board which appoints the Director. The Communists in particular, have been urging the change in the structure giving primary authority to the Conference. An example of this is evidenced by ex-

cerpts of a speech by Mr. Dzunov, Federal Secretary for Labor, Yugoslavia, before the plenary session on Monday, June 22:

The Conference should be the main and supreme authority of the ILO, a forum in which the policy and activities of the Organization would be determined in a fully democratic way. Past experience has in fact shown that, owing to the restricted competence of the Conference and the unsolved problems in regard to the composition of the other main bodies of the ILO, the majority of countries have so far been practically deprived of the possibility of exercising an effective influence on the orientation, program and forms of activity of the ILO.

The Conference should determine the activity of the Organization as a whole and be responsible for the drawing up of its agenda.

The Conference should have an effective insight into the practical implementation of its decisions and resolutions, and be regularly and fully informed about the implementation of its decisions left to the care of the governing body or of another of its organs.

The Conference should decide on the election of the Director General.

The present situation is described in the following quote from the report of the Director General:

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONFERENCE AND THE GOVERNING BODY

Any discussion of the future role of the Conference necessarily poses in some degree the question of the relationship between the Conference and the governing body, a matter of which there has been some discussion in recent years. The question comprises three elements, the representative character of the governing body, the part played by the governing body in the work of the Organization as a whole, and the manner in which the Conference, as the only body representative of the whole membership of the Organization, is kept informed of, and when necessary associated with, decisions taken by the governing body.

The need for a wider representation in the governing body of the growing membership of the Organization has recurred at intervals in the course of the development of the Organization. The governing body originally consisted of only 24 persons. By an amendment to the constitution adopted in 1922, which did not enter into force until 1934, the number was increased to 32. By a further amendment adopted in 1953, which entered into force in 1954, the size of the governing body was again increased from 32 to 40 persons. By a still further amendment adopted in 1962, which had received on March 8, 1963, 45 of the 71 ratifications necessary to bring it into force, provision is made for increasing the size of the governing body a third time from 40 to 48. There is also provision for 10 elected deputy members in each group; the employers' and workers' groups also elect substitute members, of whom there are at present 11 in the employers' group and 10 in the workers' group. In these circumstances, the number of places should certainly be large enough to permit of the election of a fully representative governing body.

Questions have been raised in the Conference and representations made to the Director General concerning the extent to which the governing body as at present composed is in fact reasonably representative of the Organization as a whole. The general principle that the governing body should be fully representative in character does not appear to be open to discussion, but the application of this principle is essentially a matter for the electoral colleges of the government, employers' and workers' groups respectively.

While it is important that the governing body should be fully representative of the

Organization as a whole, the need, particularly in a tripartite organization, for a strong governing body with real authority and the full confidence of employers and workers must not be underestimated.

The Conference delegation on constitutional questions in its report on the work of its first session (January-February 1946) defined the position in the following terms:

"75. The unique strength of the International Labor Organization derives from the manner in which the tripartite system makes it representative of workers and employers as well as governments. It is this strength which has made it a power in the world, has enabled it to survive the disruptive influences of war, and gives it the vitality to confront with a bold freshness of approach the problems arising from the war. All ILO action derives from a chain of a representational character. The foundation of the Organization is the member States which appoint their delegates to the Conference. The delegates to the Conference, acting through the electoral colleges, appoint the elective part of the governing body, the non-elective part being representational in another way. The governing body appoints the Director of the International Labor Office who, subject to the instructions of the governing body, is responsible for the efficient conduct of the International Labor Office and for such other duties as may be assigned to him. It is the existence of this chain of responsibility which gives its distinctive character to the International Labor Office, the work of which grows out of and in its turn contributes to the formulation of policy by the responsible representatives of the peoples of the world, acting through their governments and their employers' and workers' organizations.

