all employers with 25 workers in industries affecting commerce will be covered. The title establishes a five-member Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to be named by the President and confirmed by the Senate. No more than three members may belong to the same political party. The Commission would be empowered to investigate complaints and go to court in civil actions to halt or prevent unlawful employment practices. Before bringing court action, however, the Commission must first investigate and then seek to end the unlawful practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. The Commission is authorized to make agreements ceding jurisdiction to State fair employment practices commissions, such as that in California and 24 other States.

Title VII is perhaps the most important section of the bill when viewed from the strong desire of 20 million Negroes to build, through their own efforts, a more secure place in American society. Statistics which show that they are being denied their right to the pursuit of happiness are impressive: The Negro unemployment rate is twice as high as the rate for whites. Negro earnings are slightly more than half as high. Many of the better jobs are closed to Negroes altogether. Across the Nation they are victims of the last-hired, first-fired doctrine. Thus their potential contribution to American society remains unfulfilled. They contribute less to production and, therefore, have less to give toward consumption. Negroes cost society more in unemployment and welfare benefits than they would if there were no color barriers to jobs. Many opponents of the civil rights bill declare "Negroes should work to improve their economic condition." Title VII will go a long way toward giving them this opportunity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Ecclesiastes 12: 13: *Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.*

Eternal God, our Father, help us to appreciate more fully how sacred and wonderful is the privilege we have of engaging in a moment of prayer and yielding our minds to a mind that is infinitely wiser than our own to be instructed and guided.

We rejoice that in this quiet Lenten of prayer and meditation we may hold fellowship with a heart that is filled with love and mercy toward all the members of the human family who at times are so lonely and disquieted.

Endow us during these troubled and restless days with calm and courageous hearts and inspire us to cultivate and keep alive our faith in Thee and in the moral and spiritual values without which we have no standards and no stability, no peace and joy.

Grant that we may be eager to follow Thy ways and obey Thy will and live righteously and honestly, believing that this is Thy divine order for the universe in which we live and move and have our being.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space of the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM N. McLEOD, JR.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the information that William N. McLeod, Jr., a former clerk of the House District Committee, received $2,500 in gifts as a result of his employment by that committee, should be of serious concern.

McLeod first stated he was paid $1,500 by Don B. Reynolds, Maryland insurance broker, for legal services in connection with passage of a bill authorizing construction of the District of Columbia Stadium. Reynolds denied McLeod had performed any legal service, and McLeod then said the money was a gift.

The Washington Metropolitan Police Relief Association admits payment of $1,000 to McLeod for his "courtesies" to the association while an employee of the House District Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it has been said this sort of gift giving is "not unusual," I urge the House Administration Committee to launch an investigation of the activities of this former employee of the House of Representatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, today we have, of course, the military authorization bill.

That will be followed by a resolution providing for an official picture of the House of Representatives.

On tomorrow, under consent previously granted, George Washington's Farewell Address will be read.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, and there will be called up for consideration H.R. 9419, regulation of business of selling securities.

On Tuesday the conference report, H.R. 8363, Revenue Act of 1964, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday, H.R. 8316, lack of authority of FCC to make rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast commercials, will be called up for consideration.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 5838, amending the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards, will be considered.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I make a further inquiry of the gentleman? A number of Members have expressed some concern as to how quickly on Tuesday the conference report on the Revenue Act may be called up. Do I understand correctly there will be a beginning made on the International Development Association bill?

Mr. ALBERT. At the present time that is the plan.

Mr. HALLECK. And the conference report will come up sometime along in the middle of the afternoon?

Mr. ALBERT. I would think it would not be earlier than 2 o'clock, although I do not want to be held to that. It is planned to take up the rule on the International Development Association Act first.

May I advise the gentleman that today when the legislative program has been completed, I shall ask unanimous consent to adjourn from tomorrow until Monday, and also to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 631, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move 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. 9637) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 631 provides for consideration of H.R. 9637, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate.

H.R. 9637 provides authorization in the amount of $16,914,800,000 for defense programs for fiscal year 1965, which amount includes $2,061,200,000 for the Army, $5,823,600,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps, and $8,533 million for the Air Force.

The bill authorizes over 2,700 aircraft and about 35,000 missiles for all the three military services and 53 new ships for the Navy. The bill also authorizes the conversion of seven ships.

It is appropriate to note that the Army will procure 1,282 aircraft this year which is 234 less than authorized for fiscal year 1964.

In the case of the Navy and Marine Corps, the number of aircraft authorized for fiscal year 1964 was 670 while this year 584 are requested—which is 86 less.

For the Air Force, the number of aircraft being requested is 889 which is 23 less than authorized last year.

This is 343 aircraft less than was authorized last year for all three services.

The Army is requesting 13,998 missiles this year as against 28,196 authorized last year.

The Navy is requesting 9,914 as against 14,705 authorized last year.

The Marine Corps is requesting 1,505 as against 400 authorized last year.

The Air Force is requesting 9,795 as against 16,560 authorized last year.

All in all, this is 24,649 missiles less than the number authorized last year. The reason for this is, of course, the large missile buys of last year and the year before. We are approaching our total requirements.

In the case of ships, this year's program covers 53 new ships and 7 conversions of which 38 of the new ships are combatant ships and 1 of the conversions is a combatant ship.

Last year's authorization was for 31 new ships and 35 conversions. Of those new ships, 27 were combatant and of last year's conversions, 26 were combatant.

The large procurement programs of the last several years, particularly in the field of missiles, permits a lower level of procurement for fiscal year 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 631.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as has already been stated, makes in order consideration of the bill, H.R. 9637. This is probably one of the most important bills to come before the House and it is also probably one of the least controversial bills. It authorizes appropriations during the fiscal year of 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes.

The Committee on Armed Services has brought this bill out after most careful consideration, as we all know. It has been considered in the subcommittee. It has been worked over in that committee and then again in the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a highly technical bill. It is a bill really that no one can judge unless they sat in on all of the hearings and unless they had heard all of the discussions.

It is to be noted that the fiscal year 1965 request for new obligational authority for the entire Department of Defense totaled $50,880 million. Of this amount $17,185,300,000 was requested by the executive branch for authorization under the provisions of section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, as amended. The committee modified the original request by deleting $270,500,000. So that the new net total in H.R. 9637 is $16,914,800,000—or close to $17 billion.

The committee, however, did cut, and there would have been a further reduction of $92 million more, but the committee in its wisdom felt it was necessary, and to fulfill their responsibility, to continue the building of the manned bombers which will not, incidentally, be ready for use, as I understand it, until 1970—and some say not until 1972. It seems to me this is a question that has been solved by the committee. I doubt very much if anything we say or do here will be of much importance. I am quite sure the chairman has expressed it aptly when he said "we should not have all our eggs in one basket." That is a very true and old-time saying. There is another saying very much like it and that is, "It is better to be sure than sorry." I fear very much if we do not do what is recommended in this legislation and what has been passed by the Committee on Armed Services, we may in time rue the day.

For this reason, I feel sure the House in its wisdom will as usual back the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no possible objection to the rule. I feel that the 3 hours of general debate can give us a clear picture, that is, as clear as we could get, on such an important subject.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] 5 minutes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the House is today considering legislation authorizing research and development funds for the military. I feel that it is appropriate to address the House on this subject and on another aspect of military life.

I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague, good friend, and chairman, the honorable CARL VINSON, for the speed, effort, and precision with which he cleared H.R. 9637 through the Armed Services Committee and to the House floor. It was "leadership and generalship" at its best. He set a grueling pace for those of us who are privileged to be members of his committee. He started hearings at 9:30 in the morning, and ran them until 7:30 and 8 o'clock in the evening.

It is my prayer that when I reach the age of 80 years, I too can set as fast a pace, and stay with it, as the gentleman from Georgia. The Congress is indeed fortunate to have the services of a man with 50 years of continuous experience in the demanding field of military legislation, such as CARL VINSON. This Nation will feel a great loss if he follows his announced plans to retire at the end of this Congress.

Before President Johnson announced the appointment of Stan Musial as his adviser on physical fitness, I heard several members suggest that the chairman was the most obvious candidate for the job, and from the committee schedule, it appeared that he was only exercising his muscles. My hat is off to the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. He is truly an outstanding gentleman, legislator, and statesman.

Gentlemen, at Fort Benning, Ga., the infantry division has a statue of the Army's ultimate weapon. It is a statue of an infantryman. The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral McDonald, in January, told the Armed Services Committee that "people" are the Navy's most priceless asset. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, has repeatedly stated that he considers "people" the Air Force's most valuable asset. This Congress has recognized this fact by passing the largest military pay increase in the last decade. Today the House considers a bill for the machines the military needs and will need to maintain the defenses of this country. With such items as new manned bombers, which I have long advocated, we are keeping our military hardware up to date and ready. But

machines are only as good as the men who operate them.

Last week the House passed the most far reaching civil rights bill in history. Today I rise to report on legislation aimed at protecting the civil rights of another major segment of our society—the members of the military forces of the United States.

I want to see the rights of "our first line of defense" protected every bit as much as the civil rights our civilian society enjoys. We know and appreciate the importance of morale in our Armed Forces. We have taken cognizance of this fact in passing legislation concerning pay and better housing for the military personnel. Now, let us not forget another major aspect of their lives—justice and equality before the law.

I am very pleased to report to you that the Department of Defense has favorably reported on 6 of the 18 bills I introduced on September 25, 1963, designed to bring additional protection and justice to the millions of men and women in uniform. These six bills, which the Defense Department has favorably reported, have also been accepted by the Bureau of the Budget. The Defense Department suggests that H.R. 8567, H.R. 8576, and H.R. 8577 be combined into one bill. On H.R. 8571 the Department suggested certain amendments, which I have incorporated in a new bill. In reporting on H.R. 8574 and H.R. 8579, the Defense Department suggested they be combined into one bill, also.

I wish to thank the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget for their valuable assistance with these bills.

I have today introduced three bills as substitutes for the six bills now under consideration. The first bill is offered as a substitute for H.R. 8567, H.R. 8576, and H.R. 8577. The second bill introduced today is a substitute for H.R. 8571 to include only those provisions that meet with Defense Department approval. The third bill introduced today is a substitute for H.R. 8574 and H.R. 8579.

In reporting on H.R. 8567, which would amend chapter 47, title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section to provide that the law officers of a general court-martial may conduct a pretrial conference, with counsel for both sides, the accused, and a reporter present. The Department and the Bureau of the Budget observed that such procedure is desirable as an aid in affording the accused a speedy trial. Also, it results in savings in money and man-hours.

The Department and the Bureau of the Budget pointed out that use of this pretrial procedure would improve greatly the administration of military justice. It would eliminate the numerous delays now encountered after the convening of a court-martial.

The Department's report on H.R. 8576, which is primarily concerned with the one-officer court and the right to waive trial by court-martial in favor of judgment by the law officer, points out that the Department of Defense supports the concept of a one-officer court, noting that such a procedure has long been recognized in Federal district courts where the accused may waive trial by jury. Adoption of this concept for use in the Armed Forces would improve the administration of military justice and would save money and man-hours, the Department advised.

I am delighted that these provisions of H.R. 8567 and H.R. 8576, which received such high praise from the Department of Defense and approval by the Bureau of the Budget, are included in the first bill I introduced today.

With the passage of this substitute bill for H.R. 8567, H.R. 8576, and H.R. 8577, the duties and responsibilities of the "law officer" in a military court-martial become more like those of a judge in the Federal district courts; thus, the second bill I have introduced today, as a substitute for H.R. 8571, will change the name from "law officer" to "military judge," and should be of great value to everyone in understanding the scope of this position and the powers and duties of this office. While some might consider it only a technical matter, it will certainly make the court-martial procedure more understandable to everyone.

The third bill I introduced today, which was worked out as a substitute for H.R. 8574 and H.R. 8579 with the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, amends chapter 47—Uniform Code of Military Justice—of title 10, United States Code, section 869, article 69, by authorizing the Judge Advocate General to either vacate or modify the findings or sentence or both, in whole or in part, in any court-martial which has been finally reviewed, but which has not been reviewed by a board of review, because of newly discovered evidence, fraud on the court, lack of jurisdiction over the accused or the offense, or error prejudicial to the substantial rights of the accused.

The Defense Department has pointed out that it has been the experience of all the services in this class of cases, particularly with respect to summary court-martial cases and those special court-martial cases not reviewable by a board of review, that some provision should be made for removing the fact of conviction, as well as granting other relief. This amendment would not limit the power now possessed by the Secretary concerned, acting through boards established by public law to correct an error or remove an injustice.

This bill will extend the time within which an accused may petition the Judge Advocate General for a new trial from 1 to 2 years.

I also feel it is my responsibility to report to you that the Department of Defense and this Oklahoma Congressman are not in agreement on H.R. 8578, a bill to further insure the fair and independent review of court-martial cases by prohibiting any member of a board of review from rating the effectiveness of another member of a board of review.

The hearings held by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in February and March, 1962, revealed that in Army and Air Force Boards of Review, the chairman of the board rated the efficiency of the members of the board and that these ratings helped determine future promotions and assignments of the board members. Naturally, this practice does not promote the independence of the board members in cases where they disagree with the chairman. Shortly after the Senate subcommittee hearings, the Army discontinued this practice, but the Air Force has retained its rating system. Because such rating systems threaten the fairness of the appellate review of court-martials, including review of serious issues involving constitutional rights, it should be prohibited. I shall make my disagreement with the Department's report on H.R. 8578 known to the Armed Services Committee chairman, and shall hope for a full hearing before a subcommittee in order to give this measure the fullest possible consideration.

The Defense Department's report on H.R. 8570, a bill to improve the structure and designation of boards of review, does not favor its passage because they feel it would undermine the prestige of the military lawyer inasmuch as the bill would provide that the presiding officer of the appellate court be a civilian. They also disagree because it sets a tenure of office for the military personnel assigned to these boards.

I cannot agree with the Department's report. The highest position a member of the military service can attain is not a job description, but the number of stars he may wear on his shoulders. The introduction of highly qualified civilian judges in the appellate system of military law assures us of continued civilian control of the military, which I feel is the very backbone of this democracy.

As for the Department's complaint on the bill establishing a tenure of office for those military officers assigned to such duties, I find myself in complete agreement with Chairman VINSON'S principles when he introduced a bill establishing the tenure of office for members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This tenure in the justice field will permit free and independent judgment of all cases, without the military board members having to fear being withdrawn from the assigned duty and shipped by a slow boat to Vietnam.

I shall, of course, make my views on H.R. 8570 known to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and seek a hearing in order to give full consideration to this most deserving piece of legislation. The Department's report on H.R. 8578, a bill to insure due process in the administration of military justice in the Department of the Navy by establishment of a Judge Advocate General's Corps in such Department, seems to be in agreement with the purpose of the bill, but complains that it will require additional "admirals" to get it done. I shall withhold comment on this report at this time, but with the full understanding that I shall comment on it at a later date, and perhaps we can, in the name of justice of all naval personnel, even locate a few additional "unused admirals" for the Department of the Navy.

Thus, gentlemen of the Congress, I am happy to report a high batting average on the military justice bills that were introduced on September 25, 1963. The Department of Defense has reported on 9 of the 18 bills. I shall seek additional information from the Defense Secretary

on why reports have not been filed on the remaining nine bills, which are as follows:

H.R. 8565, a bill to insure due process in the case of certain administrative actions involving military personnel.

H.R. 8566, a bill to broaden the constitutional protection against double jeopardy in the case of military personnel.

H.R. 8568, a bill to provide additional constitutional protection in certain cases to members of the Armed Forces.

H.R. 8569, a bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by insuring their rights to be represented by qualified counsel in certain cases.

H.R. 8572, a bill to implement the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing appellate review of certain administrative board decisions.

H.R. 8573, a bill to insure the military personnel certain basic constitutional rights by prohibiting command influence in court-martial cases and in certain nonjudicial proceedings.

H.R. 8580, a bill to amend chapter 47—Uniform Code of Military Justice—so as to assure the constitutional rights of confrontation and compulsory process by providing for mandatory appearance of witnesses and the production of evidence before certain boards and officers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8582, a bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who are charged with having committed certain offenses while subject to trial by court-martial, who have not been tried for such offenses, and who are no longer subject to trial by court-martial.

H.R. 8581, a bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who, while accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States, commit certain offenses against the United States.

The entire area of administrative boards and the separation of military personnel by these boards cannot be considered by the House Armed Services Committee until seven of the remaining nine bills have been reported by the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget to the committee chairman. It is in this area that kangaroo courts are made official. This is the area of military justice that disgraces our whole concept of fair play and equal rights. These seven bills can do away with the legal front these administrative boards have maintained.

Gentlemen, last week this House passed the civil rights bill, which its strongest supporters claimed would bring justice to the Negro population of this Nation. The enforcement of that civil rights bill, if it should become a public law, can well rest in the hands of the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States. In all good conscience, can you expect our service people to enforce the civil rights law, when the military law covering their own lives is not just and fair? Some of you will remember the closing line of my speech on September 25, 1963, when I introduced these 18 military justice bills. It carries even more meaning today than it did some 5 months ago. Thus, I repeat, "Justice might wear a blindfold, gentlemen, but let us never forget she also carries a sword."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. 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. 38]

Abele	Diggs	Martin, Mass.
Adair	Dorn	May
Ashmore	Dowdy	Meader
Ayres	Elliott	Miller, Calif.
Bass	Finnegan	Miller, N.Y.
Battin	Flynt	Montoya
Berry	Forrester	Morris
Blatnik	Fulton, Tenn.	Murray
Bolton, Frances P.	Gill	O'Brien, Ill.
	Goodell	O'Konski
Broomfield	Grant	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Randall
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Ind.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bruce	Hawkins	Riehlman
Buckley	Hoffman	Roberts, Ala.
Burkhalter	Horan	Roybal
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	St. Onge
Casey	Kee	Secrest
Cederberg	Kelly	Senner
Celler	Kluczynski	Short
Collier	Leggett	Smith, Calif.
Colmer	Lesinski	Teague, Tex.
Corman	Lloyd	Tupper
Cramer	McClory	Udall
Curtis	Macdonald	Younger
Davis, Tenn.	Madden	
Dent	Mailliard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 350 Members have responded to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. VINSON. 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. 9637) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9637, with Mr. DONOHUE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will be recognized 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 9637, is the annual authorization bill for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. It also covers research and development for those items and, for the first time this year, all other research and development.

It is the largest authorization bill ever to be presented to the House. But at the same time, the program it represents is smaller than it was last year. This is easily explained by the fact that the bill covers more territory this year than last year. But it does not involve any new elements. It is just that last year some of the things that now require authorization did not require authorization at that time.

The bill totals $16,914,800,000, and I am going to go into some detail as to just what makes up this total. First, however, let me refer to the law which makes this authorization bill necessary.

Back in 1959, we passed Public Law 86–149. Section 412(b) of that law required that there be congressional authorizations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

In 1962, this law was modified to require similar authorization for the research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations associated with aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

Last year, we passed Public Law 88–174 and modified the basic law once more so as to require that appropriations for all research and development be authorized.

The law today, therefore, reads as follows:

SEC. 610. Section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any Armed Force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1962, to or for the use of any Armed Force of the United States for the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1963, to or for the use of any Armed Force of the United States for any research, development, test, or evaluation, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates."

I am going to deal in these remarks with economies that have been effected within the Department of Defense, and I will make reference to the fact that this year's bill shows a decline in almost all areas of procurement. Therefore, I want to draw your particular attention to the fact that if the newly added jurisdiction which I have referred to were not considered, the bill this year would be actually less than the bill last year—about $1.3 billion in the field of procurement alone, or $1.6 billion if both procurement and research were considered.

You should not think for one moment, however, that the fact that this bill is smaller than last year—and that the number of items that we are procuring

is less than last year—has in any way diminished our military strength.

Simply stated, we are reaching a point in several areas, principally missiles, where we are coming up pretty close to our total needs. And we simply do not need to buy as many of the items as we did before. As a matter of fact, we are stronger in our defense today than we have ever been in any peacetime period before.

We have got the best peacetime Army that we have ever had—the strongest Air Force—and our Navy is more powerful than all of the other navies of the world combined. So there need be no fear on that score.

Now, I am going to tell you what this bill will do.

In the area of procurement of aircraft, the Departments will receive the following amounts:

For the Army, $443,600,000 for 1,282 aircraft.

For the Navy and Marine Corps, $1,854,900,000 for 584 aircraft.

For the Air Force, $3,663 million for 889 aircraft.

This is a total of 2,755 aircraft in the bill.

You will see all of these aircraft described on pages 7, 11, and 19 of the committee report.

In the area of missile procurement, the Departments will receive the following amounts:

For the Army, $282,600,000 for 13,998 missiles.

For the Navy, $660,100,000 for 9,914 missiles.

For the Marine Corps, $13,100,000 for 1,505 missiles.

For the Air Force, $1,730 million for 9,795 missiles.

This is a total of 35,212 missiles in the bill.

There is a description of all these missiles on pages 8, 13, and 20 of the committee report.

The Navy will get 53 new ships and 7 conversions at a cost of $1,966 million. Thirty-eight of these new ships and one of the conversions are combatant-type vessels.

Starting on page 14 of the report, you will find all of these naval vessels described and the estimated cost of each one stated.

Now, that is a total of $10,613,300,000 for all of the procurement in the bill. Last year, for these same items, we authorized $11,915,200,000. Against this $11.9 billion in authorizations, appropriations were granted in the amount of $11.4 billion. This is only about a 4-percent difference.

Specifically, there are 343 less aircraft in the bill this year than there were last year.

There are 24,649 less missiles this year than last year.

As for ships, last year's bill had a total of 66 new ships and conversions while this year's bill has only 60 ships and conversions. This year's bill is $193 million less than last year's authorization for ships.

Now, for "Research and development."

The bill requests authority for $6,301,500,000. I want to point out that this is $270,500,000 less than requested by the Department. This reduction in research and development, and this was the only place in the bill that the committee made any reductions, would have been $362.5 million but for the fact that the committee added $92 million to this portion of the bill for research and development associated with the follow-on bomber and the improved manned interceptor. I will go into this matter in more detail a little later on.

It is always a matter of interest to see the direction in which we are going in legislation which involves sums as large as there are in this bill. I am, therefore, going to briefly compare this year's bill with last year's bill, and you will immediately see that the trend is now downward.

On page 3 of the report which is before you, you will see a table entitled "Progress of the Program." It has five columns. The first column shows the authorization last year and the fifth, or last column, shows the authorization in the bill this year as reported by the committee.

You will note that, for example, Army aircraft procurement has gone down by $60 million—and Army missile procurement for this year is only about one-half of what it was last year. This is also true of Navy missiles. Substantial reductions are also apparent in Air Force aircraft and naval vessels and the authorization for naval vessels has gone down by $193,600,000.

In the field of research and development associated with aircraft, missiles and naval vessels—the decrease is $442 million from last year. Part of this particular difference is a smaller request than last year and another part of it consists of reductions made by the committee.

So, here is the whole bill in a nutshell:

The grand total of the bill for procurement and research and development is $16,914,800,000.

The Army gets $2,061,200,000.

The Navy and Marine Corps get $5,823,600,000.

The Air Force gets $8,533 million.

And the defense agencies get $497,200,000.

The bill will authorize 2,755 aircraft for all services and 35,212 missiles for all services.

And the Navy will get 53 new ships of which 38 are combatant and 7 conversions of which 1 is a combatant type.

And as I have said, in almost every area the bill has gone down from last year. I want to stress the fact that the decreases noted above do not in any way weaken our defense, and I have told you why this is so.

PERSONNEL

At the end of fiscal year 1965, the total active duty military is planned to be 2,680,721. This will be about 6,100 less than the number planned for the end of this fiscal year, that is, June 30, 1964.

Air Force strength will decline somewhat primarily as a result of the phaseout of the B–47 bomber. Navy strength will increase somewhat as additional Polaris submarines are commissioned. The Army and the Marine Corps will continue at about their present levels.

The actual personnel strengths at the end of fiscal 1965 will be about as follows:

Army	973,999
Navy	677,896
Marine Corps	190,060
Air Force	838,766

ARMY DIVISIONS

The Army will continue to have 16 combat divisions and will continue to test an Experimental Air Assault Division at Fort Benning, Ga.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

We have about 1,300 strategic bombers today:

600	B–47
630	B–52
80	B–58

This 1,300 will decline to about 935 by June 1965 through deactivation of all but five B–47 wings.

NAVAL VESSELS

On June 30, 1964, the Navy will have an active fleet of 873 ships of which 656 will be combat types; and on June 30, 1965, there will be an active fleet of 883 ships, or 10 more than on June 30, 1964.

POLARIS

The last six of the planned fleet of 41 Polaris submarines were in last year's bill. The entire force of 41 submarines and 656 missiles can be deployed by the end of fiscal year 1967.

The first 5 of these submarines will have the 1,200-mile missile. The 6th through the 18th will have the 1,500-mile missile and the 19th through the 41st, with the 2,500-mile missile.

Today there are 16 Polaris submarines—each with 16 missiles—ready for sea duty. And 11 of them are actually deployed right now.

ICBM'S

Today there are about 554 intercontinental ballistic missiles in place and ready to go. They are divided up as follows:

Atlas	126
Titan I	54
Titan II	54
Minuteman	320

Within a couple of months, there will be another 130 Minutemans in place.

Only the Minuteman has solid fuel. The Atlas and Titan have liquid fuel. And the time will come in the future when we will have only Minuteman missiles. They will be improved from time to time.

By 1965, we will have 1,184 ICBM's made up of Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman.