"76. In this chain of responsibility the governing body is a vital link * * *"

This characterization of the position is the more interesting and significant in that it was not the handiwork of a governing body committee but that of a body appointed by and responsible to the Conference itself. The same general conception was more fully developed in the first report of the International Labor Organization to the United Nations, which describes the role of the governing body in the Organization as follows:

"The governing body plays a key role in the International Labor Organization. It has a general responsibility for coordinating the activities of the Organization into an overall program which can be fulfilled within the limits of the financial resources available and modified rapidly when necessary to take account of changing needs or priorities.

"Under the constitution and constitutional practice of the Organization, the governing body has the primary responsibility for fixing the formal agenda of the International Labor Conference. This responsibility is not exclusive, since the Conference itself also has authority to decide at any session to include a question in the agenda of the following session. It is, however, unusual for the Conference to exercise this power except for the purpose of including in the agenda of the second session of the Conference questions being considered by a double discussion procedure which have already been placed on the agenda of the Conference for a first discussion by a governing body decision. This concentration in the governing body of effective responsibility for determining the agenda of the Conference has been of inestimable value in enabling the Conference to concentrate its energies at each successive session on a limited number of well-defined subjects, on which it is called upon to take definite decisions. The Conference also has an opportunity, on the occasion of the discussion of the Director General's report, to undertake a broad survey of the whole field of social policy and thus to bring into focus further issues which call for

detailed consideration by appropriate procedures.

"Under the established constitutional practice of the Organization, the governing body is also responsible for convening other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization, fixing the dates and duration of such meetings, determining their agenda, and deciding what action shall be taken on the basis of the reports or resolutions adopted by them. These functions of the governing body make it possible to integrate the work of the various conferences and committees, including the work done on an industrial or regional basis by the industrial committees and by regional conferences, within the framework of the general activities and policy of the Organization.

"The financial regulations of the Organization assign to the governing body important functions in connection with the budget of the Organization. It examines annually the proposed budget submitted to it by the Director General, and approves the estimates submitted to the Conference for adoption. The close supervision exercised by the governing body over all the activities of the Organization makes it singularly well qualified to judge of the financial resources necessary to permit the economical and efficient discharge of the responsibilities assigned to the Organization by its members."

The General Assembly of the United Nations, the Economic and Social Council and governments generally have been increasingly and rightly concerned with better coordination in international organization. In the International Labor Organization the governing body is the linchpin of such coordination, both as regards the multifarious activities of the International Labor Organization itself and as regards the relationship of these activities with those of other members of the United Nations family and of other organizations, international and regional. As the 1946 Conference delegation said (report on the work of its first session, par. 79), "in order that the International Labor Organization may continue to operate efficiently it requires a strong governing body which continues to enjoy the full confidence of the members of the Organization." It is therefore vital that the steps which may become necessary from time to time to revitalize such confidence in changing circumstances should never have the effect of impairing the capacity of the governing body to fulfill the central coordinating responsibility which the efficient conduct of the work of the International Labor Organization requires.

One important element in the necessary balance of authority between the governing body and the Conference is that the Conference should be kept fully and regularly informed of matters of general interest and in particular of the manner in which effect is given to its own decisions. With this end in view the 1962 session of the Conference adopted unanimously a resolution requesting the inclusion each year in the Director General's report to the Conference of a chapter setting out the steps taken to give effect to the resolutions of previous sessions and the results achieved. This may help the Conference to enjoy the fullest opportunity to play vigorously and effectively the major role in adjusting the work of the Organization to the needs of a changing world which clearly belongs to it as the only body representative of the whole membership of the organization.

I think it would be extremely unwise for the Conference to have the kind of authority which the Communist bloc nations have been proposing and which many of the developing nations seem to have joined in urging. The Conference is a huge body meeting for 3 weeks once

each year. The largest number of delegates have never been in attendance before, and therefore, spend much of their time learning the structure of the operation. They have particular axes to grind concerning their country and their region and do not have a firm grasp of the overall purposes and possible accomplishments of the ILO. This group can be moved by emotional appeals and not have an opportunity to be thoroughly appraised of the ILO work. Many of them do not make the decisions themselves but must be in constant touch with their government at home as to the actions they should take. Therefore, we should constantly guard against a breakdown in the authority of the Director General and the governing body.

THE NEW ALLIANCE OF 75 DEVELOPING NATIONS

When I arrived at the ILO Conference, the first order of business on the opening day was the election of the president of the Conference. Due to the policy of rotation, it was Latin America's turn to select the man for president. They had chosen Mr. Aguilar, of Venezuela. The Communist bloc countries had made a deal with the Asians to support Mr. Raza of Pakistan this year in return for support for a Communist bloc president next year. It appeared that Africa was going to go along with the Asians, and Mr. Aguilar whom the West was supporting would be defeated. However, during the trade conference which had just completed its work when the ILO Conference convened, an alliance of 75 nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America was formed. This was the alliance of developing nations counteracting the views of the industrial nations.

You can see the probability of such an alliance in a trade conference. However, when the ILO Conference met, speakers referred to this alliance, and some of the Africans bemoaned the fact that they were seeing a breakdown in the spirit of the 75 in the first order of business in this Conference. In what appeared to me to be an unprecedented action, the African, Asian, and Latin American delegates asked to have the hall cleared. Delegates from all other nations and spectators were asked to leave.

In the session that ensued, the 75 met alone and agreed to support Mr. Aguilar, of Venezuela this year and Mr. Raza, of Pakistan next year. With 75 out of the 110 delegates, you can see the strength which these developing nations have. This surely did not appeal to the Communist bloc, and Mr. Borisov of the U.S.S.R. stood up immediately after this action was announced and stated that he wanted it to be known that no agreement such as this was acceptable to them.

The first action in the conference of the 75 was a success for the West. The group who most aggressively pursued the alliance within the Organization were the Africans. This was evidenced in the selection of officers of some of the committees of the Conference. I think this alliance should be watched closely. Undoubtedly, there will be more causes for a breakdown of such an alliance than there will be to hold it together. However, if the alliance should hold up and flourish, not only in the ILO but in other

organizations, even the United Nations itself, this could have a very important effect on international organizations, and it may be detrimental to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this pretty well covers my report on the actions as I viewed it in the short period of time I was at the Conference. The comments of the delegates from the United States will be on record as will the final results of this year's Conference after July 9.

I might point out in conclusion that just as in the United Nations, the United States pays the lion's share of the ILO—25 percent. We have been overgenerous not only in financial participation but in the few votes which we have. Russia is represented by Byelorussia, Ukraine, and the U.S.S.R. Byelorussia pays 0.45 percent of the ILO budget; Ukraine, 1 percent; and U.S.S.R., 10 percent; making a total of 11.45 percent, while the United States pays 25 percent. They have three sets of delegates and we only have one set. In other international organizations, as well as the ILO, I think we should have constant efforts to adjust the financial participation and voting participation of the United States to a more equitable basis.

PAN AMERICAN CELEBRATES ITS SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF TRANS-ATLANTIC SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, commercial air service across the Atlantic, inaugurated by Pan American Airways 25 years ago, observed its silver anniversary on June 28.

The departure of the silver anniversary flight from Pan Am's glistening umbrella-shaped terminal at John F. Kennedy International Airport, New York, was vastly different from the take-off of history's first flight of paying passengers across the Atlantic on June 28, 1939.

On that day, 5,000 spectators cheered and a brass band played as 22 passengers filed out on a yacht-type pier in Manhasset Bay at Port Washington, Long Island, N.Y., to board the *Dixie Clipper*, an appropriately named flying boat capable of the then considerable cruising speed of 150 miles per hour.

That plane, a Boeing 314, took 42 hours and 10 minutes to fly to Marseille via the Azores and Lisbon. It was in the air a total of 29 hours and 20 minutes.