I should point out that all of the Minuteman missiles are in hardened sites and are safe from any kind of attack except for a direct hit. They are also dispersed not only throughout the country but also widely dispersed in the individual locations.

Mr. Chairman, the committee did something a little bit unusual this year in that it inserted in the report a portion of the statement delivered to the committee by the Secretary of Defense. This section begins on page 41 of the

report and is headed "Excerpt from Secretary of Defense Statement." It is preceded by a section of the report designated as "Decrease in Budget—Increase in Savings."

I hope that every member of the committee has already read these two sections and if he has not, I certainly hope he will because it provides truly substantial grounds for encouragement in the field of expenditures for our defense.

I will mention only a few highlights but I certainly do recommend these portions of the report to every member of the committee and, indeed, to every Member of the House—and to the public.

In the first place, the total requests by the Departments came to almost $61 billion. But the budget, as approved and presented to the Congress, is over $10 billion less than this.

I hope you will not mind my making a somewhat prideful reference to the fact that virtually every step taken by the Secretary of Defense in reducing expenditures follows a course laid out by the Armed Services Committee in its reports over the past 12 years. No one, however, has been able to take the actions recommended by the committee to anything like the extent that Mr. McNamara has been able to do.

As a matter of fact, Mr. McNamara in his testimony conceded this debt when he said:

> I obtained a lot of the ideas that we have outlined here from the reports of this committee and from, I should say, the reports of the Comptroller General.

Some typical examples given by Mr. McNamara of savings effected appear on pages 43 and 44. Again on page 46 is a table showing savings that were gained through competitive as distinguished from noncompetitive buying. The first two items, for example, on the table shows that the price was more than halved through competitive procurement.

And let me draw your attention to page 53 of the report under "Cost Reduction Goals." Here the report sets out the goals set by Mr. McNamara for each of the Departments and as you can see in the table, every Department exceeded the goal assigned to it for fiscal year 1963 and the same will be true of fiscal year 1964. And I personally believe they will be exceeded again for fiscal year 1965.

I think you will all agree that Mr. McNamara has done a magnificent job and should be congratulated for the way he is running the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to refer to the $92 million added by the committee to the Air Force R. & D. section of the bill. This is made up of $52 million for a follow-on bomber and $40 million for an improved manned interceptor. I shall refer to them as the bomber and the interceptor.

The first thing I would like to say is that this bomber has nothing whatsoever to do with the XB–70. As the Committee recalls, the original plan of the XB–70 was for three airplanes. We were advised by General LeMay that he is recommending the cancellation of the third airplane but that they are going forward with the developing and testing of the first two, including certain instrumentation and testing requested by the Federal Aviation Agency to assist in the development of the supersonic transport—SST.

This is the situation: The last B–52 and the last B–58 were delivered to the Air Force in October of 1962. SAC bomber strength will drop from about 1,300 today to 935 by June 1965 through deactivation of all but five B–47 wings. These 935 bombers are made up of:

225	B–47
630	B–52
80	B–58

There is no bomber anywhere near production. In fact, there is no bomber even designed at this time, and as you all know, design to delivery on a complicated bomber is some 6 to 8 years.

Now, our B–52's and B–58's are going to last for a good while. But the time is going to come when there will be no bombers if we do not get started on a bomber today. The B–52's and B–58's will simply wear out. And should this happen, we will be in the position of depending entirely on missiles, a thing that none of us wants to do.

The Department of Defense is thinking about a bomber but there does not seem to be much push behind designing one and getting one up to the point where it could be produced. In the minds of the committee, there just is not enough sense of urgency involved here. And we are trying to create that sense of urgency by putting $52 million in the bill so as to indicate that it is the committee's view, and we think it will be the view of the whole House that we should step along this road faster than we are today.

Now, I want it clearly understood that these additions by the committee are not just an expression of the committee's views. We did not start this whole thing. Solid testimony was given to the committee by General LeMay, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, clearly indicating the urgency of starting out on a follow-on bomber and a new interceptor.

Simple logic—not technical information—tells anybody that if it takes 6 to 8 years from drawing board to runway for an airplane, and if you know that your present bombers will not do the job 6 to 8 years from now, you had better get started on some new airplanes now.

I believe what General LeMay says.

Now, that is a simple explanation of that particular addition to the bill.

Now, let me say a word about the interceptor.

I do not know how many years we have been talking about a new interceptor. Apparently everybody agrees that we need one, but nothing very much has been done about obtaining one.

There can be no doubt that we have some of the finest airplanes in the world today in our Air Force and Navy. And we know that the TFX is coming along and will do a fine job. But the plane I am talking about—the interceptor—must have very special characteristics. Very special in the way of radar; that is, its ability to see very far in front of it and from a great altitude down to the ground—a much greater capability in those areas than any other plane in the world possesses today.

The reason we need this interceptor, stated in the simplest of terms, is this: You all know that we have on our B–52 bombers a missile called the Hound Dog. This is a missile which is launched by the B–52 at a great distance from its intended target. The missile proceeds to its target and the bomber, if such is the plan, need not proceed anywhere near that particular target.

Now, the Soviet Union also has missiles somewhat like the Hound Dog. And the job of the new interceptor would be to knock the Russian bomber from the skies before it got within range of a target within the United States at which it could launch its missile.

Now, there is much more to be said about both of these airplanes but if we go very much further than what I have said, we get into classified areas.

Now, as to the bill as a whole, let me say this: There is nothing new about it. It is the same annual authorization bill that you have seen for the past several years. The only thing that is at all different about it is the fact that it now contains authorization for research and development which is not connected with aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

The committee became aware of the tremendous interest that had been generated in the research and development programs being carried on by the Government. Very, very large sums are spent each year in this field, not only by the Department of Defense, but by almost all agencies of the Government. The reason for this, of course, is quite simple: We are living in an age of much more than technological advance—it is more an age of technological explosion.

This being so, we have no choice but to progress as the state of the various arts permits us to progress and, in the area of defense, we are not seeking things that are better, merely because they are better—but because our national survival will depend upon them being better.

A better strain of corn, a better breed of cattle is a good thing to have. But we could live without them. And research and development in those areas, while important, are probably not absolutely essential.

In the area of defense, however, second best is simply not good enough. We must make every effort to keep well ahead of the enemy in our aircraft and missiles and naval vessels. We are not talking about luxury here. We are talking about sheer, stark necessity.

So, as I say, the bill is, in essence, just more of the same with only the slight difference that the committee has taken cognizance of the area of research and development which has always been going on but which we are authorizing this year for the first time.

I would like to make particular note of the outstanding work which has been performed for the committee by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. He is chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee and has as his right-hand man on the minority side the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will have some remarks to make

on the subject of research and development and I commend his statement to all of you because he is our expert in the field of research and development. We all owe him a debt.

Mr. Chairman, there is the bill and this is my statement. I will ask no more of the House than has been given by it freely and wholeheartedly in the past: an overwhelming vote in favor of this most important defense legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield to me?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I can well understand the gentleman from Georgia in his concern about the time period of 1970–75. This is indeed a very important time period as we look down the road on our military preparedness program for those years. I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, however, with the reductions in the R.D.T. & E. authorizations. I realize the chairman of the committee and the Committee on Armed Services have a legitimate concern for the bomber and the interceptor aircraft development during the time period 1970–75. Just as important however as these weapons systems are our ASW efforts and many of these other systems under study in research and development. The committee has cut these other programs. It takes from 4 to 7 years to move a new system from the start of R.D.T. & E. efforts to use by our forces.

Mr. VINSON. Of course it is.

Mr. LAIRD. It seems to me rather than decrease research and development funds, that during the next few years we should be increasing them. I am not as concerned about procurement funds during the time period up until 1969. We do not have any new major weapons systems in development and we need these systems in the 1970–75 time period. R.D.T. & E. is the important area in this year's budget, and I do not believe it is being given proper consideration by your committee recommendations.

Mr. VINSON. I want to thank the gentleman. Because of what he says I am glad that he finds himself in agreement with an amendment that the committee put in to provide $92 million.

Mr. LAIRD. On the increase I do, but this is a reduction in funds of $500 million compared with the 1964 spending level in research, tests and evaluation, and for the time period of 1970–75 this is the year that we have to be making those expenditures if we are going to develop new systems, whether they are offensive or defensive.

Mr. VINSON. That is the reason why, after we took the testimony of General LeMay, we wrote this amendment in.

Mr. LAIRD. I agree with the gentleman as to the strength of this country during the next 4 years, but I am concerned about it for the period between 1970 and 1975.

Mr. VINSON. I will have more to say about this matter later on.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I wholly support this bill. The chairman of the committee has described the bill in very considerable detail and I will not burden you with repetition of facts and figures. I would, however, like to express to the House some deep concerns which I have felt for a long time and have, on more than one occasion in the past, presented to the House when considering legislation of this kind.

I suppose that it is correct to say that again the Armed Services Committee comes before the House to continue what some may feel to be a useless fight for the retention of manned weapons systems in our military arsenal.

The nature and extent of the military force in this country is the result of bilateral action with the legislative branch and the executive branch each contributing to the end result.

There are, however, substantial differences between the contribution made by each—and the failure of the one to authorize or the other to execute frustrates what is ostensibly a common end.

Of the two branches of the Government, the true moving force behind the establishment of an effective military posture is the legislative branch—for it must provide the authority and the funds to create such a military force. It must always take the first step. If it fails to perform its proper function, the Executive is powerless to act. Neither branch can assume or exercise the authority of the other. Responsibility, therefore, is clearly fixed for each of the branches of the Government but, again, it must be kept in mind that the first step must be taken by the legislative branch.

Neither the people who elect us nor our own good conscience can permit us to sit idly by and allow the executive branch to both propose and execute. Sometimes it seems to have been forgotten—but we are lawmakers. And among the laws which we must make are those which reflect our constitutional power—

To raise and support armies.
To provide and maintain a Navy.
To make rules for the Government and regulations of the land and naval forces.

All too often in the recent past, we in the Congress have found ourselves threshing about in a sea of frustration because the Congress cannot, except by the most extraordinary action, force the executive branch to take action.

And what does all of this lead to? It leads to simply this:

We have a very strong man at the head of the Department of Defense; an effective man. But, I fear, a man who feels it his bounden duty to make every decision with the Department by himself. He is a man who does, indeed, listen to his military advisers but I, for one, must wonder how often his decisions are colored by what he has heard from his military advisers. Not very often, I think.

We remember the RS–70. We remember Skybolt. And I am fearful that in the future I may be able to say, "We all remember the follow-on bomber and the improved manned interceptor."

We added a total of $92 million to the bill for these two airplanes—$52 million for the bomber and $40 million for the interceptor. I hope and expect that the House will follow the committee in these two recommendations. I hope also that the other body will join with us as it has in the past in the case of the RS–70, for example.

But let us suppose that Congress does express its will, based on its best judgment which, in turn, is based on the firm recommendations of the military people within the Department of Defense—where will we be then? Probably no further along the road than we are at this moment. Because the Secretary of Defense simply does not seem to care how the greatest bomber expert in the world feels about airplanes.

I anticipate—and I say this with real reluctance—that he will again say to us, in effect: "I'm not really taking your part in the decisionmaking process away from you, I'm just not abandoning it to you."

I feel it my duty to alert the House to the fact that power has moved—on tip-toes—from Capitol Hill to the Pentagon, and once there, has reached back a friendly hand and issued a smiling invitation to come on over and watch the computers work.

Frankly, I am frustrated. And I think a lot of you listening to me today are frustrated. It is a disturbing feeling to sit in committee and listen to the recognized military experts of our country state flatly that we need this or we need that, and for us to attempt to meet those military needs through legislation and have the whole thing an exercise in utter futility.

I am, indeed, frustrated.

Two years ago, the committee referred in one of its reports to how the role of the Congress in determining national policy, defense or otherwise, had deteriorated over the years. The committee referred to the fact that the role of the Congress had come to be that of a sometimes querulous but essentially kindly uncle who complains while furiously puffing on his pipe—but finally gives in, hands over the allowance, grants the permission or raises his hand in blessing and then returns to the rocking chair for another year of nodding and wondering as to whether he has done the right thing. This is a sorry sight.

If I exaggerate somewhat, it is only to dramatize the danger we face as a legislative body—a danger that can be met if we press hard enough.

Here we are today with 1,300 bombers. In 1965 this 1,300 bombers will become 935 bombers. What will we have in 1970? No one can say.

But we do know this. That the last bomber was delivered to the Air Force in 1962 and that in 1970 that last bomber will be 8 years old.

And what answer has the Department of Defense found to this problem? It has found no answer at all.

The chairman of the committee has pointed out that it takes 7 or 8 years from the time a bomber is conceived to the time that it flies. And to date, there has not even been a conception.

I do not know whether I will be in the Congress 8 or 10 years from now but whether I am or not, I want to be able

to look back and say that I issued a warning—that I did my best to see that a new bomber airplane was started. Perhaps there is no more that I can do.

Let me speak for a moment about the state of our fleet. I am happy to say that it is in excellent shape at this time.

We have some 873 ships in the fleet today—656 of these ships are combat types. Our Navy is in the forefront of our defense and we all have reason to be proud of it.

But let me ask this question. Where will we be in that inevitable future which we must face if we continue to build ships at the rate we are building them today?

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has shown a great deal of concern in this field and as chairman of a subcommittee looked into this matter 2 years ago. And what he found was not encouraging. He worked the whole matter out on a purely mathematical basis and his conclusion was that our Navy would be in very dangerous shape less than 10 years from now unless the course we are pursuing is changed and changed promptly.

Let me show you what this arithmetic is. The Navy, in 1973, will have about 335 ships which either are in existence today or which have been authorized and which can be considered as assets in 1973. That number is 335.

The next step in the arithmetic is to realize that the ships we will have in 1973 must have been authorized by about 1970 for the simple reason that it takes that long for some ships to be built, launched, commissioned, and made ready for sea.

So, if we take the number of new ships which are authorized for this year—that is, 53—and multiply that by the number of years between now and 1970—that is, 7 years—we get the figure of 371. If we add this 371 to the 335 which I have referred to as assets during that time, we get a total of 706 ships. That is 706 ships against 873 ships which we have today.

In other words, our "progress" will be from 873 ships to 706 ships 9 years from today—or 167 ships less.

Your immediate reaction might well be, "Well, we will build more ships in the future." And I will answer that; last year only 33 new ships were authorized—although the Armed Services Committee of the House attempted to increase this program—and there is no reasonable expectation that we will see such an increase in the program in the years to come as to warrant a belief that we will be able to maintain the fleet at anything like its present size.

I hope that I have made my major point clear and that is that the voice of the military, although, in my own opinion, loud enough, is not being heard in the Pentagon. What are, in truth, military decisions are being made on the purely civilian basis of cost analysis, computer gaming, and theoretical extensions of what are, in essence, a civilian's view of military matters.

I have said that I am frustrated. I must also say that I do not despair. I have great faith in the American people and I have great faith in the Members of this House. This trend can be reversed and I hope that you will all join with me today in beginning that reversal.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, overall I believe we have brought a good bill to the floor of the House today, and I have no hesitation whatsoever in giving it my complete support as far as it goes. But, as the gentleman from Illinois has indicated only a few minutes ago, there are many items omitted from this bill which I believe must be put in the bill next year and in subsequent years.

Last year when we addressed ourselves to the question of ship obsolescence on this floor we indicated quite clearly that unless we took more aggressive action in respect to the fleet over the period of the next few years our fleet would dwindle. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this bill has in it less money today for ships than last year, and last year's bill had less money in it than the year before. Seventy-one percent of our ships today are of World War II vintage. They are getting old, not only advancing in age, but from the point of view of practical usage they are really becoming really outdated. I think we should do more than we have done in this bill with respect to the fleet of the U.S. Navy.

In that connection, I would like to make some remarks on a subject which is of particular interest to me and which has a direct relationship to this bill and bills of this type that we will see in the future. That subject is nuclear power for ships generally, and especially for aircraft carriers.

There is no aircraft carrier in this bill. The last one was authorized 2 years ago and, as you know, has been the subject of considerable discussion as to whether it should have a conventional powerplant or a nuclear powerplant. As authorized, it must have a conventional powerplant. Legislation would be necessary in order to change its propulsion to nuclear power.

All in all, this bill represents what I consider to be a sound view that it is proper at this time to do something about replacing many of the old and only partially effective logistical replenishment and amphibious lift ships.

As you have been told, today there are 53 new ships in this bill, and 7 conversions. This program will cost almost $2 billion.

In the bill there are six nuclear attack submarines. As I am sure you are all aware, all of the submarines now being built are nuclear powered, and I do not think there can be any serious argument against this program.

In the fleet today, the Navy has three nuclear powered surface ships in operation. These are the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the destroyer *Bainbridge*. I think it fair to say that in a very real sense these three ships represent a pilot program to test nuclear power in these three different types of combatant ships.

The Congress has authorized 41 ballistic missile submarines, and 16 of these have been completed. We also have authorized 45 nuclear attack submarines, of which 17 are now complete. The addition of 6 nuclear attack submarines in this bill will raise the total number of nuclear powered submarines in our Navy to 91, allowing for the loss of the *Thresher*. At the present time, the Navy is building a destroyer leader, named the *Truxton*, which was added by this body to the fiscal year 1962 shipbuilding program.

There we have, then, a summary of past and present nuclear powered shipbuilding.

The advantages of nuclear power combatant ships appear to be so greatly accepted today that one wonders why there is opposition to further extension of nuclear power in the Navy. We no longer have to present our arguments for nuclear power in terms of analytical studies and technical judgment, but can point persuasively to a great wealth of operational experience.

Nuclear power for submarines hardly needs to be advocated, for it has proved itself beyond the wildest expectations of its early proponents. We take it for granted today that our Polaris submarines can take their stations for the defense of the free world without any doubt as to their ability to remain on station for great lengths of time and to be ready to resume station on short notice.

The nuclear powered submarines of our Navy are capable of sustained high speed which the submariner of World War II would find it hard to believe. These submarines can penetrate deep into enemy waters without any worry over their endurance.

In summary, our new submarines can maintain a much higher degree of readiness to operate than could ever have been the case with their oil-burning ancestors.

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

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, if my memory serves me right, the program for the building of the Polaris-type submarine originated in the Congress.

Mr. BATES. Yes, it did. All of us who are great believers in the experience and ability of Admiral Rickover, and those of us who served on the Committee on Armed Services as well as those of us who served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy were convinced as to the desirability and the necessity of such a program very quickly after the admiral made his presentation to us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Surely, it is most appropriate at this time to also mention Admiral Raborn in this connection.

Mr. BATES. Yes, indeed and I believe he should have been awarded medals to a greater degree than he has been. Admiral Raborn is one of the great heroes of the postwar period. I am glad the distinguished Speaker of the House has referred to the admiral and I do hope that somehow Admiral Raborn will be given another medal commensurate with his abilities, the courage he has demonstrated, and the many contributions he

has made to our country. It was, the result of his tremendous effort, because of physical reasons, that he had to leave his post of duty and is now retired.

The experience which we have gained from the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* has rendered, in my own opinion, entirely clear the great advantage of nuclear power in carriers. Not only can it steam to distant parts of the globe—and steam at high speed—but it can at a moment's notice launch a varied mix of airplanes capable of delivering a great variety of weapons. The *Enterprise* now carries more airplanes than the largest conventional powered carrier in the fleet.

The reason for this is quite simple. Additional space is available for these airplanes because of the elimination of the very large amounts of fuel oil used by a conventional powerplant.

Another advantage which has been established by the *Enterprise* is a substantial decrease in the vulnerability of the carrier because of her high sustained speed and her freedom at sea from the requirement that she be replenished by oilers.

I feel that the cruiser or large destroyer or frigate can experience similar advantages.

One of the interesting and gratifying results of operating the carrier *Enterprise* is the realization that the Navy can operate mixed types of ship power. Right now, for example, the *Enterprise* is operating along with oil burning destroyers, cruisers, and other ships. There is no serious degradation to the *Enterprise* because her escorts are conventional powered. As additional nuclear powered ships—large antisubmarine and anti-air-escorts and carriers—join the *Enterprise*, the *Long Beach*, and the *Bainbridge*, measurable advantages will accrue to the force.

The real controversy over nuclear power for naval ships centers around the problem of cost. Here there is no argument that nuclear powered ballistic firing or attack submarines are not economical—to build and to operate. But for the carrier and other surface vessels, there are those who say that we cannot afford the luxury of nuclear power and that it does not afford us justifiable military advantages. Much of this argument is concerned with what factors to include in the computation of the costs of a nuclear carrier and a conventional aircraft carrier.

If authorized now, a conventional carrier would cost about $277 million. To build a nuclear powered carrier, we would have to add the reactors and the nuclear core or fuel. The Navy would also prefer the size of the next nuclear powered carrier be somewhat larger than the *Enterprise*. This increase in hull size is not necessarily attributable to nuclear power, but simply represents the growth of aircraft carriers.

We are told that the reactors would cost about $81 million, the nuclear core about $32 million, and the cost of an increased hull would be about $13 million, adding up to $126 million for the additional cost of a nuclear-powered ship. The total cost of a nuclear-powered carrier, then, would be about $403 million.

These figures apply only to the construction cost of a carrier. For a proper appreciation of the increase in costs which are attributable to nuclear power, we should consider all costs associated with a warship. As a result of their investigation into this question, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently concluded:

> The total lifetime cost of the nuclear carrier with its aircraft is estimated to be only about 3 percent more than the lifetime cost of the conventional carrier with its aircraft.

What then should our policy be on the question of nuclear power for ships?

First of all, it is generally agreed that we should incorporate nuclear power in a naval vessel wherever there is a military gain and where installation is technically and economically feasible. The Navy now has a policy that all combatant ships above 8,000 tons to be built in the future should be nuclear propelled. I believe we should endorse this policy, as well as to lend it a degree of flexibility by saying that where these gains and feasibility exist, we should incorporate nuclear power in all large combatant ships, even if this means going below the 8,000 ton figure.

The question of economic feasibility is a relative one. We should not let ourselves be so circumscribed by artificial cost-effectiveness analyses that we sacrifice important military advantages for a mere few dollars. I would rather see the slight additional money taken from some other program in the military budget. In this connection, we should recognize too, that in the final analysis, cost effectiveness is little more than an educated opinion. For there is still the problem of what costs are proper to include.

We must continue to vigorously prosecute efforts to advance the state of the art of nuclear power. This is true not only of warships, but of merchant ship applications such as the NS *Savannah* and of atomic power generating stations. There is every reason to expect that the research and development will bring about simpler, smaller, safer, and more efficient nuclear powerplants.

Of course, one of our principal objectives should be to reduce cost. If we are successful here, we will not only conclusively resolve the question of nuclear power for ships, but will be providing, at the same time, a wonderful benefit for our civilian nuclear powerplants around the country.

It is important to increase the number of trained persons in the field of nuclear power. The development of a large group of educated and skilled engineers and technicians will not only insure that we are able to operate the nuclear equipment on hand, but are able to staff our development centers as well.

As a final objective, I submit to the House that we should encourage the Navy and the Department of Defense to speedily bring to us a program that will create an entire nuclear task force in our fleet. When this request is presented to us, I am sure the Congress will exercise its wisdom in authorizing the necessary construction, just as it has done in encouraging the adoption of nuclear power for submarines.

I would like to speak briefly at this time on a matter which is of considerable concern to me, and I know of great concern to many Members of Congress, and that is the obsolescence of our fleet.

Two years ago I had the honor to serve as a member of a subcommittee of which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] was chairman, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] was a member.

This subcommittee was appointed by the chairman [Mr. VINSON] to look into the serious problem of block obsolescence of our fleet.

Now, until recently, block obsolescence has been predicated on the principal basis of mere age of the ships of the fleet. This was not unreasonable in view of the fact that most of the ships in our fleet today were built during World War II.

However, there is another serious problem relating to obsolescence of our fleet which until recently did not receive sufficient attention, and that is tactical obsolescence. Broadly defined, this term means the inability of a ship to perform her assigned missions in the face of enemy threat.

The term "block obsolescence" which implies a sudden, wholesale, overage condition of our ships, has tended in the past to obscure the real nature of this problem. As I have indicated, age, in itself, does not necessarily represent a measure of the ship's capability, or, in reverse, the extent to which it is obsolete.

Rather, it is necessary to determine first what exactly are the precise criteria for each type of ship as such relate to the particular mission of that ship. Second, when, in the point of time, for any given ship or class of ships, is it no longer tactically effective, and, third, what feasible methods are there for overcoming this obsolescence.

At the present time the Department of the Navy is conducting a major study to establish valid criteria for ship obsolescence on a ship-by-ship and class-by-class basis.

I have been informed that the results of this study will be presented to the Armed Services Committee, and I believe this study will define more clearly exactly what kind and how many of the ships which we in the Congress should authorize in the years to come.

It has been pointed out before, and I wish to stress here, that at the rate we are proceeding in our building of new ships, our Navy, of very necessity, must be degraded in the years to come.

One might contend that the tremendous improvement in the individual ship—its greater firepower and its greater speed—has made numbers of ships, as such, much less meaningful than in the past. While the speed of the individual ship has tended to shrink to some small extent the vast reaches of the oceans of the world, this has not been enough to change the classic situation which requires our Navy to be widely dispersed throughout the world.

A particular ship, or a particular task force of ships, cannot be in two places at one time—and no amount if improvement in the ships themselves can ever change this fact.

On a purely arithmetical basis, we are headed for a smaller, and necessarily less effective fleet by 1972 or 1973. This trend must be reversed; the number of new ships to be built each year must be increased, or we all will have failed to fulfill a clear and present responsibility toward the defense of our country.