The Boeing 707-321 fan-jet clipper, which operated the silver anniversary flight, cruises four times as fast and can carry as many as 161 passengers. In the same amount of time its predecessor required to reach Marseille, it was more than three-quarters of the way around the world.

Mr. Speaker, 42 hours and 10 minutes after taking off from New York, the Boeing jet clipper was two-thirds of the way from Tokyo to Honolulu, having stopped at London, Frankfurt, Vienna, Istanbul, Beirut, Karachi, Calcutta,

Rangoon, Bangkok, Hong Kong and Tokyo.

That pioneering venture of June 28, 1939 has grown into the world's most heavily traveled international tourism and trade route. The first flight was followed by twice-weekly Pan Am flights and at the end of 1939, Pan Am proudly announced that it had crossed the Atlantic 100 times. In the ensuing years the pace quickened, and on June 28, 1955, 16 years after the first flight, Pan Am crossed the Atlantic its 50,000th time. There were 1,175,000 passengers on those 50,000 flights.

In the next 7 years, the number of crossings and passengers leaped forward spectacularly. On July 2, 1962, Pan Am's 100,000th flight crossed the Atlantic and the airline announced that 3,590,000 passengers had flown on those 100,000 flights.

The second 50,000 flights were operated in half as many years and carried more than twice as many passengers as the first 50,000 flights.

And that growth continues, Mr. Speaker. The silver anniversary flight, one of Pan Am's two daily round-the-world flights, was the airline's 120,443d flight across the Atlantic. The number of Pan Am passengers across the Atlantic reached 4,900,000 by June 28, 1964. Pan Am now flies the Atlantic 222 times every week as part of its service to 114 cities in 86 lands around the world.

Behind these statistics is the story of the Pan Am people who helped realize the vision of the airline's founder and president, Juan T. Trippe, who foresaw aerial conquest of the oceans.

For every employee of Pan Am—mechanic, salesman, engineer, pilot, designer, stewardess—June 28 was a very significant date. And for one member of the crew of the silver anniversary flight, the date has added importance. Purser Kenlynn Williams Grism was born in Janesville, Wis., the day the *Dixie Clipper* made time fly.

Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I take great personal pride in congratulating Pan American on the anniversary of this historic event. Pan American's contributions as a pioneer in international air transportation have been so extensive that hardly a day goes by without the observance of one anniversary or another, of major or minor consequence. But, Mr. Speaker, when an air carrier has been flying the Atlantic Ocean for 25 years it is certainly an event which should be marked by all Members of this body.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the profiles in courage that engulf the airline industry are very great indeed. Pan American Airways began flying the Atlantic Ocean in 1939. This, and the jet era that ultimately followed, has been a most consequential period in the aviation history of the United States.

However, I like to think of Pan Am in its contributions to this Nation's supply line during World War II, the Korean airlift and the Berlin crisis. Many thousands of this airline's employees were unsung heroes during these periods of national concern. Whatever situation may face us, however soon, in regard to international logistics, I, and I am sure all Americans, take comfort in the proximity and dedication of Pan Am.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in celebrating the 25th anniversary of commercial air transport across the North Atlantic by Pan American Airways.

It is my objective, Mr. Speaker, not only to congratulate Pan American on this historic occasion, but to salute so many of my constituents who live in the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut and who work for this great international air carrier.

For example, Sam Pryor, of Greenwich, has been a vice president of Pan Am since 1941 and the history of his contributions to Pan Am and the United States is well known. The airport development program, by which many hundreds of airports were created for the allied cause during World War II all over the world, was a Pan American operation directed by Sam Pryor.

President Truman, Mr. Speaker, saw fit to bestow upon Sam Pryor the Medal of Merit for his contributions to the war effort. This is particularly significant considering that for a considerable period of time Mr. Pryor was Republican National committeeman from Connecticut and also vice chairman of the party.