Mr. SHRIVER. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, the Nation's first President, George Washington, whose birthday we observe tomorrow, declared in his first annual address to both Houses of Congress:

> To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

I rise in support of H.R. 9637 because it represents positive action by the Congress in providing the necessary weapons and materials for our armed services. By authorizing nearly $17 billion for military hardware and research and development upon new weapons systems, we acknowledge General Washington's concept that a strong defense capability is the best deterrent to actual conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to voice my support of the Committee on Armed Service's recommendation that the Congress authorize $52 million in order that substantial development work can be initiated on a follow-on bomber for our present B–52 and B–58 aircraft, and $40 million for development of an improved manned interceptor.

All of us are aware of the many trouble spots throughout the world. We must be on guard in southeast Asia, Africa, in Central and South America, and in the Mediterranean area. We can well remember the confrontation with the Soviet Union over missile installations in Cuba in the fall of 1962. SAC bombers played a vital part in that crisis when they maintained an around-the-clock airborne alert for approximately 1 month.

There is a substantial and necessary program to modernize and keep the B–52 fleet operational into the 1970's. However, we know that sooner or later these jet bombers will wear out. There are no other bombers presently on the drawing boards. The B–70 bomber, still in the developmental stage, evidently is to be abandoned.

We have been told by the Secretary of Defense that this Nation will continue to have a mixed force of missiles and manned bombers. However, we must prepare for the day when our present bomber fleet has reached full depreciation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in listening to our military authorities, such as General LeMay. We have been told that we can gain 1 year in the development of a follow-on bomber if we begin now. We must maintain versatility and flexibility in our defense system. We cannot do this if we place our complete reliance upon missiles alone.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to rise to place myself in accord with the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts who has just spoken.

As a former Navy pilot, having flown planes off our carriers, I think I can speak with some authority on the subject that the gentleman has spoken about. I would urge everyone who has not had the opportunity to visit and go aboard one of the aircraft carriers, particularly to see the changes and advances that have been made in their operation. I know you would feel much more secure for having made such a visit.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, you have been informed by the chairman of the committee and you have seen in the committee report on the bill that we have added $92 million to the bill for studies directed at a follow-on bomber and an improved manned interceptor.

I trust that the House will indulge me when I say that I was at least somewhat instrumental in having these two additions—$52 million for the bomber and $40 million for the interceptor—placed in the bill.

I have felt for some years the same concern which has been expressed by many members of the committee and many Members of Congress who are not members of the committee, that we are headed—and inevitably headed—for a single kind of defense, and that is missiles.

This is a very, very serious matter. You have been told that our last bombers were delivered to the Air Force in the latter part of 1962. Those bomber lines—the B–52 and the B–58—have been closed down since that time. Even if we wanted to buy some more B–52's or B–58's, we would have to spend vast sums of money to get these production lines back in working order.

And, although these are both fine airplanes, I think it would be unwise for us to take this course. The art and science of airplanes, like the art and science in all other fields, is advancing very rapidly. The technology of today is of little use in the weapons system of tomorrow. And we cannot afford to fall behind.

Although Premier Khrushchev has talked about the bomber being no longer a truly effective weapon, there is very good reason to believe that he is improving his existing bombers in very much the same way that we are improving our own bombers. I cannot say with any authority that the Soviet Union is producing a new type of bomber but, as we all know, the closed society of the Soviet Union glories in its ability to surprise the Western World with a new missile or a new airplane.

How many times has our first view of a major new Soviet weapons system been that which we gained during the May Day parade. The development of these weapons systems has been kept a closely guarded secret, and the first time we learn about it, it is an operational system. So, how can we say today that they are not producing a new bomber and perhaps a much more effective bomber than we have in our own inventory.

I feel—and all but a few members of the committee feel—that we are on the soundest possible grounds in adding authority to this bill for the follow-on bomber and interceptor, a total of $92 million. And what is our basis for making these additions? Our authority is the greatest expert in the world on bombers and fighter aircraft—General LeMay, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

He said flatly and absolutely before our committee, that there was a need and an urgent need, for studying, designing and developing both a follow-on bomber and an improved interceptor.

I think we made one tactical error in committee, and I would like to speak about this for a moment. Our discussion in committee revolved in very great part about the need for stepping these programs up, and stepping them up immediately. We talked in committee—and talked at considerable length—about these two airplanes. But all of our talk, as I say, related to the idea, the theory, for these airplanes. We did not get down into the details as to how, precisely, each dollar would be spent during fiscal year 1965.

It was my own intention, and I am sure the belief of the whole committee, that these minute details would be the subject of papers submitted to the committee, studied by the staff, and presented here on the floor today. I regret to say that this is not the case.

I want it clearly understood that we in the committee were fully satisfied from the testimony given by General LeMay, that there was a real need for these two airplanes, and that the amount of money for each of them was General LeMay's own statement. We did not dream up the $52 million or the $40 million; these are General LeMay's figures.

You might well ask, "Well, why did you now get this detailed material as to just how each dollar would be spent during this fiscal year?" The answer to this is a very simple one: As soon as General LeMay left our committee and went back to the Pentagon, he had the lid clamped on him so firmly that he could not say a single word to us from then on. The Secretary of Defense simply refused to permit the committee to get any information which would permit it to give you the details today as to how, in minute detail, the funds would be spent.

In other words, since Mr. McNamara had not asked for the follow-on bomber or the improved manned interceptor, he was not about to permit anybody in the Pentagon to help us get the detailed facts so that we could make a better case ourselves.

General LeMay may have been gagged, but I have not been. And I am telling you the plain, unvarnished truth here on the floor today.

Why do I make such a point of this particular matter? It is simply this: Those of the committee who have issued

"additional views" on this subject, seem to place some emphasis on the fact that these details are not known, that the Department is not really ready to spend this money, that it is, in effect "pressing the art" to go ahead with these studies at this time.

Well, I do not know where they get their information or on what basis they draw their conclusions unless, of course, there has been less reluctance on the part of the Pentagon—and I am speaking of the very top of the Pentagon—to give them information than to give it to those of us who are trying to get these airplanes.

I can make no direct statements on this subject because I do not have any facts. But I can draw reasonably logical conclusions.

Here we have another example of the military being overridden by the civilians in the Department on matters that are of a purely military nature.

General LeMay during his testimony, said that he had his "best people" working hard on this matter for many months. Now, you do not put your "best people" on anything but your most important problems. If he thinks that he should have his best people occupied in this fashion, that is good enough for me.

You have had the follow-on bomber and the improved manned interceptor described to you by others who have spoken. What I am talking about here is the principle involved. Our bombers are wearing out, and I do not think it is reasonable to expect them to last beyond 1970 or, at the very latest, 1972.

Just stop for a moment and think that there are B–52's flying as part of our active Air Force today that are already 10 years old. These planes, it is true, will fly for some more years. But it seems to me to be the very height of foolishness to expect these airplanes to fly forever. And if they will not fly forever, then where are we going to be less than 10 years from now? I will tell you where we are going to be. We are going to have a country studded with missiles and we are going to have nothing else.

As General White, when he was Chief of Staff of the Air Force, so rightly said, "missiles have two modes—they can go or they cannot go." And once they are on the way, there is nothing that can call them back.

Missiles are important, and I do not mean to degrade them in any way. But in the last analysis, they are what we could call absolute weapons. They have no flexibility whatsoever.

On the other hand, our bombers—and this is true as I speak here today—can be in the air, loaded with their weapons, ready to go at all times. But if there is some reason to call them back or to redirect them to different targets, this could be done. They are flown by men. They are at all times subject to the intelligence of the people flying them and the commanders who are directing them from the ground.

I will end on this note: We will be in a sorry state, indeed, the day that we find ourselves with one single weapons system—missiles.

And I say to you today that unless we reverse the present trend in the Pentagon, that is where we are going to be in the very near future.

I call on every Member of the House—on both sides of the aisle—to support the committee in the addition of this $92 million to the bill. You will then be participating in the exercise of a constitutional responsibility which has been started by the committee but which cannot be completed without your help.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation. Of course, as a member of the committee, I am in favor of it. It is a fine bill. I simply have one or two changes to propose in the legislation. I would like to invite Members who may not yet have had an opportunity to read some of these proposed changes and the reason for them to look at part II of the committee report, report 1138, which I am sure is available from the pages on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, it is always of course with a certain amount of trepidation that any member of the great Committee on Armed Services opposes the view of the distinguished chairman and the majority, and this situation is no different today.

Mr. Chairman, in the past few years we have, of course, gotten rather used to having some opposition from some members of the committee on some parts of these bills. We thought that, perhaps, the members of the committee would be a little bit disappointed if there were not some opposition today, even though the "fearless five" of last year on the B–70 question has now become the "fearless four."

Mr. Chairman, what we have to propose today, I believe may be of some interest to the members of the committee, because we are going to offer an amendment at the appropriate time. This amendment, I am happy to advise the Members in advance, is going to be the kind of an amendment which every Member of this House is always looking for, an economy amendment which you can support.

Mr. Chairman, this is an economy year. The President of the United States has made it very clear that we are all interested in reducing excess expenditures and in getting a dollar of value for every dollar we spend. Here is the first big major authorization bill of this 2d session of the 88th Congress. I say to the members of the committee that I want to urge you to get your economy vote in early by supporting our amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a tight bill. It has been reduced, as the distinguished chairman said, even in the Department of Defense. When it came over to our committee, it went, first, to the Research and Development Subcommittee and the members of that committee reduced it even further, recommending a reduction of $362 million in R. & D. funds. Perhaps, we went a little bit too far. However, we made this reduction at the urging of the chairman of the committee who said that we have got to get in step with this economy program, we have got to think and we have got to act economy in our great committee. We believed him. We supported him on that basis.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that we do not get everything we want if you believe in economy even in the field of national defense. Even in that field, if you want economy you have got to keep a tight budget.

Now, our amendment, Mr. Chairman, is that the $92 million which the full committee has recommended be added back in by way of new aircraft should be eliminated.

Now, I would like to make one thing clear, Mr. Chairman. You are going to hear—in fact, you have already heard and you have read in the press—that this is a fight over the manned bomber, that we who are pushing this amendment are opposed to manned strategic aircraft, that a great battle is going to be fought on the floor of the House to test whether we do or do not still believe in the manned bomber. Well, do not believe it. That is not the question here at all. We are in favor of aircraft. One of our Members even flew them, with a very distinguished record, during the war. We believe in aircraft. In fact, we have supported in this bill, mind you, another $75 million for the controversial B–70 aircraft. We believe in a mix between manned aircraft and missiles.

But we do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is anything sacred about manned bombers. We do not believe that this House has or should have any commitment in perpetuity to the manned bomber any more than it should have a commitment in perpetuity to the battleship or the horse cavalry. Every weapon has got to justify its existence and the money we spend on it on the basis of hard fact. If we are going to have a new aircraft then we ought to know what it is going to do and what it proposes to add to our national defense and how much money we have to spend on it.

All that we oppose in our amendment, Mr. Chairman, is the spending of money on these new aircraft when the record itself clearly demonstrates that the Air Force itself does not know exactly what it wants in this particular instance. This might be called an instance of what is sometimes referred to as the Washington syndrome, the feeling that if you have a problem and all you do is throw money at it, somehow it will go away. So, we hear, we have a problem, so if we will only put some money in this budget, about $92 million, then we can all feel a little bit better and we can all go home with a clear conscience.

But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the real waste in the Department of Defense over the years has come from spending money prematurely on projects nobody clearly knew what they could do, like the Dyna-Soar, the Typhon, and even the B–70. We of the "fearless five" urged you last year to oppose $363 million for the B–70. We did not give you a bum steer then. We came within a narrow margin of carrying that recommendation on the floor. And those of you who stood with us then, when you go home

now you can hold your head high because you were right—and because today, 1 year still later, the B–70 is still not flying and it probably will not get into the air now until late this spring. Even the Air Force itself has now abandoned the B–70 as a weapon system. Well this is what happened on one attempt to try to spend money before we knew precisely where we were headed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are opposing the same kind of thing on this proposal. Let us see what happened to this follow-on bomber? Well, the Air Force said last year, "We have agreed that the B–70 is not getting anywhere. We want to find a new plane." So the Air Force asked last year for a reprograming of $5 million to study the concept of such a new plane. The Secretary said "Look, you already have money in there to study such things. You do not need $5 million to make this study." And they did make their study. This year when the budget came up the Air Force said:

> We want $53 million to move into the program definition of a new bomber, and also to procure various components.

The Secretary said:

> Look, you still have not told me exactly what you want. I am willing to give you the $5 million you wanted last year so you could make the study. Tell me what you want first, before we spend all this money without knowing what we are going to get.

That $5 million is in this bill. It was presented to the Research and Development Subcommittee, we approved it, and it is already included there.

The fact of the matter is that this follow-on bomber is still nothing but an idea. Even the Air Force is not clear just what their idea is, because the Secretary of the Air Force has not sent the request for this new bomber to the Secretary of Defense.

And let me say further, in response to what the gentleman from New York said a moment ago, even the distinguished Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General LeMay, has not come up with the answers to these questions either. On page 7479 of the hearings, in answer to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] General LeMay is quoted as having said:

> It is correct that the formal papers have not yet gone on down because he has asked additional questions—

referring to the Secretary of Defense—

> of how we intend to use these bombers, what the operational concept is going to be, and how many of them are going to be needed. These are very difficult questions to answer at this particular time when we are talking about * * *.

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

Mr. STRATTON. If I have time at the conclusion of my statement, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman has used my name and referred to me.

Mr. STRATTON. I will be happy to yield when my statement has been completed. My time is running out.

Mr. BECKER. Read General LeMay's answer. I challenge the gentleman to read General LeMay's answer.

Mr. STRATTON. General LeMay said "These are very difficult questions to answer."

They may be hard questions to answer, but they go to the key of whether we are spending this $92 million wisely. I do not know what we are going to get. And if we do not know how this money is going to be used, if we do not know how it is going to contribute to our defense, then the $5 million is all we need because that money is in the bill precisely to answer these specific questions, and until they are answered we cannot use the money any more wisely than it was suggested last year we use it for the B–70.

The distinguished Secretary of the Air Force is quoted in this morning's paper as saying:

> The cost of weapons systems has reached such a point that no military organization can make many bets of new systems.
>
> Very difficult choices have to be made, and the time devoted to painstaking analysis will be well worth while, in terms of getting the right system and the right program.

So let us not waste money. Let us find out what we want to spend this money for before we go ahead and spend it. For in these two planes we are not just getting into $92 million. The follow-on bomber is the system that will cost ultimately some $5 billion. The improved manned interceptor is a system that will cost ultimately at least $3 billion.

Mr. McNamara has been praised by the majority of the committee, Mr. Chairman, for saving money. But the reason Secretary McNamara has saved money, the reason he has been a great Secretary of Defense, is that he has had the courage to refuse to spend money on systems that nobody could completely define or completely understand. I say that it is about time that we in this Congress demonstrated the same kind of courage. Let us not just spend money here because of slogans, or words. Let us not have it said that you can always get $92 million out of the House of Representatives any day in the week just by crying "Manned bombers!" We are living today after all in a modern age of missiles. Let us look before we leap. Let us look before we spend.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. The first thing I would say to the gentleman is that he has made a plea for economy. It is rather surprising in view of his many votes in the House I have noticed, where he never voted for economy on other things. If he is so much for economy, why is he fighting to keep the base at Schenectady? That is in his own district. It is a different kind of economy when it hits home in his own district.

Mr. STRATTON. As the gentleman well knows, the studies show, and in my discussion in the committee the other day with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations he agreed with me, that that base is more economical and more efficient than others that are not being closed.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, maintenance of our military strength at the level required to secure our Nation against attack is an objective to which all are committed. However, what constitutes that level in the face of world tensions and rapidly changing technology is not readily ascertained.

First, the danger must be correctly appraised. Even a quick glance at the face of the world will disclose troubled areas in a "measles" pattern. Despite gestures of detente, we know that the Communist conspiracy is continuing its drive for world domination. In so doing it is employing its most effective techniques of subversion, and the unrest in emerging nations is being exploited with the propaganda machine working overtime. Our involvement, or threat of involvement, has assumed such proportions that only through the most modern of weapons can we provide adequate response. We are compelled to deploy our military strength over widely dispersed areas, so we must have the mobility and flexibility which the best modern technology can devise. The cost of this effort is sobering but there are few who would suggest that we take the great risk which a lesser effort would entail. The action of the Armed Services Committee in bringing H.R. 9637 to the floor affirmed its conviction that the military responsibilities of our Nation demand a high level of development and procurement in our basic weaponry. The procurement portion of the bill supports unchanged the request of the Defense Department respecting aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. Guided by the study of our distinguished Subcommittee for Research and Development, we have reduced the Department's figure by $362.5 million and added $52 million for the follow-on bomber and $40 million for the improved manned interceptor. This increased support of the bomber project was prompted by the belief of the committee that the most satisfactory weapon response required a strategic mix which would be lost if ultimate reliance were placed solely on missiles. This concern has been expressed quite consistently over recent years and the House has shared the apprehension. The Secretary of Defense and the Air Force representatives confirm the vital role of the manned bomber in present-day strategy. We have no reason to believe that this role will terminate with the life of our B–52 and B–58 bombers. Therefore, it seems mandatory for us to proceed with all reasonable speed to provide the successor to these very effective planes. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General LeMay, has made it very clear that time is against us and delay in pressing this development is dangerous and unwise. The $52 million which we include for this project in this authorization represents cheap insurance. We do not know the precise status of Soviet bomber capability as of this date nor can we predict with certainty the future emphasis it will receive, but we can be certain it will be substantial. Accordingly, we must accelerate the research neces-

sary for the selection of our next version in this field. The required leadtime is so extensive in years that if the decision is not promptly made we will incur a dangerous gap before the actual bomber can come off the production line. This step which the committee recommends is vital if we are not to be caught off guard. The same general reasoning supports the additional funds for the manned interceptor.

It is argued that even if we authorize and subsequently appropriate this additional $92 million for aircraft research and development, the money may never be used. Certainly it will never be done without this action on our part and by so doing we are making very clear our judgment and our wishes in this vital matter. We have a responsibility to discharge. We are acting in good faith and call upon all concerned with this program to do likewise. We do not ask or expect that this money will be spent beyond the rate of effective use but we do wish to do everything possible to expedite the right answer. Many of us believe that the security of our country makes this an action of highest priority.

The U.S. Army, together with other members of the defense team, is faced with an ever-increasing responsibility and problem of protecting this Nation, aiding new nations and their allies, against the basic world Communist threat. This responsibility requires our personal constant vigilance to see that our Armed Forces obtain the maximum capability to meet the real and potential capabilities of the Communists to wage war.

We have, in the last few years, seen significant progress made in the modernization of our Army by the procurement of the most advanced and modern materiel available. We have seen the Army equipped with a new light antitank weapon for the individual infantry soldier; a new and much improved machinegun; we have seen the soldier's battlefield mobility improved by new armored personnel carriers; and the battlefield control and command of his actions increased with vastly improved, transistorized communication equipment. We are giving him the ability to move quickly and rapidly—overcome obstacles such as rivers and mountains and be able to take the battle to the enemy at the time and place of our choosing through the use of modern Army aircraft. We have seen our Army receive new guided missile antitank weapons, new armored reconnaissance and mechanized flamethrower vehicles; we have seen its artillery support being increased by new self-propelled howitzers, in lieu of the towed howitzer. We have seen its long-range conventional and nuclear capability increased with the addition of the Sergeant and Pershing missile systems, as well as its antiaircraft defense capability improved with the addition of the Hawk missile. However, we cannot have a really modern Army if we have insufficient materiel on hand to support the Army in combat, no matter how modern it may be. Likewise, our Army cannot be modern if it was fully equipped, but only a small portion of its equipment was of the latest design. We must have adequate quantities of equipment in all categories of the latest design available and actually in the hands of our troops if we are to have a really modern Army that is capable of carrying out its responsibility in protecting this Nation from the critical and real Communist threat.

For our troops to gain the advantages of our scientific knowledge and technology, they must have the new equipment that we can produce in their hands when the battle starts. Prototype and drawing board designs are no value to the soldier engaged in combat against forces equipped with superior materiel. The next war, if it comes, will be won or lost with the materiel our soldiers take into battle, not what they would take if we were given sufficient time.

The job of keeping our combat forces at the highest degree of combat capability is a continuous process of seeing that they receive an adequate flow of modern equipment. Our whole society and way of life depends on recognizing that a forward-looking research and development program must be pursued. We must act to keep our Army modern and in the highest state of readiness to meet the challenge, where and when it comes, from the Communist bloc.

We, in Congress, have done a pretty good job over the past few years in helping to modernize our Army. But, there is no basis for complacency, no reason to feel that we have finished our job. We must continue to see that the Army is equipped in a timely manner with the new weapons and equipment appearing on the horizon which will give our forces even greater capability to protect this Nation and to carry out this Nation's responsibilities and commitments.

I am concerned as anyone with the high cost of meeting our defense needs. Where we can economize without weakening our military strength we should do so. Postponement of necessary items may masquerade as economy but we should not deceive ourselves or the country. During the past year, I served on a Subcommittee on Military Reserve Posture. It was clear that critical shortages existed in the Active Army units and the Reserve components and as a result of extended hearings, we became convinced that modernization of the equipment of the Army required an expenditure of $3.5 billion each year for 5 years. Yet there is proposed a budget for fiscal year 1965 which calls for a little over $2 billion. Either the information given to us on the hearing was not valid or we are gambling in a dangerous area.

I would like to see world conditions which minimize our threats but if I read the signs correctly there is no such indication. On the other hand there is much to tell us that if we are not firm and courageous we will be subjected to even greater pressures and indignities. Our ability to protect our rights and our willingness to do so must go hand in hand. Congress is concerned with providing the means to act and this bill is a sensible effort to do so. It deserves the full support of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in support of this bill. I also rise in support of the amendment introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. STRATTON], the current leader of the "fearsome four." As you know, his amendment is designed to reduce the proposal by $92 million and for the reasons that he has already so clearly outlined.

I do not, however, go along entirely on the theory that we should look at this as strictly a budget matter; I do not go along entirely because as a member of the Committee on Research and Development, which went into this subject in great detail, I would argue that it is not only our obligation to try to reduce the spending levels, for the reasons that have been noted by my distinguished colleague, but in addition there is a question of priorities. I will have more to say about this later, because if we are going to add $92 million, I believe we can better spend that money in some other places, and I will make certain proposals at the appropriate time.

First of all, let me take this opportunity to thank my chairman for the time that he has given us to argue our case. I might say also that if the chairman is allowed to carry out his announced intention of retirement at the end of this 88th Congress, which I sincerely hope he will not, that this may indeed represent a milestone in our national history, as this will be the last time that Chairman VINSON will be presenting this always formidable procurement bill for aircraft, missiles, ships, research, and development. Therefore, while I am in opposition today in respect to this amendment, and as I have been from time to time in the past, I want to say publicly that I consider this in no way detracts from my deep personal regard, my great appreciation and pride in getting to know and to serve with a great American, Mr. CARL VINSON, the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. In all my time on the committee he has been most gracious in his consideration of all the members of his great committee.

Mr. Chairman, as you now know and as has been set forth in the committee report on page 2, the Air Force requested $3,205 million, for research, development, test, and evaluation. The full committee accepted the recommendation of the subcommittee to reduce the Air Force portion by $157 million. In a separate action the full committee added $52 million for the development of a follow-on strategic bomber and $40 million for a so-called improved manned interceptor. By this action there is left a net reduction for the Air Force of $65 million.

For a more detailed analysis of our argument I urge Members by all means to read the additional views of Messrs. STRATTON, COHELAN, PIKE, and NEDZI. Meanwhile I should like to review the present situation as I see it.

Last year our distinguished chairman appointed a Committee on Research and

Development. I serve on that committee under the chairmanship of our able colleague from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], a veteran member of the Armed Services Committee and of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. Chairman, the declassified transcript of our extensive hearings may be found on pages 7549 through 7906, some 357 pages of testimony which represent 30 sessions that we went through last year and approximately 25 hours that we put in this year.

It should be noted that when the Air Force came before our subcommittee there was no effort made to present their case for either the IMI or the follow-on bomber, except in the broadest and most general terms. This was no accident as the record will show that the proposals for both the follow-on bomber and the improved manned interceptor have not even been submitted from the Department of the Air Force. And in the hearings you can find ample evidence to support this statement, which was made by Secretary Zuckert.

I think it should be clear by this time that this whole subject should have been reviewed by our subcommittee. And, incidentally, this is one of the basic reasons for my dissent on this particular problem. No one I know of on our subcommittee is dogmatic or is unwilling to consider the follow-on bomber or the improved manned interceptor. As a matter of fact we are all agreed that we must examine this question forthwith. This can be done expeditiously and in an orderly fashion. The entire question, therefore, should be referred to the Research and Development Committee for intense study and investigation. We can then come back with a report and recommendation that will enable us to go forward in a manner that will insure we are going to minimize waste and maximize the effectiveness of any program the Department of Air Force comes up with.

Reluctantly some of us on the Research and Development Committee cut $362 million out of that bill. In my own case I had great reservations about the $45.1 million that was cut from the proposed budget for military science. And I intend to have more to say about this before the day is over.

One further thought about the B–70. Last year the then "Fearless Five," as we have been called, urged you to cut $363 million for 2 additional B–70 R. & D. bombers.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to overdo this because it is fairly clear that the B–70 had much bad luck. But I desire to make my own position clear. And the testimony as contained in the record will clearly support it.

I earnestly hope that the B–70 will fly, and I expect it to fly. I feel that there will be some fallout, although the record will show in the research and development hearings that whatever fallout we are going to get from the B–70 bomber is only around $200 million. Last year the Air Force declared that they had to have these two additional B–70 bombers. Now we find, from the testimony of Dr. Brown and General LeMay, that it is not even going to become a weapons system because it has no mission. But what we are going to get out of it is about $200 million worth of fallout which will probably go to the FAA in its development of the supersonic transport. This is true even after a total expenditure of $1.6 billion.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this should be pretty good evidence that our efforts here today are in good faith. We are trying to do an honest job as we see the situation. We sincerely feel that our views in the matter should prevail for all of the reasons set forth in our additional views.

Now, I would like to make one reference to what Dr. Brown had to say about this matter in respect to the B–70. He says, and I quote Dr. Brown:

> I think the conclusion which I reached a long time ago, and which may or may not be shared by the qualified people in the Air Force, but in any event are the same conclusions that the studies have gotten to, is that additional speed is not worth the additional cost and additional difficulty for this mission. There are perhaps other purposes for a mach 3 aircraft, but the strategic capability with which an aircraft can complement missiles are not associated with its having to go mach 3.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this pretty well takes care of the question of the B–70.

Now, what about the IMI? Why were funds not requested? You could look at the hearings—and I do not have time to make the references now—but the hearings are clear that they never requested anything before our committee.

The matter that bothers me—and I am most disturbed about this—is that I cannot understand why they have to make this end run around the Research and Development Subcommittee. We are a hard-working group. We would have been glad to consider this question. But the fact of the matter is they did not have a proposal. The Secretary of the Department of the Air Force has testified to this. He testified at the time he was before our full committee that no proposal had come from his office. To be sure, there had been discussions about this, but there had been no proposal.

Mr. Chairman, what we are suggesting is this: Bring us a proposal, bring it to the proper subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. We have every confidence that our subcommittee can come back and make recommendations on this question. This is not simple. It is a very complex and difficult problem.

In the limited time remaining, let me briefly restate our position and our reasons for opposing the additional $92 million for a follow-on bomber and a manned interceptor.

Let me make it clear once again that we do not oppose this bill—we support it. But we do oppose the committee's action in adding $92 million to it—an action we believe to be premature, totally unwarranted by the facts, and contrary to the committee's otherwise rigid adherence to strict budget economy.

As the additional views make clear, three stages are involved in the development of any new aircraft: the conceptual stage, the definition stage, and the acquisition stage. And as General LeMay testified, it would take a year to a year and a half, once the concept had been approved, for the definition stage to be completed.

In other words, at this stage the Air Force itself does not yet know what it wants for a follow-on bomber. As a matter of fact, the $5 million which the Air Force requested, and which our Subcommittee on Research and Development approved, was intended to provide answers to just these questions.

It is simply not clear what the additional $52 million is to be spent for, and there is nothing in either the committee report or in the hearings to answer this question. It is therefore hard to see how funds could be wisely or economically spent on an aircraft whose full configuration and mission have not even been clearly defined. Indeed, the expenditure of funds on weapons systems which have not been clearly defined has been a major source of waste in the past, as programs such as the Dyna-Soar and Typhon so dramatically illustrate.

There is great merit to the Air Force's plan of a mixed strategic force of missiles and manned aircraft operating into the 1970's. But we must be careful to guard against building new aircraft for the sake of building them; before we know how a particular system will be used and precisely how it will be integrated with the ballistic missile force on which we are now concentrating so much of our effort and substance.

And we should not forget that if the committee's recommendation is adopted, the total cost of the program will not be just $52 million, but, rather, closer to $5 billion.

As for the IMI, it is significant, I believe, that the Air Force representatives who testified before the Research and Development Subcommittee made no request—none whatsoever—for funds for this plane.

Second, as the additional views again make clear, there is substantial reason to be concerned with the apparent neglect tendered one of our basic aircraft for the 1970's, the TFX.

The Air Force, for example, regards the TFX as an attack plane, and this makes the appeal for a new interceptor. The Navy, on the other hand, regards the TFX as an interceptor and has requested funds for a new generation attack aircraft, the VAL. These conflicts and discrepancies obviously must be cleared up before the House can intelligently go over the head of the Secretary of Defense and authorize this added $40 million for the IMI.

Third, an adequate continental defense requires two programs—a sound defense against aircraft and a sound defense against missiles. We already possess a substantial capability in the first but the second is enormously expensive and we have not yet really begun to implement it. It is hardly practical—either financially or militarily—to further increase the former when so much work remains to be done in the latter.

Mr. Chairman, before this House decides to embark on new spending programs totaling $92 million, I think it is

essential to know first whether we would really be getting our money's worth; whether we would really be making a corresponding increase in our overall defensive strength; whether any increased defensive power that might result would exceed that which could be obtained from expending comparable funds in other directions, on other weapons systems.

In the absence of persuasive evidence to the contrary—and none has been presented—I do not believe we are justified in authorizing these additional funds, at this time.

Instead, I urge support of the Stratton amendment when it is made. And I urge support of the amendments which I will offer at the appropriate time to restore shortsighted cuts made in the military science programs; programs which have a higher priority, in my opinion, in fiscal 1965.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 9637.

I endorse the committee's recommendations though I recognize that even with this procurement authorization we will still be inadequate in certain areas. I am particularly concerned about our shipbuilding program because I am very much afraid that there are many people in the Department of Defense who do not have a full conprehension of the importance of seapower.

I was disheartened to learn that the Secretary of Defense is of the opinion that by the early 1970's there will be a reduction in the number of attack carriers.

As the importance of seapower increases with each passing day, the need for naval task forces increases correspondingly. I can see nothing in the future that will permit us to reduce our attack carriers. In fact, I am thoroughly convinced that we are going to have to have more attack carriers.

We were all impressed with Operation Big Lift, and our ability to move a division of troops by military aircraft in a short period of time. But Operation Big Lift was made possible because we prepositioned heavy equipment weeks and months in advance, and this equipment was carried in the holds of naval vessels. Operation Big Lift was possible because we had overflight rights over foreign countries. Operation Big Lift was possible because air fields were ready to receive American aircraft. But it does not take much imagination on anyone's part to visualize a situation where we would not have prepositioned equipment; we could not get overflight rights, or airfields would not be accessible to us.

Until the day arrives that we have aircraft capable of long and sustained flights carrying heavy equipment and men, and resupply, we are going to need carrier task forces, and more of them than we have today.

I would also like to endorse, without reservation, the additional $52 million that the committee added as an amendment for the development of a follow-on strategic bomber, and the $40 million added for an improved manned interceptor.

In January 1962, General LeMay directed the Deputy Chief of Staff for Research and Development, General Ferguson, to convene a group to examine the nature of a follow-on aircraft to the B–52. The question was studied intensively and a report was submitted to General LeMay last October.

The last 2 months of this 8 or 9 months' study were continued concurrent with Project Forecast, another Air Force study of broader scope. I am advised that the conclusions and findings of both studies turned out to be essentially the same.

The program which was approved consisted of first, studying a group of low-altitude manned penetrators; second, a group of high-altitude supersonic reconnaissance airplanes which were penetrators also; and third, a group of airplanes called MPLE—multipurpose long-endurance airplanes—which were large airplanes which would not penetrate, but which would stand off and launch missiles.

The concept of the program consisted of in-house studies in each of the areas, to be followed by contract studies over the winter. The study of these new SAC systems was not restricted to only these three classes, but any reasonable candidate was to be looked at. In addition, the study group was asked to look at modifications of existing airplanes.

In examining the multipurpose long-endurance concept, the Air Force conducted an extensive in-house study. This was initiated as a result of a request from Secretary McNamara that the Air Force look at and consider such a type airplane.

In 1962 the Air Force contracted for studies on the extended range strike aircraft system—ERSAS—with General Dynamics and Boeing. In addition, further in-house studies were conducted.

Advanced manned precision strike—AMPS—studies were conducted under contract by General Dynamics, Boeing, and North American. These studies have been completed and reports have been submitted to the Air Force.

The Air Force has a design for the airplane desired. This design is the result of many thousands of man-days of examination of all of the alternatives, and in addition, I am sure, an expenditure of several millions of dollars.

Testimony was that the design itself is not pressing the "state of the art." The fundamental design will take advantage of experience with the TFX. The engine is the item or subsystem requiring the longest leadtime. However, it is stated that the engine will be of a type on which one or more of the engine manufacturers is already doing component development.

Air Force testimony was that the long leadtime items are not the airframe, necessarily, but the engine and the bombing and navigation systems.

It appears to me that the Air Force has conducted sufficient studies to know that the airplane required is feasible and is within the "state of the art." No technological breakthroughs are required.

Funds should be authorized and appropriated now for the development and testing of the already identified long leadtime items, the engine and the bombing and navigation systems. The funds authorized by the Committee on Armed Services would allow this development to be accelerated during the coming fiscal year and would increase substantially the possibilities of having a follow-on system to the B–52 operational in the early 1970's.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in a bill of the magnitude of $16,914,800,000 it is very easy to get lost regarding the 1.5 percent on which there may be some disagreement, and to ignore the fact that on the 98.5 percent there has been no disagreement whatever. It is a tribute to the chairman of the committee, and the members of the committee, that despite the small disagreements on relatively small amounts the bill was reported out of the committee without a dissenting vote.

It is the differences, however, which are perhaps a little more interesting and which, of course, make the newspapers a little more conscious of what we are doing here.

I take you back to the report on the military authorization bill for last year. Starting in the middle of page 4 you will find a heading called "The RS–70 Weapons System." It goes on for the balance of page 4, page 5, page 6, and to the middle of page 7, and in all of that, they were talking about the RS–70 weapons system.

In the report for this year you will find on page 32 one paragraph of six lines entitled "XB–70." They do not call it the RS–70 this year. It is the XB–70 program. That does not mean it is out, that does not mean there is not any money in this bill for a follow-on bomber. Anybody who tells you that we are not spending money for a follow-on bomber this year, whether we put the extra $92 million in the budget or not, is talking through his hat. There is $55 million left in the B–70 program from last year, there are $20 million more for the B–70 program which we have added this year. There is $5 million in the research budget for the conceptional studies of a follow-on bomber. That is $75 million right there. In addition to that, every single month that that B–70 program is delayed costs us another $15 million.

So those who say we are not spending anything to study the concept of the follow-on bomber are not being particularly sympathetic to the views of the people back home who are paying the price.

I am glad the gentleman from California talked about the fact that we in the Research and Development Subcommittee cut $157 million from the R. & D. budget. The interesting thing is that not a dime of what we cut is being put back by this $92 million. We cut it $157 million, and the committee did not restore a dime of it. We are putting in $92 million here that the Air Force did

not ask for before the R. & D. Committee, and that was not in the original Air Force budget. We are putting in $92 million based solely on the testimony of General LeMay before the full committee. It would seem to me that the Air Force itself might almost rather have $92 million which we cut from them that they had asked for put back in than $92 million that they did not even ask for in the first place.

I should like to talk a little bit about a different program. I am later going to have an amendment to offer. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody can call me a compulsive amendment offerer. The sight of a clean bill does not trigger any Pavlovian reaction within me in a desire to substitute my language for the bill's language. In fact, after 3 years and 6 weeks in this honored and honorable body, this will be the first amendment which I have ever offered from the floor.

This amendment will cut $171 million from the Navy's portion of the bill. At the risk of saying something so classified that even Time magazine has not printed it yet, I will say that a substantial portion of this money will be found in Navy R. & D. and another substantial portion of it will be found in Navy procurement. This amendment will be aimed at that part of the Navy procurement called the VAL aircraft. You will find the VAL explained on page 11 of the committee report. Anyone with the temerity to point out that the three-line explanation there comes to about $60 million a line will be met with the argument that the details are "secret" or, as we say for the enlightenment of Members in our printed hearings, "deleted." To those of you who may feel slighted by the word "deleted," I want to say to you that as far as this program is concerned you are not missing a thing. I want to assure you further that the more you study this particular procurement the more firmly you will be convinced of the need for secrecy, not to protect the details of this program from the terrible Communists, but to keep the details of this procurement from our taxpaying constituents.

The VAL is a new attack aircraft for the Navy. It is designed to be placed on the new aircraft carriers which we are not building in the late 1960's or the early 1970's.

I hope that before you vote on this amendment you will consider two things: First of all, how this program was presented to Congress and to the American people, and second, the merits of the proposed aircraft itself.

The proposal was presented to Congress as a reprograming action. To me, a reprograming action has always meant that you take money from one authorized project and you put it into another authorized project. What was done in this instance was nothing even remotely like this. We took money away from 27 separate projects which had been authorized and put it into a new project which had not been authorized in any manner.

The Navy called it a modification of an existing aircraft. It was just a tiny little modification—consisting of a new engine, a new fuselage, new wings, and new avionics. It comes out 10 percent existing aircraft and 90 percent new aircraft. If this can be done by reprograming, the Navy can reprogram a barge into a battleship or a carrier into a catamaran.

Why did they do it by a reprograming? Because, they said, time was of the essence. So important was time that they waited from November until February before announcing that this little old $2 billion program—and that is what it will be eventually—was heading deep into the heart of Dallas. Of course, everyone in the aircraft industry knew it was heading for Dallas back in December, but the Navy played games with Congress on this procurement. They showed us in the Armed Services Committee pictures of four aircraft and they said that the changes in whichever one of these aircraft was picked would range from 30 to 90 percent. But they did not tell us they had already decided on the one which was 90 percent new plane. Since they would not tell the committee, one of the members of the committee told them on February 1. The Navy confirmed it on February 11 publicly. That was a pretty date—the House had finished the civil rights bill the day before and the Members of the House had all gone home. I cannot conceive of a better day to slide that particular announcement out.

As to the merits of this aircraft, I believe it should be judged in conjunction with the merits of all other aircraft which are now in production or which are now under development.

Aside from the long-range strategic bombers, both the Navy and the Air Force have two basic types of fighter aircraft, the interceptor aircraft, designed to fight way up there, and the attack aircraft, designed to fight way down there. The interceptor aircraft is designed to intercept other aircraft; the attack aircraft is designed to lend support to troops on the ground. What do we have today?

The Navy has plenty of interceptor aircraft designed to fight way up there. They have a plane called the F–4, and they think it is the best interceptor in the world. The Navy, however, says it needs a new attack plane called VAL.

Now, the Air Force today has a new attack plane called the F–110, and they think it is a pretty good one.

For the future, the Air Force is going to get another attack plane called the F–111. The Navy is going to get a new interceptor called the TFX. So today the Navy is producing one interceptor and preparing to produce another, but it needs a new attack plane. The Air Force is producing one attack plane and preparing to produce another. And one amazing thing about it all is that the interceptor the Navy is now producing and the attack plane the Air Force is now producing are the same plane. Another amazing thing about it all is that the TFX which the Navy calls an interceptor and the F–111 which the Air Force calls an attack plane will also be the same plane. Just by applying different labels to them the Navy says it needs a new attack plane.

The VAL program is designed to keep some production lines which were to close down this summer in operation. What will this magnificent new naval aircraft do?

I quote from Admiral Thach, page 7319 of the hearings:

Question. Admiral, can you tell me any mission which your new VAL can accomplish that the A–6A you have just shown us cannot accomplish?

Admiral THACH. No, sir. Both can accomplish the mission that we have in mind.

Question. Is it not also true that the A–6A which you have just shown us can accomplish a great many missions which the VAL that you now propose to buy cannot accomplish?

Admiral THACH. That is also true, sir.

Question. The A–6A is faster, is it not?

Admiral THACH. Yes, sir. The A–6A is slightly faster.

Question. It has a substantially greater carrying capacity for ordnance, has it not?

Admiral THACH. It has more capacity than was envisioned for this specific requirement, sir.

Question. It has a substantially greater range, has it not?

Admiral THACH. Yes, sir.

What does the Air Force think of this program? I quote from General LeMay, page 7515:

We won't be interested in it, because as I understand it, it is practically the airplane they are flying now, with a new engine in it, which would give a little more range, a little more load-carrying capability, but nothing like the TFX. And I believe the TFX will be a better airplane, not only from the users' standpoint, from a tactical standpoint, but I think it will prove out from an economic standpoint; from a cost effectiveness standpoint the TFX will be much better.

This is a brandnew $2 billion program, illegitimately conceived, and dedicated to the proposition that the Members of Congress will vote for any military program because they would rather be called soft in the head than soft on communism.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased indeed to join my Armed Services Committee colleagues today in support of this legislation authorizing the procurement of aircraft missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces.

Of course, in any procurement authorization of this size, there is bound to be some waste and unnecessary fat, but I believe that the Armed Services Committee members, our staff and the military services have done a very reasonable and commendable job in making this an efficient, economical procurement bill. I support this bill as is.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk today in reference to the so-called "fearless five." I am pleased to be a member of the "We need something new 32."

Further, I am pleased to support the position taken by Air Force Secretary Gen. Curtis LeMay, our distinguished committee chairman CARL VINSON, and the majority of the members of our committee who have recommended and approved the additional funds for the development of the advanced follow-on

manned bomber and the advanced improved manned intercepter program. We cannot afford to put all our eggs in one missile basket; we must have mix of both missiles and advanced manned aircraft.

This country will remain free only so long as we remain strong, militarily strong. We must not, indeed, we dare not, drag our feet, back down, give in, up or out. I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill points up what I consider to be a basic fault in the McNamara approach to our Nation's defense and security policy. We are spending too much money building up our conventional warfare forces while at the same time we are embarked on a slowdown in our capital investment on the side of technological advances, which is a form of pressure the adversary finds most difficult to meet over the long pull.

In this bill, the authorization for research, development, test, and evaluation is down 7 percent from what was appropriated last year, while ships and aircraft for conventional warfare are sharply up.

For example airlift aircraft is up 19 percent over last year. Ships for mine warfare is up 55 percent over last year. Amphibious ships is up 186 percent over last year. And yet it was last November that the Secretary of Defense was bragging about our then existing conventional superiority over Soviet bloc conventional forces. In an address to the Economic Club of New York, on November 18, 1963, Secretary McNamara said:

> The Warsaw Pact total, including the Soviets, is only about 4.5 million. Against that, it is today the members of NATO whose active armed forces number over 5 million. The ground forces of NATO nations total 3.2 million, of which 2.2 million men are in Europe, as against the Soviet ground combat forces total of about 2 million men, and a Warsaw Pact total of about 3 million. Both the Soviet Union and the United States forces of course include units stationed in the Far East. In central Europe, NATO has more men, and more combat troops, on the ground than does the bloc. It has more men on the ground in West Germany than the bloc does in East Germany. It has more and better tactical aircraft, and these planes on the average can carry twice the payload twice as far as the Soviet counterparts.

This bill ought to be lower by about $3 or $4 billion being wasted on unnecessary buildup of equipment for conventional warfare.

We ought to be investing more in R.D.T. & E. to strengthen our advance technology for the long haul.

In order to emphasize my views on this fundamental and important point, I intend to vote against this authorization bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] 10 minutes.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9637 and urge the adoption of this legislation.

Although differences exist respecting the emphasis to be placed on certain weapons systems, most of the members of the committee have questioned the wisdom of the Defense Department's decision to place so much reliance on missiles. Most of us are very disappointed over the indifferent attitude of the Department in the development and construction of aircraft to replace the aging B–52's and B–58's. It is an uncontroverted fact that we will have no bombers if we do not now commence a program in order that we can bring the bombers into our inventory in the seventies.

We have taken the position that our national defense effort, to be truly effective, must be based on a balanced and flexible military force, a force capable of meeting any crisis or emergency that may arise anywhere in the world, be it guerrilla warfare or nuclear attack.

When we urged passage of last year's procurement authorization bill, the grave situation in Cuba was cited as a dramatic illustration of the Communist threat we must be prepared to counter. Today, almost 1 year later, we learn that Cuba is used as a major training ground for subversive agents and guerrillas from many parts of the globe promoting takeovers by Communists throughout Latin America. Trouble brews in nearby Panama, as well as other areas around the globe. We must be ready, and that readiness must not consist of total reliance on our missile capability for our military strength. It would in my judgment, be dangerous indeed if the safety of the United States was totally dependent upon the faultless operation of electronic equipment. It is imperative that we maintain a proper mixed striking force of missiles and manned aircraft, and the decision to increase the recommendations of the Defense Department by $92 million to further this stated objective was in my opinion a most wise decision.

Although technical difficulties have naturally been encountered in the development of the RS–70 bomber program, it appears that they are being overcome and we are anticipating a test flight in the near future. It may be stated here that the money expended on this aircraft to date has paid for giant steps forward in the advancement of the art of supersonic flight.

Unless plans are made for a new bomber, the time will come, in the not distant future, when this Nation has no new bombers in the planning or production stage.

While we recognize the capabilities of the Secretary of Defense and commend him for his success to date in implementing cost reductions, I sincerely believe that he has seriously erred in his decision to deemphasize the role of long-range bombers. I am of the further opinion that he committed grave error in submitting his written statement to the committee prior to having the comments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I would hope that this would not occur in future posture hearings. I am hopeful therefore that he will see fit to direct the expenditure of the $92 million which this bill would authorize in the manner desired by an overwhelming majority of the committee. This expenditure would greatly insure the strong military posture of the U.S. strategic forces far into the 1970's and will enable us to remain as the strongest Nation in the world militarily. The cost of national security is high indeed, but it must be paid and we can afford no other position.

The committee has approved the recommendation of the Research and Development Subcommittee reducing the total R. & D. budget request by $362 million. Of this reduction $92 million was restored. I approve of the committee's action with one reservation, and that has to do with the authorization of funds for research and development of vertical takeoff and landing aircraft programs. I believe that more emphasis and more funding should have been recommended for the programs being pursued in this country. Our programs are much superior to the English programs and will favorably affect our economy.

Although this legislation authorizes the expenditure of in excess of $16.9 billion for military procurement—the largest sum authorized for this purpose in the Nation's history—the hearings before the Armed Services Committee have convinced us that any lower ceiling would not enable us to maintain the level of military preparedness the current world situation demands. Accordingly, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 9637 as reported by the committee.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], a member of the committee.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. As can be expected in a bill which is so complicated and so far reaching, and which involves so many highly technical procurement items, I naturally have some reservations. I intend to speak about those reservations, but that should in no way be interpreted as detracting from the fact that this is on balance an excellent bill and deserves the support, I believe, of every Member of this House.

First, I would like to express a doubt, a deep-rooted doubt, that this Nation is embarking speedily enough upon a military space program.

We all know that the history of warfare is one of continuing breakthrough, technologically speaking, followed by moves from potential enemies to meet that breakthrough.

I sometimes think that we in this country have a tendency to develop a system and then think, "Well, this is the ultimate." We have a tendency to get caught without having looked far enough down the road. Missiles today are looked upon as the ultimate in a defense system. I cannot believe that the history of warfare is going to change. I believe further that within a very few years a crucial advantage to a possible enemy may be gained in either inner space or outer space, or both.

I questioned General LeMay at considerable length, and Secretary Zuckert, about our military space program. Naturally the replies have to be considered as classified information. But I can say that the impression which I gained from those questions and answers was that the Air Force today is too content to wait for what NASA may be able to tell

them about requirements for a military space force.

Now, early in December some of the confusion was theoretically removed when the Secretary of Defense announced that we would embark upon a manned orbital laboratory program, which would be designed to give us some of the answers insofar as the military use of space is concerned.

At this point the aerospace industry does not have any idea where the Department of Defense—or NASA either, for that matter—intends to go in the military development of aerospace. We are rambling around here in a space cloud with no definite indication of where we are going or what our objectives are going to be. In fact, at this very moment, industry does not even know whether the MOL program is going to be handled by NASA or the Air Force.

The time has come for some decisions to be made, some objectives and guidelines to be set down and the aerospace industry told what to expect. This is a deficiency which may become acute in the near future.

For a few minutes today I would like to talk about a part of aviation which is becoming more important each year. I believe that if the possible benefits of vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft can be fully exploited there will be radical changes in the character of future military forces. This potential leads me to the conclusion that we in the Congress should strongly support development in this area.

The idea of vertical flight is certainly nothing new—for it is far older than aviation itself. Before conceiving of the glider or the powered flying machine, man always thought in terms of lift devices that would carry him straight up and down. But until fairly recently we simply did not have the technology to permit this kind of flight.

From the days of the very first aircraft, takeoff and landing characteristics have always been limiting factors. As military requirements demanded higher performance aircraft, we were forced to longer and longer runways. This was true for both propeller-driven and jet aircraft, and complicated our operational problems in a number of mission areas.

However, recent improvements in lightweight gas turbine propulsion systems have offered several promising solutions to this runway problem.

These concepts have become known as VTOL—vertical takeoff and landing—and V/STOL—vertical and short takeoff and landing. There are essentially two approaches: one would use a lift engine for the vertical portion of the flight and a separate cruise engine; the other would use the same engine for lift and cruise, with thrust deflection or engine tilting for vertical flight. When more fully developed, these concepts will reduce our dependence on airfields; make possible high performance, vertical rising fighter aircraft; permit operations in remote, primitive areas; and markedly improve our airborne assault operations.

The closer we can get the tactical aircraft to the commander's tent in the field the more efficient the aircraft will be. This is the reason for the vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft.

We happen to have two American aircraft which are ready to fly. In fact one of them will fly this week at Edwards Air Force Base in California and will be taken to Ames Laboratory at Moffett Field next month for tests in the large subsonic wind tunnel at that installation.

This particular aircraft, and the other American-made plane are funded to the extent of only a half million dollars each in this particular bill.