From my home town, Norwalk, comes Roger B. Douless, an officer of Pan Am's in Washington. Roger was an outstanding athlete and newspaperman and creative writer in our district before joining the Armed Forces and rising from buck private to major in the Army Air Force on the staff, in China, of Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer.

There are many more, Mr. Speaker, including Norm Blake, a vice president of Pan American living in Greenwich; John S. Woodbridge, the company's comptroller and a resident of Darien.

Harley Mead, Don Thomson, Jim Fox, Vice President John Gates, Dick Smith, Paul Velte, Sam Kauffman, vice president of engineering; Ev Goulard, vice president of industrial relations; Bob Crassweller, Norman Seagrave, Bob Bell, Pete Cornwall, Clif Cooke, John Paine, George Politi, John Ogilvie, Spence Garrett, Paul Rennell, Russ Morey, Pete Haaren, Dick Blair, and Jack Lillis are only a few of the many Pan Am employees who reside and vote in my congressional district.

To them I extend a special message of congratulations on a continuing job well done.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi who is also the most distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics.

Pan American's history, insofar as the city of Baltimore is concerned, is of both old and recent vintage. In the early days of Pan Am many a flying boat departed from Baltimore headed for European ports. In recent years, Pan American's development of a Latin American market for the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland has been most successful. When Friendship actually became an international airport many years ago, Pan American was pioneering with direct service between Friendship and San Juan, Puerto Rico, and on to the important trade markets of the Caribbean and South American areas.

Ultimately, Pan American began service out of Friendship to London and Paris and beyond. Friendship International Airport is an interesting base of operations for most of our air carriers. It is unfortunate that Friendship does not enjoy the amount of service that the population and the enthusiasm of the community indicate.

Left to its own devices and resources, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Pan American could do more than is now being done to improve service from Friendship Airport and to keep its prestige intact. It goes without saying that I am a fierce proponent of Friendship Airport and a great believer in the system of free enterprise which has made the continuing development of Pan Am possible.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have known and respected numerous Pan American personnel, especially its great president, Mr. Juan T. Trippe, for many years. I think that perhaps our evaluation of Mr. Trippe in this colloquy has been all too modest. The creation of Pan American has been the result of the tremendous vision of one man plus the unqualified and devoted loyalty of many tens of thousands of employees. In Florida alone, at the present time, there are more than 7,000 Pan American employees and their families living in the Greater Miami area. They are proud of their company and we are proud of them. They have been with us a long time and I anticipate that they will remain for many years to come. On this occasion of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of Pan American's crossing of the Atlantic, I salute Mr. Trippe and his great corps of personnel who have contributed so much for nearly 40 years to the pre-

eminence in international air transport of the U.S. flag.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the accomplishments of Pan American over the past 37 years since inauguration of service from Key West in 1927. However, I have always been impressed with other manifestations of public service by its one and only president, Mr. Juan T. Trippe.

Many of our colleagues may not be aware, Mr. Speaker, that education is of consuming interest to Mr. Trippe. He has been, for a considerable period of time, a trustee of the Yale Corp. which guides the financial destinies of Yale University.

He is also a director of the National Fund for Medical Education and is a director of the Committee for Corporate Support of American Universities.

Mr. Trippe's contributions to the world of aviation are well known, Mr. Speaker; I think it important that his participation in the world of education be likewise illuminated.

THE IMF CREDIT TO NASSER: FURTHER COMMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 the International Monetary Fund announced a standby arrangement with the United Arab Republic authorizing drawings up to \$40 million for 1 year. The approval came in response to the evident efforts of the Egyptians to stabilize their economy.

The United Arab Republic reportedly has agreed to increase taxes on imports, increase social security taxes, and initiate a new tax on payments "for certain invisible transactions." All this, according to the Fund management, established the basis for Egypt's eligibility.