Now what are we doing for the tripartite development being built in England today, the British Hawker 1127? We have $12.5 million in this bill for that aircraft. They say that it is 2 years further down the research and development trail than are the American planes. Well, now, let us just explore that for a moment. This aircraft, the Hawker 1127, will fly 17 minutes with no payload at all. The reason we are putting $32.5 million into the program from all three of the participating governments—$12.5 million from ourselves—is that the powerplant has proven to be a failure and we have got to start over from scratch. So, if this airplane is 2 years ahead of anything in the United States, it is in this sense: that it has already been proven to be a flop while the American planes give promise of being successful.

Mr. Chairman, here in this country we are starving two American aircraft companies where jobless Americans could work and giving them a paltry, measly $500,000 apiece. Here we are pouring $12.5 million in this bill into a plane to be developed in England which is already a flop and which has only flown 17 minutes, with no payload at all.

Mr. Chairman, I tried a week ago Saturday morning in our committee to get a little time to discuss this matter. Unfortunately, this is a complicated bill. The requirements of the legislative schedule are very heavy. I recognize that we have to move along on these things. However, 3 minutes is all I was able to get. We poured $12.5 million down a rathole in that time for $4 million a minute. In the meantime we have starved two American companies out of their right to develop an airplane which would provide Americans with jobs. Furthermore, they are airplanes which will fly for longer than 17 minutes.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the gentleman from California aware of the fact that shortly or later on during this year the Subcommittee on Research and Development plans to look into the entire V/STOL problem in great detail, including all of the varieties of aircraft in that field the gentleman has been discussing?

May I say also to the gentleman that I believe he may be incorrect with reference to the figure which he cited, because as far as at least one of those aircraft is concerned, the consortium airplane, this was a project that we "bought into" at a time that we were somewhat behind. As the gentleman well knows, without armament, it does have a greater capability than the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. GUBSER. If I may say to the gentleman—I would like to commend not only the Subcommittee on Research and Development, but the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]—had it not been for this wonderful work that this Research and Development Subcommittee has set about this year, I would never have heard of this thing. I am delighted that now we are finally going to have a subcommittee which is going into these matters. I am quite sure if the members of the subcommittee had had more time to go into this question, we would not have this $12.5 million in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my point is simply this. That we should not pour money into a program which is already a flop and which I do not think has much chance of being much better than a flop. We should support our own aircraft industry when it clearly has the better plane.

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

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

Mr. PIKE. I want to commend the gentleman from California for the fight which he has consistently made in this regard. I believe the gentleman is absolutely right. The amount of money that we have spent abroad in the development of this vertical takeoff aircraft is out of all proportion to the return we have gotten from them. The amount that we have spent in this country is ridiculously small compared to the capability of the aircraft which are presently being produced here.

Mr. GUBSER. There is the sum of $32.5 million of U.S. money already invested in this British Hawker. It has flown only 17 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like to say to the gentleman that had the American companies received the same sort of consideration, backing, and encouragement, I venture the assertion that we would have one almost ready to be operational.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON].

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, I join my colleagues in supporting this military procurement bill with a few minor reservations which I will go into in a moment.

First, I want to pay my personal tribute to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is ably shepherding this legislation through the House. Since this bill includes the procurement of many ships for the U.S. Navy, I think it is fair to point out that this regretfully may well be the last of many ships that CARL VINSON has worked for in his remarkable career in the House of Representatives.

When we consider the Vinson-Trammell Act and what it has meant over the

past years to the maintenance of a modern U.S. Navy, we can perhaps grasp to a slight extent the imprint of this man's personality on the modern Navy of today. There is no question in my mind that CARL VINSON deserves the title of "Father of the Modern U.S. Navy." My hometown of San Diego, Calif., recently gave the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] the title of "Honorary Citizen of San Diego" and, of course, he is already known as "Honorary Admiral of the Fleet."

As to this specific legislation, I support the general procurement items in the aircraft, missiles, and ships, but expressed great concern in the committee about the lack of emphasis by the Air Force on military space activities. I believe it will be imperative for us to maintain in the future complete military control of space if we are to be adequately defended in the space age. I do not believe the Air Force has pursued the military possibilities of space with sufficient vigor and enterprise.

Testimony before our committee has revealed that a real bomber gap will develop early in the seventies unless we follow the lead of this committee in deciding today to approve the $52 million added by the committee for bomber development. I have no intention of pitting missiles against bombers, but I do agree with the majority of the committee that this Congress would be derelict in not moving forward immediately with a long-range bomber program.

I find fault as well with the failure of our committee to provide sufficient emphasis in the Vertol field. In this bill we seem to be gambling research and development funds on the British designed P–1127 Hawker vertical takeoff aircraft. As our share of this agreement with the British and Germans, we are granting $12.5 million this year on an aircraft that has performed miserably in its initial tests and offers little promise toward becoming a workable aircraft. On the other hand, the two American designed and manufactured aircraft in this category are given this year $500,000 apiece despite the great promise both of these American products show.

Personally, I can see some merit in off-the-shelf procurement of foreign military items that are superior to our own, but it is plain foolishness for us to lavish research dollars in this important new vertical takeoff field and grant insufficient funds for competing American-made products.

I also feel compelled to express my concern over another reduction in the research and development expenditures. It is in this area that we insure ourselves for the future. We cannot afford to let technology development lag in any area. Particularly am I concerned with research and development of weapons designed for use in guerrilla warfare, counterinsurgency, and limited war situations.

The committee's recommended denial of Navy requested funds for development of a special warfare airplane for counter-insurgency and limited war application causes me great concern. This new aircraft is proposed specifically for the situations I have just enumerated. According to testimony, no present day in-service aircraft has the desired capability. This aircraft would see service with both the Marine Corps and the Army in trouble areas such as Vietnam. Significant studies within the Marine Corps over the past few years and recently augmented by Department of Defense analysis, attest to the desirability and practicability of developing a simple, inexpensive but rugged aircraft tailored to this mission. The Department of Defense, through the Navy Bureau of Weapons, formally advertised for proposals from industry for such an aircraft. No less than 12 contractors have been underway with this effort at their own expense for several months in response to this request. Results of this effort are already significant. Large amounts of wind tunnel data have been generated, mockups have been built and the validity of proceeding with the program is virtually at hand. The fact is, that this new airplane, scheduled to be developed and built on a firm fixed price contract, can be produced for less dollars than modification of existing airframes which would themselves only partially satisfy the requirements. I believe it is fair to say that since the industry has already invested at least $12 million in preliminary studies, we should meet them halfway, at least.

The COIN airplane is designed to perform aerial reconnaissance, close support for ground troops, helicopter escort and a variety of light logistic tasks. It is in every sense of the word, a state-of-the-art development. It will be powered by two 600-horsepower turboprop engines. It will take off in less than 800 feet over a 50-foot obstacle with a full combat load. The landing distance will be less than 800 feet over a 50-foot obstacle. This short takeoff and landing capability will permit use of the aircraft from unprepared fields, roads, and so forth, thus allowing operation of the aircraft directly with the ground troops. As a consequence, it will instantly be available for close support. In addition to its combat capability, without any modification, the aircraft can carry two litter patients and three additional passengers or upward of 4,000 pounds of cargo.

Vietnam is only one example of what is happening in many places around the world and in my opinion a versatile, rugged aircraft such as the proposed COIN aircraft is a valid requirement. Since so much has already been invested, on faith, because of the call for proposals by the Bureau of Weapons, it is my considered judgment that it is unwise and unfair to recommend denial of the $6 million requested to verify this program. These limited funds will produce several aircraft for test purposes, the results of which will be available within 18 months. Our judgment should then be made on these test results. It is my recommendation that the House reinstate the $6 million requested for this program.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my remarks come at a time when there is the least dissension in the debate on the floor. I would hope like a gentle but copious rainfall in mid-May in the Ozark hills, the lightning sometimes flashes, and the thunder rolls, and that likewise, what I have to say will fall on and startle the ears of the listeners.

I want to associate myself with everything that has been said by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Milledgeville, Ga., who has led this procurement military armed services program today, and I, too, hope he will return early, often, and long.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9637. For almost a month and a half, members of our committee have held sessions with Secretary of Defense McNamara and his civilian or military chiefs. We have, in marking up the bill, tried to be as frugal as possible, without reducing the forces that are necessary to insure the national security and the carrying out of national policy. I would like to address myself to an even more basic and profound premise.

Seventeen billion dollars is no small amount of money, but I believe it is considerably less than those who would bury us are committed to spend during this same period for weapons of war. Within the past week, we have heard it reported that a new ring of missile bases are being built around Moscow, and possibly Leningrad. Presumably these are to house antimissile missiles. These actions are hardly those of a nation which has any serious expectation of success, in the current disarmament talks. They are more likely the actions of a nation which intends to be prepared for any eventuality, and to take advantage of any weakness which their "capitalist" adversaries might demonstrate.

We cannot afford to be any less vigilant, and the funds contained in this bill are designed to maintain and strengthen our deterrent. I believe we would do well to consider the words of our first President whose birthday we will soon celebrate.

He said:

> There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it. If we desire to secure peace, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

The dollars contained in the bill we are considering today, will not, by themselves, secure the peace. They will only provide the tools of deterrence, which our committee believes are necessary and vital to security. We must be, as a nation, like our Coast Guard, always ready—"semper paratus." It will remain the responsibility of our present leadership to be aware of that strength in the forging of a strong foreign policy. If others can be persuaded that we are not willing to use our national assets to guard and protect vital American interests, then we are today really wasting $17 billion representing blood, sweat, and tears of millions of American taxpayers. If there is no will, there is no way. If no backbone, honor will not long remain. If our policy is always based on

fear, we shall neither lead—nor long have opportunity. In short, we must lead in demonstrating responsibility and progress.

I prefer to hope, Mr. Chairman, that America will not give further credence to the naive hope of some of our adversaries that we are "paper tigers." I prefer to hope, Mr. Chairman, that when a foreign nation defiles our flag, murders our citizens, or insults us in their government controlled press, that we will at the very least, shut off the flow of American dollars. And if the circumstances are such that stronger action is called for, I prefer to hope that our approval of these funds today will give the Commander in Chief whatever assurance he needs that this body is ready to support whatever is required to uphold our national honor. I prefer to have faith in the informed judgment of our peoples, who I find are usually well ahead of both the legislative and executive branches in their desire to get on with the job. We must always be vigilant and ready, plus willing, even in spite of danger of death, which is not the worst thing to befall man in life on earth. The haunting and ever present question is, "Do we have the will?"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to pay my great respects to my distinguished chairman. We have heard said here what his intentions are at the end of this session, but for 49 years he has been in this House of Representatives. Half of that time, almost 25 of them, I have labored with this dedicated American. He has led by example. Never did he count the hours of his dedication, nor indeed, has he ever placed a dollar mark ahead of the security of this country.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Georgia has been here for nearly 50 years. I want everyone to know that I share the views of the gentleman who is now addressing the House, and to add that the gentleman from Georgia will be the model committee chairman for others in the House to follow, for many more than 50 years to come. I doubt that he will ever have a peer.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

He has been the father of more things to save America than any man since the dawn of this country's birth. I consider it a privilege to have been with this dedicated American, to serve and labor in his vineyard. As I have said on many occasions, I have sat at his feet as St. Paul sat at the feet of Gamaliel. If you do not know who Gamaliel was, come to my office and I will tell you. I want to pay my respects also to the subcommittee, the new subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], on research and development. Mr. VINSON selected this subcommittee with great care and he placed in its membership men of unquestioned ability—unquestioned ability, indeed, and of dedication.

When they made their report, the committee did not detract from it in one iota. Indeed, it was so good we upped it $92 million just to be sure.

Someone has said and talked about the "fearless four" and the "fearless five." I do not know who they are talking about. But I am glad I hold membership in the "thinking 33." I would rather be wrong in the company of CARL VINSON than 50 younger men of a later persuasion. I do not want to detract from anything that these attractive young men have said. But they just happen to be wrong—they just happen to be wrong. We cannot get angry with them—we cannot get mad with them.

Let us talk about what this bill contains. I am not here to debate what they have proposed. I will debate that when their proposals are offered.

I want to address myself to what is in this bill. If, indeed, I know anything, it it because of 24 years on this committee and its predecessor under the leadership of Mr. VINSON. This is a $16,914 million bill. We spent day and night to the tune of almost 50 hours on this bill—over 45 hours—day and night. This is not easy with a so-called civil rights bill running concurrently with its deliberation. It takes a lot out of a man to be objective under these conditions. What did we bring to you? We brought to you one of the most comprehensive bills or proposals since we assumed jurisdiction in this area. You have heard Mr. ARENDS and what he had to say about the mission of the Congress. Just to refresh your memory, let me tell you what the Constitution has told you to do. I did not write the Constitution. I wish they would not change it without our having an opportunity to consider it over in another branch of the Government and in the fourth estate. But this is what the Constitution says. This is what you are charged with—"raise armies"—"provide for a navy"—"to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." No other branch of the Government is given this responsibility. It is placed in your hands directly by the Constitution of the United States. They did not say the Treasury Department. They did not say the State Department. They did not say the Commerce Department. The Constitution says the defense of this country is your responsibility. Let me tell you what this Congress did. We created the Polaris submarine. I am glad I had a little something to do with that.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying the Supreme Court has not changed that constitutional provision to which he has referred?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Not much.

Mr. GROSS. Well, not yet?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They have not changed the Constitution since yesterday—nightfall has not come yet. I would not put anything past them—if you do not fully understand my position.

Let me tell you something. We started a Polaris submarine—thank God we did.

This Congress accelerated the airlift. Thank God we did.

We have a plane that can fly 5,000 miles with 159 soldiers in their battle dress.

It will cost over $2 billion when our procurement is completed. This is our program.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORBLAD. I would like to express my compliments to the gentleman as the leader in the airlift and for the fine job that he has done as a member of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman. Someone has said the Committee on Research and Development did not suggest that we have a follow-on model. Well, they did not ask the right man. If they had asked me, they would have found out. This is no reflection on the subcommittee, they are going to do a magnificent job and it will be implemented if I have anything to do with it. Their work will be adequate to keep them busy, because they are capable, they are competent, and they are headed by a distinguished and dedicated American. But, remember this: The B–47's are gone, the B–52's are on the way out, and the B–58's really have never been used too much.

CARL VINSON says this—and he is a pretty good source of authority to quote:

> They will be worn out before we have a new one if indeed we do not do something about it.

So many of us, I included, interrogated General LeMay and said, "Do you need a follow-on for the B–52?" He said, "Indeed I do. Indeed I do." In substance, if not verbatim, he said, "I want something to complement the missiles."

You have heard Mr. VINSON talk about the Atlas, the Titan, and the Minuteman. These generations are going, but I can tell you that the B–52 is already obsolescent and there is nothing on the drawing board. Nothing. The $52 million which we have suggested you put in this is for the in-house continuation of the research and development to place one on the drawing boards.

I guess the wisest of philosophers was Aristotle. He is alleged to have said—and I take it on authority that he did—that only the dead have seen the end of war. You remember your history. What did Carthage do? Carthage in good faith sent the best young men that they had to Rome for the disarmament proposals of that time. What happened to them? They went to Rome on a one-way ticket. And what happened to Carthage? It was plowed under and covered by centuries of sand. I am not willing to put my faith in the future of my country in Geneva or in anybody's disarmament conference or, indeed, in missiles. I want B–52's and follow-on bombers, so many of them that we will not have runways to hold them. I want the latest type missiles that California

can produce, and I want so many of them that they will stick up like goosepimples.

Sam Rayburn—and he was a very great American—said this: "I would rather be a live American with an empty pocketbook than a dead one with a full one." This is my philosophy. I do not want to cut to save a few dollars and then lack for something. I would rather have an overcoat than want one, if you catch the point.

Now, take the planes of my own knowledge. Planes happen to be my hobby. Also ships. Let me tell you about ships. We will not have a navy if arithmetic is a sound science. We had a little investigation of our naval vessels. These are the things I remember. I do not have to read this from notes. These are the things I remember. We had a ship-obsolescence subcommittee look into this; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] were on it, and I forget who else—three of us, I think. We made a report on it. The Navy told us that in 1973 they would have 335 ships in the fleet that could be used. At this time they have 870-plus.

Now, this is 1964. It is 9 years to 1973. Take 3 years off of that, which leaves 6 years, because it takes 3 years to build some of them. If you have 875 ships now, in 1973 you will have 335. You have got 6 years. If my arithmetic is correct, you will have to build 80 ships every year. If you build 50 as we are doing now we will come up with, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] said, something like 135 to 150 short. So, carried to its logical conclusion, there may come a time when you will not have any because you come up short every 10 years with 150 ships.

Now, for the Navy, we have increased missions. We took on the Red Sea the other day. Obsolescence is catching up with us.

This is a modest proposal we are bringing to you. Take the fighter airplane. We are recommending to you now that we give to this country an improved manned interceptor. What new airplanes do we have in the interceptor business? We only have one and it is obsolescent, the F–106. There is the F4H, one of the greatest planes ever designed, made by McDonnell. We have the A3E series of Douglas. But the Air Force planes are obsolescent. We want to get the VAL plane. We have recommended the VAL to take its place. But we do not have a brandnew plane as an interceptor. I defy anybody to tell me that we have one. The best we have today is an obsolescent interceptor.

So our committee, responsive to its responsibility and in view of what I read you from the Constitution, have come to you and told you that we propose that we build an improved manned interceptor.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has said, "Don't put all your eggs in one basket." Let us have a James Forrestal philosophy, a rounded defense. You cannot place your faith in the parliament of man. This war may come.

This is our proposal, and out of a $600 billion gross national product we are asking you to give us $92 million.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Unlike the gentleman, I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. He said we had no new planes coming along; that we had no new interceptor. We have the TFX coming along and they are going to spend something like $6 or $7 billion on that aircraft. Is that not an interceptor?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the gentleman use his own figures. We have not got that now. My figures are from Gen. Curtis LeMay. I take him for my authority. Besides, the TFX is an all-purpose airplane and the TFX is only a proposal. The TFX came from the Department of Defense exclusively. The manned interceptor comes from the Committee on Armed Services, and I know of no better authority.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman will agree that the TFX is not an interceptor?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It is an all-purpose airplane. Everybody knows it is not an interceptor. The gentleman knows that I know better than that.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the Navy says that it is an interceptor, does it not?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I can tell you more about airplanes than a show dog can jump over. We do not have a new one. You better get on that bandwagon while time remains. Let us get the airlift. We do not have any new airplanes but the 141 that is in production. We have got the obsolete 124's; the interim 130–E's, the interim 135's. The only one we have is the 141. And this came from the Congress.

We have never advised you wrong. Place your confidence in that wise old Georgian.

I have never been wrong in 24 years in following his advice and I believe his advice will stand this country in good stead for many years to come.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE. I do not like to take the gentleman off his subject, but there is one problem that concerns me and one which I believe concerns many other Members of the House.

I would like to know whether or not the Defense Department has changed its policy in awarding contracts to surplus labor areas in the Nation?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My information is that they have not. They have not changed that policy. I believe I have a note on that somewhere. Let me see if I have it here. I am glad the gentleman asked me because I felt that someone would. I had this problem come up in my own district. I lost a contract on this.

I am informed that with respect to allocation of contracts—I assume the gentleman is talking about labor surplus areas—that the policy has not changed and the contracting officers must follow the monthly publication issued from the Commerce Department which shows the labor situation all over the country by State and by area. If all factors are equal between two bidders, the bidder from an area where a labor surplus is a fact gets the contract.

Does this answer the gentleman's question?

Let me say this in closing: This is a modest, a modest, proposal. But we have labored over this. We recommend this to the consideration of the committee and of the House, because it is a comprehensive budget. I believe it will do the job. If it does not, we have next year. But this will stand us for this year. We recommend it to you.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman knows, I am in full support of the bill, with the exceptions that have been noted and with some concern about some other areas in the bill. But can the gentleman tell the members of the committee if we today authorize the proposal for the $52 million and the $40 million for both the follow-on bomber and the improved manned interceptor, can the gentleman give the members of the committee any assurance that the Committee on Appropriations will appropriate that money?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question. I almost forgot to put that in. I have already received my orders to appear before the Appropriations Committee, where I have always been received with sympathy, courtesy, and outstanding cooperation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great satisfaction to the eloquent plea of the gentleman from South Carolina that our armed services not be equipped with obsolete equipment.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, the United States of America is about to engage upon a $277 million expenditure for an attack aircraft carrier which will be obsolete when the keel is laid, which will be obsolete when it is launched, and which will be obsolete every minute during the 25 to 30 years of its expected life.

This in my opinion is a gross error. It is in my opinion an error that the Congress of the United States should correct and which the Congress of the United States can correct. And, let me say to my colleagues, whether you are for or against aircraft carriers, one is about to be built. The issue, thus, is not

whether or not one shall be built, but whether or not the one that will be built will be an obsolete carrier, less effective, less powerful, less safe, or whether it will be the most modern equipped that this United States of America can place upon the seas of the world in the protection of its life, freedom, and order. I intend to offer the members of the committee the opportunity to make that decision by an amendment which will cause that new carrier to be constructed as a modern, up-to-date propelled U.S. naval vessel rather than an obsolete, conventionally propelled vessel.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] 2 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, in preparation for carrying out our increased responsibility to review all military research, development, test, and evaluation authorization requests, beginning this year, the Subcommittee on Research and Development received some 30 briefings last fall. The purpose of these briefings was to become more familiar with existing research and development programs and those projected for fiscal year 1965. In our review the subcommittee heard from some 56 witnesses representing the Department of Defense and each of the military services. The information presented comprised almost 2,500 pages of transcribed testimony. This material was not printed as a hearing volume because much of the unclassified information was included in the hearings released by the Appropriations Committee.

Despite this comprehensive study and review, I am the first to admit that the Research and Development Subcommittee neither knows all nor sees all that goes on in the vast area of military research and development. We have only scratched the surface. However, I do feel that we have acquired a limited knowledge of the subject and that we are better qualified to make recommendations to the Congress today than we were a year ago.

The Defense budget submitted to the Congress included a request for new obligational authority of $6.572 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation. This request compares with the $6.949 billion appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 1964; the $7.008 billion in fiscal year 1963 and the $6.402 billion in fiscal year 1962.

The recommendations of the Subcommittee on Research and Development reduced the requested amount by $362.5 million. This reduction was distributed among the services as follows:

[In millions]

Army	$62.0
Navy	121.5
Air Force	157.0
Defense agencies	22.0
Total	362.5

The amount recommended by the subcommittee, $6.2095 billion, is $739.5 million below the amount appropriated last year, and $798.5 million below fiscal year 1963. In subsequent action, the full committee increased the amount requested by the Air Force for aircraft research and development by $92 million. This "add on" has been discussed by the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON. The subcommittee received a special briefing on the follow-on strategic aircraft during its review of the fiscal year 1965 programs. However, no request was made for increasing the amount funded above the $5 million contained in the budget. General LeMay's testimony before the full committee and my review of the information presented to the subcommittee convinced me that the Air Force requirements and design concept are far enough along now to permit a more rapid development program during fiscal year 1965. The funds added by the Armed Services Committee would permit initiation of development and testing of the longest leadtime elements such as the engine and the avionics system.

The other "add on" by the full committee was for an improved manned interceptor—IMI. This development program was not presented to the Research and Development Subcommittee. I hope that in the future, if the military departments have an urgent requirement for a weapons system such as this, they will feel free to discuss the matter with the subcommittee which has the assigned responsibility of reviewing research and development programs prior to seeking the support of the full committee. However, in this instance, as in most instances, I bow to the wisdom and judgment of my chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and I will support the amount recommended to accelerate the development of this new airplane.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, Dr. Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, stated that program and budgetary decisions in both research and exploratory development are appropriately made more on the basis of the overall "level of effort" than on detailed program content. He further stated that for fiscal year 1965 the exploratory development category reflects a slight decrease below what was initially programed in fiscal year 1964. He justified this reduction with the following statement:

> We are convinced that substantial increases in the effectiveness of exploratory development dollars are possible which may well more than compensate for this small decrease in budgetary support. During this coming year one of our primary concerns will be to seek out and identify those management conditions which have in the past proven to be highly productive of militarily useful results. We then intend to initiate new policies which will make these favorable conditions more widespread than they have been in the past in the expectation that this will result in more defense for each exploratory development dollar expended.

I commend the Defense Department for this attitude and approach toward economy and efficiency. Further, I believe that the same or similar techniques should be applied to all categories of research and development, and not just to exploratory development alone. I am convinced that substantial increases in the effectiveness in research and development dollars are possible by improved management techniques, improved selectivity and objectivity of programs and better coordination among the military services and with other Government agencies. It was on this premise that the subcommittee made its recommendations for reductions totaling $362.5 million. The recommended reductions are discussed by budget activity beginning on page 23 of the committee report. The report also contains a summary chart for each department broken down by budget activities and the amount recommended for each activity.

During the past year noteworthy accomplishments have been achieved in the research and development area. One of the most outstanding of these is the Polaris missile system. Others are the Shillelagh and Tow in the Army antitank arsenal and the C–141 transport aircraft for the Air Force. These successful development programs, along with the cancellation of certain unsuccessful programs, such as Dyna-Soar and Typhon, reflect a reduction in the amount requested in the fiscal year 1965 budget of over $650 million. One way of interpreting the subcommittee's action, in reducing the authorization by $362.5 million, is that we have placed in reserve or saved approximately half of this and have allowed the balance to be allocated to other development programs.

In our recommendations, the subcommittee endeavored to be objective in its criticism and understanding of the problems of the military departments. However, in view of the increased attention now being focused on research and development, I believe that a critical analysis was warranted. In the past the committee, and the Congress, rarely has questioned the requests or requirements of the military departments for new weapons systems. With the coming of the missile age and the supersonic aircraft, the tendency has been to overlook the conventional and less sophisticated systems needed for limited and special warfare.

This oversight was corrected several years ago with increased funding and emphasis on the latter areas. Now the services appear to be in a race to stake out roles and mission claims in the special warfare area. I do not intend to discuss this further at this time, but merely indicate an impression that did influence my position on several of the research and development authorizations requested by the military departments.

It appears to me that we have reached a plateau in the level of Defense spending for research and development. Unless there is a drastic change in the military threat in the near future, we should be able to enjoy this leveling-off condition in terms of expenditures for several years to come. Because of this belief I feel that the proposed reduction to the research and development budget will neither impair nor delay the development and acquisition of the weapons systems needed to meet present or future defense requirements.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. At this time I would like to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. Having the honor of serving with him as the ranking minority member of that committee, I compliment the gentleman for the magnificent job he has done. He has well prepared our meetings, and I compliment the gentleman for the very splendid service he has rendered.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, we are not capitalizing on some of our most important assets in the field of foreign relations. Recently the United States and Mexican Governments completed the Chamizal Treaty concerning certain disputed property in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez area of Texas and Mexico. The fact that the greatest power in the world today sat down with a sister state to negotiate as equals over disputed property should have been publicized far and wide, throughout Latin America and the world. For it completely puts the lie to our detractors here and abroad.

The Chamizal Treaty was entered into and worked out by President Kennedy and completed by President Johnson. By the terms of this treaty 437 acres of land are being transferred from the United States to Mexico. This is a matter of tremendous moment, exceeding by far the actual amount of land involved. In the world today, where the guiding principles of the Communist bloc are almost exclusively based on power politics, great and powerful nations just do not ordinarily sit down with weaker ones, listen to their demands and grant their just requests. Such disputes usually end in conflict in which the larger fishes gobble up the smaller ones. But this is not the American way. The United States has always been a nation of right, not might.

The entire world needs to know of the Chamizal Treaty. It reveals the falseness and the baseness of the charges of the Communists and our other enemies that we are not a freedom-loving and a peace-loving Nation. The United States has actively sought peace and will continue to do so within the bounds of reason and national security. The Chamizal Treaty is a testament to this.

In furtherance of our efforts to win the peace and to befriend freedom-loving people everywhere President Johnson is leaving Washington, D.C., today to meet with the President of Mexico. One of America's most widely read and most perceptive and thoughtful political columnists is Drew Pearson. His column for this morning concerns in part the forthcoming conference between President Lyndon B. Johnson and President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico. Mr. Pearson writes of some of the evils that have hampered relations with our good neighbor to the south. But he also very effectively reveals the basic humanity and good will of the American people. In this lies our true source of strength and our hope for the future.

With the unanimous consent of the Members of this House, I would like to have reprinted in the RECORD the column of Drew Pearson which appears in the Washington Post, February 20, 1964:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND: JOHNSON HOLDS MEXICO'S ESTEEM

(By Drew Pearson)

For almost 100 years any Texan was always suspected, sometimes hated, by Mexico. Its people remembered—just as vividly as Texans remembered the Alamo—the War of 1848 when a good slice of Mexico was chopped off by fire-eating, pistol-packing, land-hungry Texans.

Fifty years ago, perhaps even 20 years ago, no one would have believed that a President of Mexico would sit down on American soil to confer with a Texas-born President of the United States.

The fact that it is happening this week is due in part to the more commonsense shown by both nations; in part to the two men who are meeting in Los Angeles; and in part to the people of San Antonio who elected a Spanish-American, HENRY GONZALEZ, to Congress, and to the people of El Paso who elected another Spanish-American, Raymond Telles, as their mayor.

President Adolfo Lopez Mateos is a moderate who has continued the land and economic reforms of the Mexican revolution—at first bitterly opposed by the United States. Lopez Mateos has realized that American tourist trade and American investments mean the difference between prosperity and poverty; so without sacrificing anything in the way of Mexican pride and sovereignty, he has gone out of his way to work at friendship.

He became the first Mexican President in history to cross into Texas, when he visited the L.B.J. ranch while Mr. Johnson was Vice President. And previously he conferred with Mr. Johnson at Acapulco when Mr. Johnson was Senate majority leader.

JOHNSON'S FRIENDSHIP

President Johnson, in turn, is revered in Mexico as perhaps few other American Presidents. Mexicans remember how he toured San Antonio in an old pickup truck campaigning for HENRY GONZALEZ and conceived the brilliant idea of bringing Pepe Cantinflas, popular star of "Around the World in 80 Days," to San Antonio to help GONZALEZ.

But most of all, Mexicans remember an event which occurred during the Korean war when the people of Three Rivers, Tex., refused to bury a Mexican-American boy killed in battle.

The brother of the Governor of Taxco told the story when Johnson went to that city in 1958. Tears streamed down his face as he spoke, and Johnson, who doesn't speak Spanish well, couldn't understand the reason. But here is what the Mexican said:

When a Mexican boy, drafted into the American Army, was killed in Korea, his body was brought back to Three Rivers, Tex., where he had lived. But the one funeral parlor in that little town would not give him a burial because he was a Mexican.

"Whereupon the Senator from Texas who is with us today telephoned from Washington: 'I can't make the funeral parlor bury this boy, but I can bring his body to Arlington National Cemetery in Washington and bury him alongside Presidents.'

"And that," said the Mexican speaker, "is what the Senator from Texas did."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, it was not until just a few minutes ago that I knew that I was going to have the privilege of closing debate on this bill. In summation, I should like to be as succinct and as simple as possible, because the issue is very simple.

There is not a Member of this House who does not know that it was a great American, Al Smith, who said, "Let's look at the record." If I knew who said it first I would give him credit when I say, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating."

We are faced here in one area with making a decision which we have made many times before, and that is the area of disagreement as to whether or not this Congress shall discharge its responsibility as written into the Constitution to support the armies and navies of this country. It is in that area that we almost come to an oversimplification of who is right and who is wrong.

Recognizing fully the fact that we have been thwarted in the past by the executive branch's refusing to take our direction or to fund the appropriations which have been given them, we nevertheless cannot escape the fact that it is our responsibility to guide the way. Oh, I know the story of the RS–70. Many of you were not here when the carrier *United States* was canceled out by Executive order.

But if you look back in history and see exactly where the real leadership has come from in the military, you will find it has come from this body, as led by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I certainly will not waste words or time to gild the lily—not enough can be said of him and of his great leadership.

You heard the distinguished and beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives stand here today and make the statement about who led the way on the Polaris, the most powerful weapons system the world has ever known in its entire history. It was the Congress who put that weapon in our hands and built the Navy and the defenses we have. Maybe it is significant that the present Secretary of Defense was not in office then when the Department of Defense followed the lead of the Congress. Perhaps, if that were the case, we would not have had the Polaris today. I can only speak of the future by the past.

The chairman has been most gracious in his comments about the subcommittee which I had the great privilege of heading over the past 12 years. He has been most gracious in naming me as a leader in this field. But this work was not done alone. If ever there was a bipartisan subcommittee, it was that subcommittee. I pause to pay tribute to my dear friend, former Congressman Hess, who headed the subcommittee 1 year and to pay tribute to my successor to whom I have handed the reins and who has helped me so well, the gentleman from Virginia,

PORTER HARDY. In associating myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] as to his appreciation, I point out to him, I too have been frustrated. But I have never despaired though I have been on the brink of despair many times. If I had despaired and if the subcommittee which I headed had despaired, you would have a Secretary of Defense reporting to this Congress today that by 1967 he will be able to save $4 billion a year. He did not say it in his statement, but he conceded as a result of questioning that he owed a great debt to the committee and the GAO. Where did the guidance come from?

It came from 12 long years of prodding by the Committee on Armed Services beginning back with the single catalog as introduced by our former colleague, Jack Anderson, of California, up through the so-called chamber of horrors and up through the hearings and hearings on hearings—and based on accounts furnished by the General Accounting Office and brought to the attention of the public—based on a competitive bidding piece of legislation originally introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and later introduced by me, passed by this body and the other body, and enacted into law. There is not a single instance in this saving of $4 billion where the guidance has not come from the Committee on Armed Services. But it is a tribute, at least to the ingenuity of the Secretary of Defense who is a genius of management, and I think one of the strongest and most effective Secretaries of Defense I have ever met. And I pay him tribute.

If I had a big business and I wanted a great manager of an automobile outfit like General Motors or Ford or Chrysler, I would unhesitatingly put the Secretary of Defense in charge. He is a genius at management and he has demonstrated it here where he has followed the leadership of people who know. But if I want to know something about the military—if I want to know what the future of America is in the air—I will take Curtis LeMay's word for it.

Too many times now, and continuing too many times, the beardless striplings of the whiz kids are superseding the judgment of the people who have devoted and dedicated their lives to their country in uniform. Why only yesterday it developed in the hearings that the Surgeon General does not have a thing to say about the hospitals in the country. It is a sad state of affairs, I am sure you will agree.

The words I say here are now merely echoing the words you heard in the past. The words may be a little different, but the melody is the same. It is our decision today, now, again, to make positive that we will follow the experts. My friends, the distinguished gentlemen, the self-styled "fearless five," are now reduced down to four. I claim no fearlessness. I am scared to death about what is happening around us, and I am so scared that is the reason why I make this appeal as forcefully as I can for you to support this committee; vote down any amendment that is offered. The gentlemen have asked why did not General LeMay suggest in the Committee on Research and Development, which is headed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], who has done a magnificent job, that he needed this. Why? How could they be so naive? Perhaps the tribute belongs to their youth. They will learn when they get older. Those men in uniform cannot volunteer one single word or iota of information of anything that they believe unless they are asked the right questions, and they were not asked the right questions until they got before the full committee. Then, as the gentleman from New York said, I think after General LeMay said what he had to say through direct questioning of some of us on the committee, he was immediately gagged. This is what we have to put up with. I do not know whether the Defense Department will spend this extra $92 million or not. I do not know, but it is our responsibility to express ourselves here today and to repeat, repeat, and repeat, perhaps with frustration upon frustration, but let us never despair. I exhort you and I ask you, certainly as a great tribute to a great American, to follow the leadership of that distinguished gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, because we shall never see his like here again.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the committee bill calling for updating our Nation's arsenal of weapons and assuring a strong and prepared America.

In these perilous times, we cannot afford to permit any part of our vital defense structure to become obsolete or inadequate to maintain our security.

The committee bill is our best insurance of peace today, for the men in the Kremlin understand the language of strength and preparedness better than any other.

I personally regret the committee cuts in research, development, test, and evaluation programs for each of the services, for these programs are indispensable to the preparedness of the Nation in the future, and I am convinced the Bureau of the Budget had already cut severely in these fields.

The day is not far away when mastery of space will be just as essential to the security of America as mastery of the air and the seas is essential today. I seriously question that our military research and development effort in the field of space is adequate, in view of cutbacks already imposed by administrative action.

On balance, however, I support the committee recommendations, and commend the great chairman and other members of the committee for an outstanding legislative job.

The bill should be, and I am sure will be, overwhelmingly approved by the Congress.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the Stratton amendment to strike out of H.R. 9637 the $92 million for a new bomber development program in the Department of the Air Force budget which is not wanted by President Johnson, not recommended by the Secretary of Defense, and was only added to the $16,914,800,000 appropriation bill which we are considering today upon the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee after hearing of testimony by the Air Force alone.

It is clear from the committee's report, as well as the minority report, that this is a continuation of the RF–70 bomber program which has been acknowledged by the Air Force itself as a failure in spite of the expenditure of $1.3 billion. This is completely contrary to President Johnson's economy-in-Government directive, a directive which has been fully agreed to by the Congress. It is not a matter of not appropriating enough money for a strong national defense which is involved in this question. It is entirely clear that the remaining amount to be appropriated under H.R. 9637 is adequate to provide a strong defense program for fiscal year 1965. This is but another attempt by defense industry lobbyists to coerce Congress into a new subsidy program for the aircraft industry. Adequate funds are provided in this bill, H.R. 9637, without this $92 million item to provide for research and development for any needed new aircraft program. In fact, the committee in executive session reduced the research and development requests by $362 million.

Secretary of Defense McNamara deserves the commendation of this Congress for his courage and determination in effecting economies in his Department over the past 2 years, economies which have saved the American taxpayer several billions of dollars. It would, indeed, be irresponsible, in this instance, for Congress to force $92 million on Secretary of Defense McNamara for an unjustified program he does not want or need.

The time has come for Congress to face up to its responsibilities to not only talk about reducing Federal expenditures but to follow the lead of President Johnson and be frugal.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, according to page 7059 of the hearings held in connection with H.R. 9637, this bill will authorize $1,474 million in fiscal year 1965 for Department of Defense space research and development programs. This represents a reduction of approximately $140 million from the level appropriated for fiscal year 1964. It is incredible that at a point in history where the Soviet Union is continuing its stepped-up military space programs and scoring space success after space success, our Defense Department's answer to this challenge is to reduce further the already underfunded military space program.

Contrary to what the administration would have us believe, the billions of dollars being expended by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are not and cannot provide all of the answers to the problems facing this Nation with respect to the military implications of space and the military threat from space which Soviet space activities indicate.

Last year, during debate on the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1964, the possible error of our present course was widely discussed. Since that time the administration has consistently refused

to recognize the danger to the security of this Nation and the free world which is implicit in our present course. This bill, with a reduction of military space expenditures, is a monument to the negligence of the administration and its failure to recognize the need for a dramatically improved military space capability.

Space provides a new dimension in military strategy. It presents boundless opportunities to the nation which would achieve such a dominant military advantage that it could inflict its aggressive aims upon free societies.

Mastery of near or inner space—the 100-to-500-mile belt surrounding the earth—could provide critical military advantages, enabling a nation to extend and preserve a deterrent strength, or to control, or inhibit those who would use their power aggressively to dominate life on earth. Specifically these advantages include a superior capability in reconnaissance, intelligence, and communications, an ability to direct and control far-flung ground, sea, and air operations, the defensive potential to destroy or neutralize an aggressor's missiles or his space-launched attack vehicles, and the retaliatory capability to respond with space weapons to a surprise attack.

The nation developing only limited military space competence could find itself in the role of a supplicant to a nation which has successfully developed these techniques and employs them to achieve its political aims. For these reasons, the minimal emphasis being given to military considerations in current U.S. space programs exposes the United States to a grave risk. Perhaps nothing is so portentous for the future security of the United States as the prompt establishment of realistic priorities in space expenditures.

Initially, the Soviets repeatedly claimed that their space program was scientific and peaceful in nature. But in December 1961, Premier Khrushchev pointed out that the space ships of Gagarin and Titov could be used to carry nuclear weapons to any point on the globe.

The obvious next step in the Soviet space program—and it would seem to be almost predictable—will logically be a manned earth orbital rendezvous mission. Certainly, when this event is announced, it will point even more dramatically to the Soviet determination to refine their capability in inner space—the most critical area of space from a military standpoint. Given an absolute weapon superiority it would be possible for the Soviets to implement their policies on their own terms.

In the face of these Soviet developments, the United States has assigned only subsidiary importance, both in dollars and manpower allocated, to an inner space capability and military utilization of that medium.

In an attempt to bring about a reevaluation of our national goals in space, I introduced, on August 1, 1963, House Resolution 470 to create a select committee of the House of Representatives to review and reappraise our national space goals. Shocking as it may seem, there is not now and never has been any committee in the Congress concerned with both military and civilian space programs—and the logic of our national space goals.

It cannot be doubted that American nuclear superiority has been the chief, if not the sole, deterrent of major military action by the Communists to further their aim of destroying our society. Yet despite this deterrent, the Communists have brought millions of once free peoples under the yoke of dictatorship behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. It takes little imagination to project how long our own freedom would survive should the Russians achieve an unquestioned military superiority through the military utilization of inner space.

Can this Nation pursue any course of action that could possibly lead to a loss of its liberty? The answer can only be no. I ask, then, that we act before it is too late by reevaluating, redefining, and restructuring the priorities of our space program to recognize the Communists' unswerving goal of world conquest and the fatal risk this Nation runs in permitting their possible achievement of that goal through military space superiority.

Certainly, today is no time to stop or retard space exploration. It is, however, past time for a reappraisal and redirection of our space goals. We should not necessarily abandon our ultimate goals of a lunar landing and the use of space for peaceful purposes. I suggest only that in light of the Communist record, the direction of Soviet space programs, and advancing space technology, we first take the necessary precautions to insure that peace and freedom survive. The United States has already achieved a high level of competence in space disciplines and techniques in the 6 years of NASA's life. The question is one of emphasis, of priorities. Bluntly, the question is one of national security.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and wish to congratulate the committee for the outstanding job it has done in bringing this very difficult legislation to the floor.

I should like to particularly join in supporting the appropriation which the committee has recommended for research on manned bombers.

It was my great privilege to serve under Gen. Curtis LeMay in the 20th Global Air Force during World War II. We were bombing Japan in B–29 bombers which took off from Saipan.

There can be no question in anyone's mind that one of the truly great architects of victory for our side in World War II was Curtis LeMay. It was his genius; his great skill; his confidence and courage; and his extraordinary knowledge of aerial warfare that produced a campaign of havoc over Germany and paved the way for the successful invasion by our forces.

I know of no general in the world's entire history who knew and understood the value of aerial warfare as thoroughly as did Curtis LeMay. He had that outstanding ability to marshal all the resources of our aerial strength and deploy them in a manner that helped bring the Nazis to defeat much sooner than anyone had ever dared imagine. There can be no question that because of Curtis LeMay, this Nation and the free world witnessed the glory of victory sooner and with less losses than any reasonable person could have imagined. Curtis LeMay brought to World War II the devastating techniques of precision daylight bombing, which reaped such destruction on Hitler's industrial centers producing his sinews of war.

And after he helped win the war in Europe, General LeMay came to the Pacific theater where again through his daring and uncanny knowledge about aerial bombardment, he devised the devastating fire raids which brought Japan to her knees.

It was my privilege to fly under General LeMay's command and I can tell this House that anything Curtis LeMay recommends for the future of America deserves the full support of this Congress. Curtis LeMay is a man whose only goal in life is to make America so strong that not only this generation but future generations of Americans will be able to live secure in the knowledge that no enemy would dare violate the world's peace.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I join in supporting the committee recommendation. On this very critical issue, I shall go along with Curtis LeMay, architect of victory on two continents in World War II.

Mr. VINSON. 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 five Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House or Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1965 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, $443,600,000; for the Navy and Marine Corps, $1,854,900,000; for the Air Force, $3,663,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $282,600,000; for the Navy, $660,100,000; for the Marine Corps, $13,100,000; for the Air Force, $1,730,000,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,966,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: On page 2, line 3, after "Marine Corps," strike out "$1,854,900" and insert "$1,722,900".

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, what about the second part of the amendment?

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in two parts, but I understand

we can take only the first part of it at this time as a matter of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the second portion of the gentleman's amendment is to a section that has not been read.

Mr. PIKE. That is correct. I was going to address myself only to the first portion at this time; but it is immaterial to me, I can do either.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire amendment be considered at this time. We will deal with it as a package, because the money is distributed in different places.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will reread the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: On page 2, line 3, after "Marine Corps" strike out "$1,854,900" and insert "$1,722,900".

And on page 2, line 19, strike out "$1,329,500" and insert "$1,290,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk has read $1,854,900. It seems to me that should be billion and not million. May we have the amendment reread?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will reread the amendment.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be withdrawn for the moment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: On page 2, line 10, strike out line 10 and insert: "For naval vessels, including nuclear propulsion for CVA–67: $2,092,000,000."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I said that the United States is engaging upon the expenditure of $277 million very shortly for the construction of a new attack aircraft carrier. I charged that at the time its keel will be laid down and at the time the ship will be launched and throughout her 25 to 30 years of expected life, she will be obsolescent because she will not have nuclear power. In the world today I do not think that the United States can afford to send to sea ships that are not the finest ships this Nation is capable of producing.

The Secretary of Defense has admitted that nuclear propulsion gives us a better, a finer, a more powerful ship than otherwise. But in this case he has simply said that the cost is too much; in other words, cost comes before excellence in defense.

That kind of attitude preceded World War II. That kind of attitude preceded World War I.

The gentleman from South Carolina eloquently argued a moment ago against obsolescence. The gentleman from Louisiana eloquently challenged the ability of the Secretary of Defense to make decisions on military matters of more import than those made by the military people themselves.

And the military themselves do say that we must have, in all instances—the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy—the best possible equipment we can find.

Believe me, my friends, whether you are for or against aircraft carriers, a new one is to be built. The issue is not whether it is to be built, but whether we want to build an obsolete ship or the finest, most modern ship that this Nation can build. If so, we must build a nuclear-powered ship, because for 30 years ahead it must defend freedom on the seas throughout the world. For 30 years this ship must be capable of being adapted to new and unforeseen challenges. It cannot be so unless its enginerooms are powered by nuclear reactors. Thirty years back, we were in the year 1933. Who then could have anticipated the equipment that we would have needed to fight and win World War II? Yet the finest equipment built at that time was capable of adaptation to the emergencies of World War II. The obsolete equipment of that day was valueless. The principle is the same today. We must make this expenditure in order to be able to adapt ourselves to the unforeseen but not unanticipated emergencies of the future.

Mr. Chairman, the sum that I have asked to be placed in this bill is $126 million greater than the amount that is now contained in the bill. That is what it would take to convert this $277 million conversion ship to a nuclear carrier. But when you convert it for this amount of money you buy a 7 years' fuel supply for $32 million, the same amount that conventional fuel for the carrier and her accompanying tanker would cost for the same period. You buy $81 million worth of nuclear propulsion and $13 million worth of refiguring of the hull, all of which give the ship excellence in offense and excellence in defense over the entire lifetime of this ship. This represents only an increase in cost of less than 2 percent a year. It represents an increase in capability of at least 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, can we afford not to add that cost to get the power? Can we afford not to provide the increased effectiveness of the ships and the safety of the men who sail her and the safety for our Nation by launching on the seas a modern nuclear-powered naval vessel? Furthermore, this conversion to nuclear power can be made without any substantial delay in getting the ship built. With the *Enterprise* nucleared now on the high seas, if we do not make it a nuclear ship, we signal to the Soviet Union that the United States no longer cares about superiority and power, the United States no longer cares about the threat that is now posed against us.

Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held extensive hearings on this subject. Such extensive hearings have not been held by the Committee on Armed Services since 1942. The Joint Committee heard the able naval experts; it has heard the Secretary of Defense and others.

Then it reported as follows:

First, that nuclear propulsion provides significant military advantages for surface warships.

Second, that the increased costs attributable to nuclear power are minor.

Third, the new aircraft carrier, CVA–67, should be nuclear powered.

Now, today is the last chance to make it nuclear powered. If this Congress does not act in this amendment, that ship will have conventional power and it will be an obsolete ship, a ship less than the best ship we can build. I believe it would be gross error not to make it the best.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlemen of this House, for the sake of the Nation, to support this amendment and authorize the small additional cost it adds to this bill, and thereby to buy the kind of defense Americans want—the best defense we can buy.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can agree on some time limitation for the discussion of this amendment. I think the committee exactly understands the issue. It is whether we have a conventional airplane carrier or a nuclear-powered one.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman agree that if this action is not taken now that contracts will be let and that the CVA–67 will be a conventional rather than a nuclear-powered carrier?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; I agree that the gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. HOSMER. And does the gentleman agree that the authorization previously by Congress was on the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. VINSON. The Armed Services Committee recommended it to be a conventional carrier after a long hearing, and on recommendation of the Department of the Navy.

Mr. HOSMER. Does the gentleman agree that the nuclear carrier is a superior vessel?

Mr. VINSON. I agree it will cost $126 million more, and that the program will be delayed 5 years.

Mr. HOSMER. I must respond to the gentleman from Georgia's assertion it will take 4 years. The plans have been made on nuclear propulsion and it will not be delayed for more than 6 additional months. It has already been delayed since the 1963 authorization. I must add that this ship must sail the seas for 25 to 30 years. The critical period is when she is built, not when she is building. The protection that this Nation requires is from superior hardware, the kind of hardware that means to the other side strength and a determination that the United States and her free world allies shall remain free. I do not believe we can give that kind of message unless we send to sea our most modern equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down. In 1962 the Armed Services Committee had before it an authorization for a carrier. After long consideration and after taking lots of testimony, the committee concluded it should recommend a conventional carrier, as requested. Architects were employed, drawings were made, and on April 1 they will let the contract. This coming April they will let the contract for the building of a conventional carrier. It will require at least an additional year to go from the powerplant of a conventional carrier to a nuclear carrier. There is a 1-year delay there. It requires 3 years to build either a conventional ship or a nuclear ship. So you are delaying this airplane carrier at least by 1 year, and it would be 4 years before you got the carrier. All the money that has been spent for drawings, plans, and specifications for the powerplant to be put in the ship would be absolutely wasted.

The committee concluded from all the facts and on the recommendation of the Secretary that the proper type of carrier at this time is a conventional carrier. The House has authorized a conventional carrier.

At this late date the gentleman from California comes in and wants to change it from a conventional carrier to a nuclear carrier. The committee is deeply concerned about nuclear power. We have 91 ships today in our Navy that are nuclear ships. But on the facts submitted in this case we felt we should not duplicate right now the *Enterprise* carrier.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I wish to point out to the gentleman this is the first opportunity to bring this decision to the House of Representatives.

Mr. VINSON. I fear that the gentleman is wrong about that, he could have done this last year, for example.

Mr. HOSMER. It is the first opportunity since hearings were held last November on the specific issue of the nuclear carrier out of which a unanimous report was made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The membership of both bodies strongly recommended that the CVA–67 be nuclear propelled, after considering each and every one of the objections that the gentleman from Georgia has made.