The fact that approval was given to the arrangement immediately after Khrushchev's lengthy visit, and immediately before the American visit of Israel's Prime Minister, should not blind us to the reality, that this transaction was negotiated over a period of months in accordance with normal IMF criteria and procedures.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that the conditions under which the grant was approved are extremely liberal. The United Arab Republic has been permitted to draw to the limit, under repeatedly revised prescriptions, and it is legitimate to question the basis for these transactions which inevitably must amount to an expressed confidence in the ability and purpose of the Egyptian Government.

At the beginning, there are certain specifics involving the mechanics of this standby credit which should be digested. The United Arab Republic requested that its IMF quota be increased from \$90 to \$120 million. Egypt had fully exhausted her drawing power under the \$90 million quota. This request was approved by the Board of Governors, after which, in the verbiage of the Fund, the Egyptian Government "expressed its consent" to the approval of its request.

The United Arab Republic, previous to its new quota, had drawn the full 200 percent allowable. This involved a drawing within its first credit tranche and a \$42.5 million standby arrangement, under which the entire amount was drawn in 1963. This latter arrangement was negotiated in accordance with the Egyptian Government's introduction of a "stabilization" plan.

The increase in the United Arab Republic quota to \$120 million automatically established eligibility for further loans. The recently announced \$40 million agreement, upon which Egypt can draw throughout the next 12 months, again represents the full 200 percent of her receiving power.

It is my understanding that this new arrangement is aimed at strengthening the Egyptian international payments position. It was tendered for foreign exchange purposes.

The credit extension was recommended by the management of the Fund following the usual analysis and review accorded all such requests.

Nonetheless, I am advised that there was considerable opposition to the agreement from both French and British quarters. Nor can we suppose that the strong American support for the loan was totally lacking in political motivation. It would be misleading to believe that a foreign economic policy is disconnected from political objectives, regardless of whether these objectives are bilaterally sought or channeled through an international organ.

This, of course, is no reflection upon the professional competence and integrity of the Fund's staff. They are a highly skilled group. The management applies its fiscal and economic criteria in the process of recommending action. It is, finally, the member governments who register approval or disapproval, and I cannot conceive of a government decision in this context, or any other, which does not blend with its general foreign policy perspectives. Any international being is, in the final analysis, a creature of the member states and accordingly reflects their often diverse wills.

In the matter of the recent \$40 million standby agreement, I cannot agree with the U.S. action in support of the arrangement. It does not seem to me that the Egyptian Government has genuinely established a groundwork which could warrant such a liberal credit extension.

I have said this before. The Nasser regime has been engaged in an awesome weapons procurement program which is consuming valuable foreign exchange. Moreover, there is no rational basis for this program; no state is willfully set

upon attacking the United Arab Republic. Colonel Nasser's arms buildup is the direct source of the instability in the Middle East, and as long as the United States permits the Egyptian Government by its action to divert large internal resources toward that buildup, the instability can only increase.

This is the basis for my judgment. An underdeveloped country is, I believe, eligible for bilateral and multilateral assistance if it demonstrates that it is genuinely and overwhelmingly committed to its own economic self-improvement. Many factors must be weighed in coming to this conclusion. I cannot believe that the Egyptian Government is justifying the American support which has been rendered.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for 30 minutes, on July 1; to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MONAGAN, for 30 minutes, July 1, 1964, vacating his special order of today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 60 minutes, on July 1.

Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 60 minutes, on July 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WHITE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan and to include tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. CAMERON.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 388. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1186. An act to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal Reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study;

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies;

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities, thereunder, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11376. An act to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 29, 1964:

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations;

H.R. 5514. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona;

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday;

H.R. 6920. An act to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions, the issuance of total disability income provisions for inclusion in national service life insurance policies to provide coverage to age 65;

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes;

H.R. 10000. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11499. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; and

H.J. Res. 1041. Joint resolution temporarily extending the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

On June 30, 1964:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study;

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; and

H.R. 10314. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities, thereunder, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 1, 1964, 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:

2237. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting supplementary report of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile, Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2238. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to encourage and facilitate details and transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2239. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to unnecessary costs to the Government in the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the Goodyear Aerospace Corp., Akron, Ohio, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2240. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of aircraft engine ring and vane assemblies from the Allison Division of General Motors Corp., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2241. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review relating to deficiencies in the administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile, Agency for the International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2242. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 88-115, the joint resolution of September 6, 1963, consenting to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2243. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to House Resolution 739, 87th Congress, dated August 20, 1962, relating to the decision in the *Glidden Co. v. Zdanok* (370 U.S. 530); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2244. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to House Resolution 797, 87th Congress, dated September 18, 1962, relating to the decision in *Glidden Co. v. Zdanok* (370 U.S. 530); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1006. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 11832. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research (Rept. No. 1526). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 789. Resolution to provide for the concurrence of the House of Representatives to the Senate amendment to H.R. 7152; without amendment (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 792. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 11832. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 11833. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 11834. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11835. A bill to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the computation factor used in the determination of annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act of employees engaged in criminal investigation and detention duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 11836. A bill to authorize the commissioning of a sculpture or other work, to be placed at the Capitol, representing the contribution of minority groups to America; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 11837. A bill to amend titles I, II, III of the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 11838. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protec-

tion to additional employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11839. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11840. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 11841. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 11842. A bill to provide for the designation of a national flower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 11843. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11844. A bill to require the establishment, on the basis of the 19th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11845. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of parts designed for use or chiefly used in agricultural or horticultural implements or in tractors suitable for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11846. A bill to amend the act of August 19, 1958, to permit purchase of processed food grain products in addition to purchase of flour and cornmeal and donating the same for certain domestic and foreign purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H.R. 11847. A bill to provide for the transfer of receipts of the Colorado River development fund to the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, commencing with fiscal year 1967 and as long thereafter as necessary to reimburse said basin fund for its contributions to Hoover Dam powerplant deficiencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 11848. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 11849. A bill to protect consumers by requiring that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part with imported meat bear a label showing the country of origin of such imported meat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11850. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require, as a condition of assistance thereunder, that a community have an effective minimum standards housing code and make certain expenditures for general code enforcement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11851. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11852. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that annuities awarded for disability under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11854. A bill to indemnify dairy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11855. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 1085. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 1086. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLOSKEY:

H.J. Res. 1087. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 1088. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.J. Res. 1089. Joint resolution prohibiting the Federal Trade Commission from promulgating or enforcing rules or regulations requiring the labeling of cigarettes with respect to their effect on human health until duly authorized by the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.J. Res. 1090. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.J. Res. 1091. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 1092. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 1093. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 1094. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 1095. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 1096. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 1097. Resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.J. Res. 1098. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.J. Res. 1099. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of \$250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 1100. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H. Res. 797. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Governor Scranton to intercede in behalf of the people of Pennsylvania in regard to the mushroom industry, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 11856. A bill for the relief of Napoleon and Panagiota Tsounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11857. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giovanni Borelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 11858. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schulz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11859. A bill for the relief of the children of Margaret Wint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H.R. 11860. A bill for the relief of Bianchina Franceschini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:
H.R. 11861. A bill for the relief of Arthur Noel John Pearman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:
H.R. 11862. A bill for the relief of John William Daugherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:
H.R. 11863. A bill for the relief of David A. Senior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:
H.R. 11864. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gerardo Pinto, Rosalia Reale Pinto and minor child, Miguel Antonio Pinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

947. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to

opposition to H.R. 11650, House Joint Resolution 1046 and House Joint Resolution 1047; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

948. Also, Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to take necessary steps to refer the southeast Asia affair to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

949. Also petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the action of the Supreme Court of the United States relative to the present structure of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congo Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of the Congo—Léopoldville—celebrates the fourth anniversary of her independence. We would like to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic, Joseph Kasavubu; and to the Congolese Chargé d'Affaires to the United States, Mario Cardoso.