Mr. VINSON. The committee the gentleman refers to is the Atomic Energy Committee. The Atomic Energy Committee did make a recommendation. They could make a recommendation any time with relation to nuclear carriers. But the Congress has gone on record on this particular carrier.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were—ayes 32, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read in its entirety and that each section now be open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1965 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $1,397,000,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,451,000,000;

For the Air Force, $3,205,000,000;

For Defense agencies, $519,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "$1,397,000,000" and insert "$1,335,000,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 17, strike out "$1,335,000,000" and insert "$1,342,600,000".

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if at this time I should offer my amendments en bloc, as I have two other amendments to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending now only the first committee amendment to this section.

Mr. COHELAN. Very well. I will introduce the others at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of this procedural point that I am in the position of having to argue this amendment before the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] to strike the $92 million.

As I indicated in my remarks during general debate, as far as I am concerned there is a serious question of priority here. If we are to add $92 million on the way we apparently are going to do it—without having the opportunity to consider it in the Subcommittee on Research and Development, I think the matter of priority should be very seriously considered. As I indicated in my earlier remarks, I am very reluctant to make a recommendation to cut certain items. This amendment is to restore $7,600,000 for Army military science.

Now what the subcommittee has done is to strike $45.1 million for military science, which is basic research—and very vitally needed research for the armed services.

I am sure you will agree with me, this is just as important if not more important than this problem of the followon bomber and the IMI at this time. The Secretary of Defense has plainly come to the conclusion at this time, we are not at a stage where we can spend sums in dealing strictly with air defense. A number of projects, as we indicated in our report, which we regard as meriting higher priority than the two aircraft were cut by the Research and Development Subcommittee in its efforts to hold research and development spending at an absolute minimum in line with the requirements of national defense and strict budget economy.

For example, $28.5 million was cut from research in military sciences for the Navy; $32 million was cut for aircraft engine research; and $17 million was cut for ship studies.

All three of these items are related to the priority basis of antisubmarine warfare.

For the Army, and this is the pending amendment, $7.6 million was cut for military sciences and $23 million from other equipment, with both items relating to development useful in special warfare operations such as now being conducted in Vietnam.

What this particular amendment, and there will be two to follow, proposes, is simply that we restore $7,600,000 for military sciences for the Army, and I will subsequently introduce amendments for the Navy and the Air Force.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. I think the committee would be enlightened, if you would just tell us where all of this study is taking place. Where is this research being carried on for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? I am asking that because a moment ago you were against increasing the bill and now by this amendment you propose to increase it. I just want to know where all this research and development is taking place. I am sure you can tell us where it is taking place.

Mr. COHELAN. It is taking place in antisubmarine warfare.

Mr. VINSON. I am referring to where it is taking place geographically. That is what I am talking about. That is all I want to know and I am sure our colleagues want to know where all this is going on.

Mr. COHELAN. Geographically this is going on in the universities throughout the country in the basic sciences.

Mr. VINSON. In which particular universities is it going on?

Mr. COHELAN. In many universities throughout the country. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is trying to get me to say this is all going to the University of California, but believe me; it is not.

Mr. VINSON. I see.

Mr. COHELAN. It is going to every university in the country. Of course, this is an extremely important item of research that we need to continue. I do not want you to get pulled off the bag, as it were, because this matter has been called to my attention by the services and there are many areas here that are

classified, but it is an extremely important thing.

Let me point out what is going to happen so far as the Navy is concerned. We have told them that they could not cut oceanography. We have told them they could cut other very delicate things in antisubmarine warfare. But there remains, for example, other activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

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

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Research and Development was unanimous on this item when it considered the budget request for the Army for military science. All seven members of the subcommittee supported a minimum reduction in this item.

The Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1965 requested $154,200,000 for the military sciences.

The Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1964 was funded in the amount of $147,900,000 for this item.

The committee's recommendation was to allow $146.6 million in authorization for military science or a reduction of only $7.6 million. The two major activities in this item in the military science category are for research and exploratory development. The subcommittee held thorough hearings on this matter. There are a number of items within this category. The subcommittee has allowed the Department full flexibility in reprograming within this category, so that in the opinion of the subcommittee, and unanimously at the time, there was little opportunity for this category to be hurt by this minimum reduction. Since the action of the subcommittee was unanimous and has been unanimously endorsed by the full committee, and since this is a very minimum reduction on a $154 million item, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 19, strike "$1,451,000,000" and insert "$1,329,500,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 19, strike "$1,329,500,000" and insert "$1,358,000,000".

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this specific item refers to the Navy and on this $45.1 million for military science what we have done inadvertently is to cut the Navy some $28.5 million, which I think any fair person will agree is a disproportionate amount. The object of my amendment is to take the whole area of military science and give each service the amount they requested in an effort to try to adjust what is an obvious inequity.

What we have done—and I am sure we did not intend this—was to cut $28.5 million from the Navy requests for research and development in the field of military science where they are doing some very distinguished work.

Mr. Chairman, I have here letters and correspondence from areas throughout the country where this work is going on, where they have made a point that this is going to affect seriously some of the very important work that the Navy is carrying on. For example, I quote from a report on the impact of what we have done.

It goes on to point out that:

Due to constraints which may not allow reduction of funding in oceanography, ARTEMIS and in other antisubmarine warfare areas, the remaining items in this budget activity will of necessity suffer a disproportionately large cut, 20 percent. With the cost rise of 5 percent per year, the reduced fiscal year 1965 program of $98.6 million represents a reduction of 19 percent below the equivalent fiscal year 1963 level ($110.0 million plus 5 percent per year for fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1965—$121.3 million).

Mr. Chairman, I think this is manifestly unfair. If we are going to put in arbitrarily by action of the full committee an item of $92 million it would seem to me that this is the proper place to express one's self on what we think priorities should be. I would suspect that if the services had their choice as between what may happen to the $92 million and what would happen in connection with the $45.1 million, they would choose the $45.1 million.

Mr. Chairman, so that there will be absolutely no mistake about who the beneficiaries will be in connection with this particular item on military science I want to refer you to the hearings at page 7635 and following pages, which will give you a complete list of the educational and nonprofit institutions which receive military prime contracts for experimental development, test, and research work for 1963. My own University of California is included among those. It is an array of great colleges throughout the country; University of California is certainly among them along with every other university in the country. It so happens that the sum total as listed in the committee report as far as the University of California is concerned is a mere $12 million. And you must remember that this must be related to the size of the institution.

Let me point out what is going on in some of the other great institutions. Georgetown University is receiving some; George Washington University also, and let us not forget that the Georgia Medical College in Augusta, Ga., is receiving some, as are universities in almost every State of the Union represented by every member on the committee. So this is not a personal matter of whim with me. It is a very, very important item which I consider to be even more important than the addition of $92 million for the follow-on bomber above the already authorized levels.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would this be on the committee amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. VINSON. On this amendment.

Mr. PIKE. On the amendment offered by the gentleman from California?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. We are trying to deal with one of you at a time.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is directed toward the largest request in the research and development budget for military science; that is, from the Department of the Navy. The Navy requested $190,458,000 for this budget activity. The committee recommended $161,958,000, a reduction of only $28½ million.

Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of the committee, the unanimous opinion of the committee, it was felt that this small reduction would allow a continuation of efforts in fundamental research and exploratory developments at a level only slightly below that of fiscal year 1964, and above the funding level of fiscal year 1963.

The Navy had the largest research and development effort in military science, and this particular category is spread over 10 different budget efforts. Therefore, the reduction is at a very low figure for the 10 different budget estimates.

Mr. Chairman, the portion of this budget activity that is disturbing to the committee is the area of management and support which shows a funding increase of almost 50 percent since fiscal year 1963. This is the result of increased contract efforts with nonprofit institutions to conduct operational studies and analyses.

Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that these efforts can be reduced to the fiscal year 1963 level without endangering the defense posture of the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest the defeat of this amendment and I ask for a vote thereon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 19, strike out "$1,329,500,000" and insert "$1,290,000,000.".

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, after some procedural perils, I find myself here with half of an amendment to the entire bill. I am obliged to do it in this manner because of the parliamentary situation. However, in order to simplify it I would like to say that this particular amendment takes $39.5 million out of the Navy's R. & D. The other amendment which I shall offer takes $132 million out of the Navy's R. & D., representing a total of $171.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, the program intended to be affected by these two amendments is a new naval attack aircraft, called the VAL. I discussed earlier the fact that this program which will finally culminate in a better than $2 billion appropriation was commenced as a reprograming action, although in fact this is 90 percent the procurement of a new aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to talk about the merits of this plane. I believe that this program should be judged in conjunction with the merits of other aircraft which are now in production or which are under development.

Aside from our long-range strategic bombers, both the Navy and the Air Force have two basic types of fighter aircraft. They have the interceptor aircraft designed to fight way up there and the attack aircraft designed to fight way down there. The interceptor was designed to intercept other planes. The attack aircraft is designed to help troops on the ground. The Navy says they have plenty of interceptor aircraft designed to fight way up there.

We were told earlier in general debate there are not any new interceptors under development, there are not any new interceptors under production.

I call your attention to page 7721 of the hearings where Navy Secretary Nitze refers to the TFX as an interceptor. I call your attention to page 7236 where the Chief of Naval Operations refers to the F–4 as an interceptor. The Navy calls both of these airplanes interceptors.

The Air Force, on the other hand, manufacturers the F–110. It is a McDonald Phantom aircraft. They call it an attack plane. The Air Force is also going on with the TFX program. They call that an attack plane. So today the Navy is producing one plane it calls an interceptor, and it is preparing to produce another plane it calls an interceptor. The Air Force is producing a plane it calls an attack plane, and it is prepared to produce another plane it calls an attack plane. They are the same aircraft. The Navy says it needs a new attack plane because it has not any attack planes, but it already has the same two planes that the Air Force calls attack planes.

What will this magnificent new naval aircraft do? I quote from page 7319 of the hearings, the witness being Admiral Thach:

Question. Admiral can you tell me any mission which your new VAL can accomplish that the A–6A you have just shown us cannot accomplish?

Answer. No, sir. Both can accomplish the mission that we have in mind.

Question. Is it not true that the A–6A which you have just shown us can accomplish a great many missions which the VAL that you now propose to buy cannot accomplish?

Answer. That is true, sir.

That is what the Navy thinks about this program. What does the Air Force think about this program? We have heard so much about General LeMay and what a wonderful mind General LeMay has, both as to fighters and bombers, and I agree. But this is what he says regarding this VAL program on page 7515. This is the position of the Air Force:

We won't be interested in it, because, as I understand it, it is practically the airplane they are flying now with a new engine in it, which would give a little more range, a little more load-carrying capability, but nothing like the TFX. I believe the TFX will be a better airplane, not only from the user's standpoint, from a tactical standpoint, but I think it will prove out from an economic standpoint; from a cost effectiveness standpoint the TFX will be much better.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment be adopted.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote down this amendment. We had a very fine hearing on this new plane. This plane operates off the airplane carriers. You might classify it as an attack bomber.

Four big companies in the United States were invited to participate. It so happened that we did not have enough planes to go around, so they had to select one company. They did not select the company located in the district of my friend from New York. They selected another company, the Ling-Temco-Vought Co. down in Texas. The Navy came before the committee and said Congress had authorized money in 17 other instances, and they would like to reprogram some of that money. They also said that the Secretary of Defense was going to let them have $15 million of his emergency fund to use also. So after a lengthy hearing, the Armed Services Committee by a rollcall vote of 26 to 6 agreed to the reprograming. After it had agreed to the reprograming, which authorized 3 to be built, then they came before the committee in the consideration of this bill and said they wanted to buy 35 planes. The 35 planes would cost $105,800,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thought all time had expired.

Mr. GUBSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I have said enough. Everybody knows you cannot do everything you want to do. But I am not concerned about these things. I am concerned about an adequate national defense. Here is a plane that can fly twice as far as the planes they are replacing on our carriers, and carry twice the load. I ask that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, in the time remaining may I say I agree completely with the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee. May I say that the TFX, the F–111 as it is sometimes called, is technically an interceptor, but it is a fighter interceptor. On page 7221 of the hearings it is said that the F–111 will provide greater "fighter capabilities" for less carrier deck space. There is no interceptor under development which will perform the mission of the IMI which this amendment would delete.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly today in support of H.R. 9637, this year's authorization bill for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and for the research and development carried on by the Department of Defense. I would like to deal with three particular matters since they represent areas of special interest to me.

The first of these is, I think, one of the most interesting and more important developments in recent years. I am referring to the Army's Air Assault Division which is now training and experimenting at Fort Benning, Ga.

I have seen—and I am sure that you have seen—references in the press which tend to create the impression that the Army is building up its own Air Force. This, of course, is a matter which has been the subject of question over the years and I felt that this should be inquired into and the true facts discovered. I did exactly this and this is what I found out.

The Army, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, at present is testing a concept in which aerial vehicles replace conventional means for the movement of troops and supplies, and also replace some of the traditional fire support systems with armed aerial platforms.

Land warfare is based upon the two basic essentials of firepower and maneuver. The firepower of today's soldier has increased many times over his World War II counterpart, but his mobility, until recently keyed to the wheel, has changed but little. By getting the soldier away from the friction of the earth's surface, he can transcend obstacles and, more importantly, can avoid much of the ground based fire of the enemy. I am told that in World War II and Korea over 90 percent of the casualties in our Armed Forces were suffered by soldiers on the ground.

The air mobility concept was born as a result of exhaustive studies conducted to determine the best methods of reducing the ground soldier's exposure to enemy ground based fires, thereby reducing casualties, and of increasing his ability to move rapidly around the battlefield, thus reducing the size of forces required.

As you know, the Army has just reorganized its divisions to make them more flexible, to increase their firepower, and to adapt them to the requirements of the modern battlefield. The Army is justly proud of the results of this reorganization. Using the new infantry division as a base the Army has developed and organized an experimental air assault division. This experimental division, designated the 11th Air Assault Division, was activated last February at Fort Benning, Ga. In this new type division they have added some 350 aircraft, but have reduced the number of trucks by over 1,800 and have taken out all the tanks and medium artillery. The weight of equipment in this new division is substantially lighter, actually about one-fourth the weight of a standard infantry division.

To compensate for the loss of medium artillery and tanks, the air assault division includes an aerial rocket battalion and a Little John rocket battalion.

The Army is now training the personnel and testing the concepts of employment of this division to determine if it offers significant advantages over divisions already in being. The first test of a reinforced infantry battalion at Fort Stewart, Ga. last fall indicated that the air mobility concept shows great promise. Additional testing by the Army and also by the Joint U.S. Strike Command will be held this year.

The Army recognizes that the air assault division is not a panacea for all types of warfare. In fact Army officers candidly discuss certain limitations in the concept. They concede that low and slow flying aircraft which live and operate in the frontline environment are vulnerable to enemy action, but not nearly so vulnerable as a slow moving column of trucks or infantry marching on foot. The current lack of an all-around-the-clock capability for Army aircraft is often cited as affecting the sustained fighting ability of air mobile units. This is an area to which the Army is devoting a considerable effort and has a reasonable expectation of developing improvements in bad weather capabilities.

As I mentioned earlier, the initial tests of air assault units show great promise. There will be no decision by the Army or the Department of Defense however, as to placement of air assault division in the force structure until all the results are in and have been completely evaluated. But I feel the Army can point with pride to the steps which they are taking to enhance the effectiveness of their forces by examining bold new concepts for land warfare in the future.

I mentioned that I was going to discuss three matters relating to H.R. 9637. The second of these is the VAL, spelled V-A-L, airplane in which the Navy is showing such a great interest.

V, is the designation for a heavier than air aircraft; A, stands for attack; and L, is the symbol for light; a light attack aircraft which will be able to carry a much greater payload than the Skyhawk, and will have almost twice the range of the Skyhawk. This means, of course, that VAL will have more time on station for any close support mission.

Last year the Navy in reviewing the entire picture of its air-strike capabilities found that the A4 series of aircraft did not fully meet its present requirements. The A4 aircraft was designed in the late forties to deliver at the least possible cost a single nuclear weapon.

Today with our great Nation faced with an ever increasingly and vitally important limited war role for our aircraft carriers, the Navy determined that a more versatile aircraft with a great nonnuclear capability is required. Although this is a new buy, it is not a completely new aircraft. The VAL in effect is an improved version of the F8E Crusader. It will be modified primarily for its attack mission.

On February 11 of this year the Navy announced the selection of Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., of Dallas, Tex., as the winner of the design competition. The selection was made from proposals submitted by four aircraft companies: Grumman, North American, Douglas and the Ling-Temco-Vought. The Navy expects that a fixed price development contract will be awarded in the near future. In its fiscal year 1965 request the Navy has asked for 35 VAL at an initial unit cost of $3,033,857. It is expected that the unit cost, however, will average out at approximately 1.7 million over the life of the VAL program. These figures include spares and repair parts.

I consider this VAL program one of the most important, if not the most important, current effort and current program that the Navy has presented. I consider it to be essential to have an aircraft with the characteristics of the VAL and to have that airplane in the shortest possible time.

The third matter which I would like to deal with is the addition to the bill of $92 million.

I feel the same concern that you have heard voiced so often; that is, that we are headed down a road which leads to the total abandonment of the manned bomber.

It has always been a matter of complete paradox to me that those charged with the responsibility for defending the United States could be so shortsighted as to place all of our capabilities in one single weapon system.

I do not mean to say by any means that that has been done. What I do mean to say is that it is an inevitable consequence of the course now being followed by the Secretary of Defense. He is a brilliant and capable administrator; of this there can be no doubt. But I simply cannot find myself in agreement with him that we should not at this time start on a new bomber when we know that it is somewhere between 7 and 9 years from the time that the studies start on such a complex system to the time that the individual service actually begins to fly the plane as an operational weapons system.

As a matter of fact, in my own opinion, I wonder why we did not start this years ago. I think we are already late.

Mr. McNamara himself said and I quote:

> We plan to continue a mixed force of missiles and manned bombers throughout the entire planning period, fiscal years 1965–69. Although most of the aiming points in the Soviet target system can be best attacked by missiles, the long-range bombers will continue to be used in the followup attack, particularly against hard missile sites and against the targets which need not be attacked within minutes; for example, weapon storage sites.

In the committee report, the committee asks, and I ask here: What is the plan if war does not occur during the life of our present bombers—the B–52 and the B–58? What will then be used to attack hard missile sites and weapon storage sites?

As I say, the whole matter is incomprehensible to me and I will say only this: I voted for the addition of the $52 million for the follow-on bomber and the $40 million for the manned interceptor. In my heart and in my mind I feel that I have done the right thing for my country. I can only hope that my strongly felt belief will be reflected in the vote on this matter in the House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 20, strike out "$3,205,000,000" and insert "$3,140,000,000".

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 20, strike out "$3,140,000,000" and insert "$3,149,000,000".

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I shall not detain the Committee long. I am offering this amendment as a matter of consistency. This proposed amendment merely adds to the Air Force request for air science the sum of $9 million and will raise the existing sum by that amount. Of course, this is part of the overall $45.1 million that I have been seeking to restore in the bill.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the report, as you know, praises Mr. McNamara for his accomplishments in saving money in the Department of Defense. But most of the major savings that the Secretary has made were possible only because he had the courage to oppose the expenditure of funds for projects which had not been fully considered or defined.

The items I have been proposing to be retained in the bill are all items that have been requested by the various services and supported by the Department of Defense. Indeed, I feel sure the Air Force itself would prefer to use any funds that the Committee of the Whole might wish to restore in the bill for a project such as this.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an "aye" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 20, after "Air Force" strike out "$3,140,000,000" and insert "$3,048,000,000".

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, in the past few minutes somewhat because of the strange parliamentary situation, the fearless four have been somewhat fractured. But lest there be some confusion with some of the amendments that have been offered previously, the amendment which has just been offered is an amendment that is being offered in behalf of our group on the Committee on Armed Services. It is the amendment that was brought to your attention by the letter circulated to the offices of Members of the House yesterday. It is the amendment proposed in the additional views which were circulated and which were printed. It is the basic amendment addressed to the arguments that have taken place on this floor this afternoon in those very minor areas such as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] has pointed out which are controversial in this bill; namely, the wisdom of expending $92 million for two additional aircraft which are either not very well conceived or which yet have not been properly integrated into the defenses of the country.

The hour is late, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to take the time of the Committee at this hour to discuss this at length. I think that probably we understand it well. This is the economy amendment. This is the amendment that those of you who supported us last year when we asked your help in striking out the $363 million for the B–70 plane want to support now and we will welcome your support. This is the amendment that those of you who for some mistaken reason perhaps, did not have the opportunity to support us on that amendment and, of course, have been regretting it, since this plane still has not gotten into the air—as I say, this is the amendment which you can now join us in supporting and erase your mistake of the last time.

This is the economy amendment. May I just say one thing more, Mr. Chairman. You have heard a lot about our B–70 getting old; and about our B–70 going out of inventory; and about us not having any manned bombers in the 1970's. Do not believe it. We have invested $18 billion in the B–52 force which we have at the present time. We have expended $1.6 billion in improving and strengthening this force and to have it continue. In this bill there are $306 million more for strengthening this force.

Talk about getting old. The 707 jet aircraft, which many of you hope to catch, if we can get out of here in time, to go back to your home districts, have racked up to date twice as many flying hours as the B–52's will have by 1970, and that, after all, is the real measure of an aircraft. Here is a safe, sound, economy amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I am the Member referred to by the gentleman from Louisiana as the one who decimated the five last year to four this year. I did join with the two gentlemen from New York, the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from Michigan in the fight on the RS–70 issue, because I thought they were right on that issue. I still think we were right on the RS–70 issue. I think that history has proven we were right on the RS–70 issue. But, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is an entirely different issue. It involves an entirely different concept. The issue is very simple. The last B–52's and B–58's were delivered in 1962. Those B–52's and B–58's are wearing out. At the present time we do not have anything in the mill to replace those B–52's and B–58's when they are obsolete. All of the experts agree that we need a follow-on bomber to replace the B–52's and B–58's. We need a mixed force of bombers and missiles. This, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, is not an economy amendment; it is an amendment which will cost this Congress, this Government, more in the long run if you do not take this step to put the follow-on bomber in the mill now.

Dissent, Mr Chairman, I think is a healthy thing, but healthy defense of the country is imperative, and this will destroy that healthy defense. I hope the amendment is defeated.

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

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

Mr. HARDY. Let me compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made. He has pointed out the fact that at least this year was different from last year.

Mr. ICHORD. Entirely different.

Mr. HARDY. And we are talking about an entirely different matter. The gentleman very aptly said we do not have any follow-on bomber beyond what we have now that are actually in service and fast becoming obsolete and running out.

Mr. ICHORD. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman did not mention the IMI. That is the other facet of this total item. That is the one portion to which I would like to address myself. I will not take up much time on it, but as a result of the hearings of the subcommittee conducted on the defenses of this country, I came to the strong conclusion that we are urgently in need of developing an improved IMI to defend our own country. It is something that must be done.

Mr. ICHORD. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. HARDY. And the other parts that are in this amendment that the committee added are absolutely necessary, in my opinion.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. I want to join with the gentleman and I want to say to the gentleman in answer to the statement, let us be perfectly fair about this. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, Army, Navy, and Air Force, jointly and collectively agree that we need this bomber and we need this interceptor. It is not done because of General LeMay alone. The testimony in this book here conclusively points out that the Joint Chiefs of Staff insist that they need these two; namely, the follow-on bomber and the manned interceptor.

Mr. ICHORD. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit one other comment on that score; namely, that the other point was developed by our subcommittee in its hearings last summer with respect to the IMI.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. To carry the point made by the gentleman from Virginia a bit further, I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia through the gentleman from Missouri whether or not it is true that we knowingly accepted a degradation of our air defenses through the phaseout of certain radar centers in anticipation that we could trade this saving off on a faster development of the improved manned interceptor.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield, let me say the matter here involved was included in a classified report. I cannot discuss this item by item, but we can probably say this, that the military anticipated the IMI would offset the degradation which might otherwise occur.

Mr. GUBSER. That is correct.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

This amendment we are now discussing is indeed, as the reformed gentleman from Missouri has said, a new program. It is an entirely different program and if we do not accept this amendment what it is going to mean is we are going to have two follow-on bombers under development in the United States of America at the same time next year. That is what it is going to mean. We have not buried those B–70's. They are out there in California. They are sitting there in the hangars. They are going to fly some day. Do we need develop two manned bombers at the same time? Why do we not wait and see if we get these things off the ground? The same

people who are promoting this new follow-on bomber this year were standing up in this House on this floor at the same time last year saying, "The B–70 is ready to fly."

The B–70 is not ready to fly. The B–70's delays are costing us today $15 million a month just for standstill time. This is the manned bomber that we are developing right now. Now they say one additional manned bomber is not enough, we have got to have two additional manned bombers. That is what this program is. This is a completely new and completely different program. Before the other one is even completed, for heaven's sake in a sense of reasonableness, let us wait until that B–70 flies. Let us wait until it gets off the ground. Let us wait until we learn from the B–70 program all we can learn from it. It has cost us $1.5 billion for a 3-plane program by the time we get it off the ground.

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

Mr. PIKE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to address a question to my distinguished colleague from New York who serves on the Research and Development Subcommittee. Was any presentation made in our committee asking for justifying this $92 million?

Mr. PIKE. No presentation whatsoever was made to the Research and Development Subcommittee asking for this $52 million. This was not something that we took out of the Air Force budget.

This was something we put in the Air Force budget they did not even ask for.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman tell me if there were not some funds included in the budget for the program definition on the B–70?