The Republic of the Congo—Léopoldville—is situated in the heart of Africa. With only a small window on the Atlantic Ocean at the mouth of the Congo River, the country covers most of the Congo River basin, one of the great river systems of the continent. Its inland waterways are the main means of transportation in the country, although roads and railways are needed to circumvent its waterfalls and cataracts.

To the east, the Republic extends to the lakes of the Great Rift Valley: Lake Tanganyika, Lake Kivu, Lake Edward, and Lake Albert. Thus, its eastern area with its fairly temperate weather in the higher territory borders on East Africa and the headwaters of the Nile. This region is in contrast to the tropical rain forest which covers one half of the Republic's area. Lying in or near the equator, the air is tropically hot and humid and the land rich in tropical flora and fauna.

It was across East Africa from Zanzibar, Lake Victoria, and Lake Tanganyika that Henry Stanley made his historic trans-African trip in the mid-1870's that established the source of the Congo River. As he traveled up the Lualaba River and then down the Congo, this hardy explorer had to fight for practically every mile as he and his party struggled over the river's natural obstacles.

The Belgian king quickly sensed the economic possibilities of the Congo and took control of it. In 1908 the region became the Belgian Congo. After agitation in the late 1950's, Belgium agreed to grant the Congo its independence on

June 30, 1960. On September 20 of that year the Congo was admitted to the United Nations. Since that time the government has made valiant efforts to solve the problems that have faced the newly independent country. The United Nations has been of great assistance, as has our own Government.

The country is economically well endowed. Its mineral wealth, particularly in copper, diamonds, cobalt, and uranium, is already contributing greatly to the revenue of that country. It also has a great potential in hydroelectric power.

On its 4th anniversary, we salute the Republic of the Congo and wish it well for the future.

Corning Glass Donates to Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the success of our people-to-people programs overseas—particularly the great work carried on by Project Hope—is only possible with the support and cooperation of individual Americans and U.S. business and industrial concerns.

I was proud to learn that one of our Nation's leading glass manufacturing companies, Corning Glass, recently donated more than 70,000 individual pieces of laboratory glassware for use on the SS Hope hospital ship's forthcoming mission to Africa.

I am particularly proud because much of this laboratory glassware was manufactured in Corning's Muskogee, Okla., plant.

As an original supporter of Project Hope and similar people-to-people programs, I take this opportunity to congratulate and express my appreciation to the Corning Glass Works Foundation, and also to congratulate the many Muskogee employees of Corning who worked on this project.

The Corning donation is most significant and worthwhile. It will bring direct benefits to thousands in the form of improved health and sanitation, on the

troubled African Continent where communism is fighting daily to subvert and overthrow free governments.

The donation undoubtedly will bring long-range benefits to every citizen of the United States by helping to create a bond of friendship and understanding between the people of America and the emerging nations of Africa.

Every Muskogeean and every other Corning employee who worked on this project can be proud of the part they have played in exporting American know-how and friendship to the underdeveloped countries of the world. They have certainly earned a debt of gratitude for being responsible and worthwhile citizens, aware of the challenging nature of today's world and the burden of responsibility upon the people of our great Nation.

A Salute to a Great American—the Honorable Marvin Jones, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday night a reception was given by the members of the University Club here in honor of the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, the Honorable Marvin Jones, who recently announced his retirement.

A large crowd was in attendance, a dozen or so of them being Members of Congress. I was honored to be one of them.

A number of those present were introduced and made short talks voicing their high esteem for this great and good man. I was also among those.

It was my good fortune to serve in Congress with Marvin. I learned very soon to honor and respect him as a statesman of the highest order. Early in World War II, Marvin Jones was appointed by the President to be Food Administrator for War. He served in that very important assignment with great distinction and honor to himself and his country.