Mr. PIKE. There are included in the budget without this $52 million follow-on bomber money $75 million for the B–70 development plus $5 million for the development of a new follow-on bomber concept.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this $92 million is not necessary this year or could not be effectively used this year?

Mr. PIKE. I would say the gentleman is absolutely correct. Nobody says that there should not ever be another manned bomber but, for heaven's sake, let us learn what we can learn from the $1½ billion we have already spent on the B–70 before we go hog wild on another one. All we have learned at this point for the $1.5 billion which we have invested in that program is that this is not the way to build a new manned bomber.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] referred a moment ago to the Joint Chiefs of Staff with regard to this follow-on bomber.

I would like to call the attention of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, to the hearings at page 7477 at which General LeMay says that the Joint Chiefs said we should go ahead with the bomber. However, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs qualified his statement to some extent, that he did not buy the long leadtime items which would go into just the program definition phase.

Mr. Chairman, we have the $5 million in there to go into the program definition phase. What General LeMay did not tell the committee, but what is a fact, Mr. Chairman, and I have been authorized to say so, is that the Joint Chiefs sent a memorandum to the Department of the Air Force after they took this action specifically asking the Air Force to give them a little better idea of exactly what this follow-on bomber was all about. This is what the $5 million is for.

Mr. Chairman, until those questions are answered, we would be wasting money to spend another $93 million, as the committee has proposed.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I want to point out in the very brief time I have remaining that if we put in this $92 million for a follow-on bomber and for an IMI aircraft, which is incidentally in quite a phantom state and we have $5 million in the budget for it.

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

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be allotted to the gentleman from California.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I sincerely appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, if this money is authorized, as it was authorized in the B–70 program of last year, I have a strong feeling that it is very unlikely the Committee on Appropriations is going to appropriate this money. Not only that, I have grave doubts as to whether or not the Defense Department will use the money if it is appropriated, simply because we do not in fact have a proper and acceptable proposal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no one objecting to these follow-on studies. They are already in the conceptional phase. Once they bring up a program and tell us what they are talking about, then we can consider and approve the program. What we have been pleading for with the members of the Committee all afternoon in general debate—for those members who were not here—was to ask the members of the Committee to refer this matter back to the Research and Development Subcommittee where we can deal with it properly, correctly, and constructively; where we can make urgent and serious study of the IMI and the FOB.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very complex and difficult question. It is not to be solved simply by throwing money at it. And we already have $5 million planned and approved for fiscal 1965.

Let me quote what Dr. Brown said when he was before our Subcommittee on Research and Development:

> However, to insure against uncertainty or possible errors in our present estimate of future wars, continuing systems studies of alternative manned aircraft systems are warranted.

Mr. Chairman, the money is in there, but we do not need $92 million in this year authorization bill.

I urge you to support the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether any member of the Committee on Armed Services has voted any more consistently toward economy than I. Today we are faced with a matter of national defense. General LeMay says that we need this bomber. Dr. Brown, as has been stated, says that we do not need it.

In this matter, are you going to listen to General LeMay or to Dr. Brown? It is just exactly that simple.

We went into this matter fully in committee. Five members voted against it. One later has repented, for which I am happy.

It is undisputed that even with the money in the bill we will not have a new bomber until 1972. If you wait until next year it will be 1973.

The question is: Are you going out of the bomber business? Today we are still ahead of Russia in bombers. If we cease to go forward and Russia does go forward, and she is certainly going forward in the matter of the production of bombers and in research and development of bombers, we will ultimately be inferior to Russia.

Are we going to listen to General LeMay, and no one questions but what he is the greatest authority in the world on this matter, or are we going to listen to Dr. Brown, a 33-year-old physicist? That is the answer we will have to make in our vote on this amendment. I urge this committee to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the basic issue involved in this amendment is whether or not we are going to paint ourselves into a missile corner and rely entirely on one concept of defense, or we are going to take the concept which has proven so successful and retain the bomber which is prepared to meet any eventuality.

I observe that a bomber can be airborne and still reserve the right until the last moment before the release of a bomb to turn back on command from the Com-

mander in Chief. That is something that can happen in pushbutton warfare.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. These are capable of low or high penetration. There is nothing that can compare with it anyplace in the world. The state of the art will be lost if you cut this money out; the state of the art on interceptors will be lost if you cut this out. The case is in your hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the merit or demerit of this bill, and I expect to vote for it, one thing that has impressed me is the fact that the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. VINSON] is apparently closing out his long Congressional career by establishing some kind of a record. Here is a $17 billion bill, and it is printed on two short pages.

I do not recall during my time in Congress of another bill being presented to the House, involving the expenditure of $17 billion, which involved less than two pages of double spaced type.

If the gentleman from Georgia does not retire this year, I wonder if next year he will be here with a bill containing one printed line, $17 billion? I personally would like to see more line items, advising where the money will be spent. On the other hand I do appreciate the economy in paper and printing.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I might say to my very dear friend from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is not the only one retiring this year.

Everything is being thrown, studies, and so forth, and they are distorted and twisted.

I do know of one thing, however: when Members have an interest in their own districts they have an entirely different attitude. Actually, the thing we are arguing about is $52 million for the definition phase of bombers.

The gentleman from New York, my colleague, did not refer to certain testimony in here. I said:

> I am sick and tired of study, and spending $5 million for studies which we do not get anything for.

That is why General LeMay testified for $92 million.

The second reason they did not come before the Research and Development Subcommittee was that the services were not permitted to, by the Secretary of Defense and by the Budget Director. The only things they could testify to were the questions we asked them and what was in the budget requests. It was not until we got to the full committee that we were able to develop with General LeMay that the bombers and interceptors were badly needed.

I will close by reading this testimony, and I will not take it out of context. It closes out this entire argument. This is the testimony of General LeMay:

> Mr. BECKER. Now, let me ask you this question, General: Has this matter of the bombers and interceptors been thoroughly discussed in the overall defense with the Joint Chiefs?
>
> General LEMAY. Yes, it has.
>
> Mr. BECKER. And what are their feelings? Have they made any determination?
>
> General LEMAY. The Joint Chiefs have said we must go ahead with the IMI.
>
> Mr. BECKER. With the bomber.
>
> General LEMAY. The Joint Chiefs said we should go ahead with the bomber. However, the Chairman qualified his statement to some extent, that he would not buy the long leadtime items, but he would go into just the program definition phase.
>
> Mr. BECKER. Now, this is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs?
>
> General LEMAY. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. BECKER. I was talking about the Joint Chiefs, Army, Navy, Air Force.
>
> General LEMAY. The Joint Chiefs shared my view that we must go ahead.
>
> Mr. BECKER. They share your views irrespective of the Chairman; the Chairman has a modification in here?
>
> General LEMAY. That is right.
>
> Mr. BECKER. What about the interceptors?
>
> General LEMAY. We all, including the Chairman, agreed about the interceptors.
>
> Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what we are waiting for.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, enough evidence has already been submitted to the Committee to justify an overwhelming defeat for this amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 29, noes 121.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 21, strike out "$519,000,000" and insert "$497,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONOHUE, 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. 9637) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to the resolution, House Resolution 631, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. ELLSWORTH moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 9637, to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 336, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—336

Abbitt	Cannon	Fulton, Pa.
Abele	Chamberlain	Fuqua
Abernethy	Chelf	Gallagher
Addabbo	Chenoweth	Garmatz
Albert	Clancy	Gary
Alger	Clark	Gathings
Andrews, Ala.	Cleveland	Giaimo
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cohelan	Gibbons
	Conte	Gilbert
Ashbrook	Cooley	Glenn
Ashley	Corbett	Gonzalez
Aspinall	Cunningham	Goodling
Auchincloss	Curtin	Grabowski
Baldwin	Daddario	Gray
Baring	Daniels	Green, Oreg.
Barrett	Davis, Ga.	Griffin
Barry	Delaney	Griffiths
Bates	Denton	Gross
Battin	Derounian	Grover
Becker	Derwinski	Gubser
Beckworth	Devine	Gurney
Beermann	Dingell	Hagan, Ga.
Belcher	Dole	Hagen, Calif.
Bell	Donohue	Haley
Bennett, Fla.	Downing	Hall
Bennett, Mich.	Duiski	Halleck
Betts	Duncan	Halpern
Blatnik	Dwyer	Hansen
Boggs	Edmondson	Harding
Boland	Edwards	Hardy
Bolton, Oliver P.	Everett	Harris
	Evins	Harrison
Bonner	Farbstein	Harsha
Bow	Fascell	Harvey, Mich.
Brademas	Feighan	Hays
Bray	Findley	Healey
Brock	Fino	Hébert
Bromwell	Fisher	Hechler
Brooks	Flood	Hemphill
Brotzman	Flynt	Henderson
Broyhill, N.C.	Fogarty	Herlong
Broyhill, Va.	Ford	Hoeven
Burke	Foreman	Holland
Burton	Fountain	Horan
Byrne, Pa.	Fraser	Horton
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Hosmer
Cahill	Friedel	Huddleston

Hull	Mosher	Shipley
Hutchinson	Murphy, Ill.	Shriver
Ichord	Murphy, N.Y.	Sibal
Jarman	Natcher	Sickles
Jennings	Nedzi	Sikes
Jensen	Nelsen	Siler
Joelson	Nix	Sisk
Johansen	Norblad	Skubitz
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Slack
Johnson, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Iowa
Johnson, Wis.	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Va.
Jonas	Olsen, Mont.	Snyder
Jones, Mo.	Olson, Minn.	Springer
Karsten	O'Neill	Staebler
Karth	Osmers	Stafford
Kastenmeier	Ostertag	Staggers
Keith	Passman	Steed
Kilburn	Patman	Stephens
Kilgore	Patten	Stinson
King, Calif.	Pelly	Stratton
King, N.Y.	Pepper	Sullivan
Kirwan	Perkins	Taft
Knox	Philbin	Talcott
Kornegay	Pickle	Taylor
Kunkel	Pike	Teague, Calif.
Kyl	Pilcher	Thomas
Laird	Pillion	Thompson, La.
Landrum	Pirnie	Thompson, N.J.
Langen	Poage	Thompson, Tex.
Lankford	Poff	Thomson, Wis.
Latta	Pool	Toll
Lennon	Price	Tollefson
Libonati	Pucinski	Trimble
Lindsay	Purcell	Tuck
Lipscomb	Quie	Tuten
Lloyd	Quillen	Ullman
Long, La.	Reid, Ill.	Utt
Long, Md.	Reid, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
McCulloch	Reifel	Vanik
McDade	Reuss	Van Pelt
McDowell	Rhodes, Pa.	Vinson
McFall	Rich	Waggonner
McIntire	Rivers, Alaska	Wallhauser
McLoskey	Rivers, S.C.	Watson
McMillan	Robison	Watts
MacGregor	Rodino	Weaver
Madden	Rogers, Colo.	Weltner
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Westland
Marsh	Rogers, Tex.	Whalley
Martin, Nebr.	Rooney, N.Y.	Wharton
Mathias	Rooney, Pa.	White
Matsunaga	Rosenthal	Whitener
Matthews	Roudebush	Whitten
May	Roush	Wickersham
Miller, Calif.	Rumsfeld	Widnall
Milliken	Ryan, N.Y.	Williams
Mills	St. George	Willis
Minish	St Germain	Wilson, Bob
Minshall	Saylor	Wilson, Ind.
Monagan	Schadeberg	Winstead
Moore	Schenck	Wright
Moorhead	Schneebeli	Wydler
Morgan	Schweiker	Wyman
Morrison	Schwengel	Young
Morse	Scott	Zablocki
Morton	Selden	

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ellsworth

NOT VOTING—94

Adair	Dawson	Montoya
Anderson	Dent	Morris
Arends	Diggs	Moss
Ashmore	Dorn	Multer
Avery	Dowdy	Murray
Ayres	Elliott	O'Brien, Ill.
Bass	Fallon	O'Konski
Berry	Finnegan	Powell
Bolling	Forrester	Rains
Bolton, Frances P.	Fulton, Tenn.	Randall
	Gill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broomfield	Goodell	Riehlman
Brown, Calif.	Grant	Roberts, Ala.
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Roberts, Tex.
Bruce	Harvey, Ind.	Roosevelt
Buckley	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Burkhalter	Hoffman	Roybal
Burleson	Holifield	Ryan, Mich.
Cameron	Jones, Ala.	St. Onge
Carey	Kee	Secrest
Casey	Kelly	Senner
Cederberg	Keogh	Sheppard
Celler	Kluczynski	Short
Clausen, Don H.	Leggett	Smith, Calif.
	Lesinski	Stubblefield
Clawson, Del	McCIory	Teague, Tex.
Collier	Macdonald	Tupper
Colmer	Mailliard	Udall
Corman	Martin, Calif.	Wilson, Charles H
Cramer	Martin, Mass.	
Curtis	Meader	Younger
Dague	Michel	
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, N.Y.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Gill.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Senner.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Buckley with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Avery.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Short.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I am recorded as voting "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. If he were present he would vote "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may have permission to extend their remarks immediately prior to the passage of the bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research and development, and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT

Mr. FASCELL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

PROVIDING FOR AN OFFICIAL PICTURE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 552 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the United States Capitol Historical Society, an educational organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia and counting among its membership some two hundred and fifty founding Members of the Congress of the United States, has as its stated purpose the fostering of an informal understanding of the inspiration and promise of American history with the Capitol edifice itself as the focal point of its program; and

Whereas said society is currently engaged in the compilation and publication of an illustrated historical introduction and guide to the United States Capitol to be made available to the public; and

Whereas said publication will be a complement to and comparable in format to the extraordinary historic guide to the White House recently developed and published by the White House Historical Association; and

Whereas said society in the public interest has pledged to make available for public use negatives of all photographs which it has collected or newly processed for its historic guide; and

Whereas to complete and lend to a book "We the People" which will serve to reflect on the magnificent history of the events which took place in the Capitol Building, said society requests official permission to make for inclusion therein a color photograph of the United States House of Representatives in actual session, which will be used in the book to be published, and for other purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives be lifted at a time designated by the leadership so that the United States Capitol Historical Society be given permission to take some pictures of the House in actual session for inclusion in their publication and for the use of the news services and any and all people who have a legitimate claim to the picture.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution sets out in detail what it calls for. I have no requests for time. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I agree that the resolution sets forth the full purpose of this legislation. I have no requests for time. I know of absolutely no objection to the adoption of the resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the official picture of the House, authorized by the resolution just adopted, will be taken upon the disposition of the conference report on the tax bill on Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this completes all the legislative business for the week. We do meet tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION TO PERMIT PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BECKER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for one moment to tell the Members of the House that for months and months and months rumors have been going around, and today are still going around more and more, that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on the subject of prayer in public schools and permission to read the Bible in public schools.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee verbally from time to time that this was going to happen. As far back as May of last year on this floor the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said he was going to make an announcement in 2 weeks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear these rumors again. Of course, I realize that there is a discharge petition, discharge petition No. 3, on the desk on which there are 145 signatures. I say to the Members of this House if you want to bring this subject to the floor of the House and get it over to the other body, in time for action to be taken at this session, the signing of discharge petition No. 3 is the only route by which we will be able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will pay some attention to this matter and sign the discharge petition now.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a copy of a letter which I have recently addressed to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because there are so many rumors being circulated as to the possibility of hearings being held on my House Joint Resolution 693, and other resolutions to amend the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools, I would hope an immediate response would be forthcoming from you in order to clear up these rumors.

Some time ago, you told me you were having a study made by your staff on this subject, and that when this study was completed and printed, you would assign this subject to a subcommittee to hold hearings.

I respectfully request that these questions be answered now:

(1) Has this study been completed?

(2) Has it been printed?

(3) Has the subject been assigned to a subcommittee, and who is chairman of the subcommittee, and what is the subcommittee?

(4) Has a date been scheduled for hearings to begin; when will these hearings be completed; when can I count on a vote from the Committee on the Judiciary; and when will a report be rendered to the House?

I assure you I intend to keep driving to secure the necessary signatures on Discharge Petition No. 3, for I am convinced that the time is drawing too short in this session in order to complete action early enough for hearings to place this matter before the House for action and to be sent to the Senate early enough for action by that body.

A prompt reply will be greatly appreciated.

FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress.

FRANK M. COFFIN

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, Frank M. Coffin, who for 4 years served as a Member of this House during the 85th and 86th Congresses from the Second District of Maine, has recently been appointed by President Johnson to serve as the U.S. representative to the Development Assistance Committee in Paris.

Frank Coffin, during his two terms in the House, was an energetic, imaginative and conscientious member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and a colleague for whom we had affectionate regard.

In resigning the position of Deputy Administrator for the Agency for International Development, a position to which he was appointed by the late President Kennedy and which he has held for nearly 3 years, Frank Coffin is undertaking the difficult assignment of representing the United States in the vital Committee of 12 industrialized nations which are combining their efforts to aid the less-developed countries of the world. The importance of a deep and united commitment by these nations to assist half of the world's population in the less-developed areas is one that particularly concerns the United States. The Development Assistance Committee which is generally known as the DAC, was formed on the initiative of the United States. Our strong and continuing concern in seeing that our industrialized partners increase both the amounts and terms of aid was underscored in President Johnson's appointment of Frank Coffin.

In making the Coffin appointment, the President said:

> This appointment reflects the seriousness with which I view the work at DAC. We hope it will make steady progress toward the stimulation of greater and more effective participation of a common aid effort by the industrialized nations of the free world.

As a Member of the House under the Foreign Affairs Committee, Frank Coffin prepared himself well not only for the important responsibilities he has held as Deputy Administrator for AID, but for the new challenge that confronts him in DAC. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he first evidenced interest in the free world common aid effort by heading a major study of the Common Market which recommended the establishment of a forum similar to DAC and which would include the United States and Canada.

The DAC was formed in 1961, the year after Frank Coffin left the House. He lead the U.S. delegation to the first annual review and confrontation conducted by DAC in the summer of 1962. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he and our former colleague Brooks Hays, undertook the first two major congressional studies of Canadian-United States relations and worked toward the development of a permanent Canada-United States interparliamentary group which is now a well established and effective channel of communications between our Congress and the Canadian Parliament. As Deputy Administrator of AID, he has been an able and articulate advocate of the executive branch in testimony before our committee and other committees of the House.

I am sure that the Members of the House, and particularly the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, join me in wishing Frank Coffin success in this new and challenging position for which he is so exceptionally well qualified.

I would like at this point to insert an editorial printed in the Washington Post of February 18 entitled "Mission in Paris" praising the appointment of Frank Coffin to the Development Assistance Committee.

MISSION IN PARIS

Frank Coffin, the able Maine Democrat, has been appointed to a post of great potential importance in Paris. He will become U.S. representative to the Development Assistance Committee, which has as its task the coordination of European, American and

Japanese foreign aid to underdeveloped countries. "Coordination" is a deadly word, but in this case it clearly describes a necessary function. Besides giving multilateral direction to aid, DAC will strive to encourage a growing European participation in assistance to poorer countries.

What is especially gratifying about the appointment is that it has ended Mr. Coffin's prolonged tour in diplomatic limbo. He has been operations director for the AID agency, a thankless chore, and his name had been on President Kennedy's desk last November as Ambassador-designate to Panama. That appointment was never made, and this country was unrepresented in Panama when the canal crisis flared up. It is good that Mr. Coffin has now been assigned a task in which his zeal and dedication can be used to good purpose.

WE CAN AND MUST WIN IN VIETNAM

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter, including articles, editorials, and reports.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in some circles recently it has been suggested that the United States seek some form of neutralization as a solution for the situation in Vietnam.

The suggestion has come from Hanoi, from France's President de Gaulle, and now even from our own legislative halls.

Such expressions from Americans, it seems to me, do a grave disservice to the brave Vietnamese people who have demonstrated, and are continuing to demonstrate, their desire to win the present guerrilla conflict against the Communist Vietcong.

Their morale, their feeling of national purpose, is most important to winning this fight. Their morale is the first line of defense.

The effect of statements, from American legislators, whether or not they have the sanction and approval of the administration, are bound to be construed by the Vietnamese as indications that the United States is growing weary of the grueling guerrilla war and want to pull out.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The people of the United States want Communist aggression defeated in Vietnam.

But the Vietnamese may not realize this. They are accustomed to hearing suggestions of neutralization from the North Vietnamese and the French, but not from Americans.

The spirit of these people has been assaulted heavily in recent months. Morale sagged as a result of the political chaos which accompanied the overthrow of the Diem regime and the subsequent ouster of the Minh military junta.

Further, French views on the struggle with the Vietcong have caused discouragement. Vietnamese fear that this attitude may become general throughout the Western alliance, causing withdrawal of U.S. men and assistance.

These latest statements from American statesmen can only indicate to them that their worst fears have been realized, that the United States is, indeed, considering neutralization for South Vietnam.

Besides worrying our Vietnamese allies, these statements give aid and comfort to the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

The Vietcong, I am convinced, were losing their war of attrition prior to the assassination of President Diem. Subsequently they rallied and the South Vietnamese suffered setbacks. But these setbacks are no reason to panic.

There is concrete evidence that the regime in Hanoi is meeting with widespread unpopularity among its own people over the war which is draining off resources from an already depressed economy.

The North Vietnamese have other problems. Their harvest last year was at least 20 percent below that of the previous year. They have been unable to rally the Soviet Union to support the war directly. Morale among the Vietcong is a continuing problem.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include two recent newspaper articles which spell out some of the difficulties which beset North Vietnam:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 19, 1964]

HANOI BARES WEAKNESSES

(By Robert R. Brunn)

WASHINGTON.—Communist North Vietnam's woes are giving sizable encouragement to the South Vietnamese regime and the United States.

Some kind of a respite is being offered hard-pressed American officials dealing with the guerrilla war. They argue that now is the time to place aggressive pressure on the Communist forces.

Self-admitted weaknesses of the Hanoi government of North Vietnam, some rather surprising assumptions by the Communists, and U.S. intelligence assessments add up in this way:

Hanoi grimly assumes that the anguish-provoking war will continue, without any question, through 1964 and beyond. This is despite Washington's acknowledgment that the next 4 months are crucial.

Hanoi is combating the widening unpopularity of the war in the south which is draining off resources from a seriously depressed economy. Apathy often characterizes the civilian attitude.

MOSCOW REJECTION

Last year's North Vietnamese harvest was at least 20 percent below 1962's middling harvest. Some starvation is visible but there is no general disaster in sight.

Moscow has flatly turned down a direct Hanoi plea for aid to support the war. The North Vietnamese reason that they can't afford to turn their backs politically on Peiping, and that Peiping's gasping economy can give them little help in terms of food or weapons.

Morale among the Communist Vietcong troops in the guerrilla war is a continuing problem for the North Vietnamese Government. Analysts have seen absolutely no evidence that the division between pro-Peiping and pro-Moscow camps seriously hampers the war effort, as such. The major Hanoi decision to side openly with Peiping was bound to leave a disappointed minority but there have been no demotions, no dissident voices raised.

Hanoi has a healthy, decisive respect for U.S. military power and sees the superior weapons, equipment, and manpower of the South Vietnamese are still a major obstacle to victory. The Communists fear an escalation of the war bringing an open U.S. invasion of North Vietnam and this has tended up to now to keep the Communist military effort within a limited framework.

While the Vietcong at times has its guerrillas at battalion strength, they are in no position to coordinate such units in massive movements against the South Vietnamese. One factor is the lack of well-anchored supply bases for such operations.

Neutralization of North Vietnam is considered to be utterly out of the question in the minds of the Hanoi regime.

Much of the above analysis comes out of a careful American study of the most important statement made by the Hanoi government in several years.

PROTRACTED TRIALS

It was spelled out in two articles in the January and February issues in Hanoi's principal journal Hoc Tan, and a third article in the newspaper Nhan Dan.

This official line laid down by the articles in Hoc Tan is designed to seep down through the ranks of the faithful and be imported to South Vietnam and discussed by the fighting guerrillas, observers here believe.

When the articles speak of "new, hard, long protracted trials" in the war and use the word "protracted" over and over again, the signal is that the Hanoi Communists are not thinking in terms of a rapid termination of the war or the imminent defeat of the South Vietnamese Army.

On the contrary, the Communists expect a mounting military initiative in South Vietnam and complain that often they will have to meet modern weapons with rusty nails and crossbows.

ECONOMIC DRAIN

Analysts emphasize there is no widespread disaffection in North Vietnam. The farm situation is grim but not beyond hope.

But there is little doubt there is a solid body of opinion in the north that the never ending war is the primary cause for the weakness of their economy.

The war in South Vietnam is seen here as basically an indigenous one, gaining its support from within Vietnam. It is a "dirty" war, and one which has its grim aspects for the Communists who have had no spectacular victories. These magazine articles were designed to buck up the morale of the fighting men.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1964]

HANOI APPEARS WORRIED OVER WAR'S PROGRESS

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

From Hanoi last week came signs that the grueling war in South Vietnam is as uncertain and troubling to Communist North Vietnam as to the United States.

This message of doubt and difficulty was extracted by Washington from what was described as the most important statement of North Vietnamese policy in the last few years.

On one side, the Hanoi Communists warned that China would defend them if the United States—in order to win in South Vietnam—invaded or attacked the north. The terms of the warning, however, clouded the question of how much Soviet or nuclear help Hanoi might get.

NEUTRALIZATION REJECTED

On the other side, North Vietnam rejected suggestions for its own neutralization, as distinct from the neutralization of the South. But in so doing it raised doubts about the Communists' heart for continued combat.

In place of both "escalation" and neutralization as desirable or likely turns, Hanoi laid out a policy embracing the Chinese line of continued struggle against "imperialism"

and abandoning the Soviet line of accommodation.

But in facing up to "new, hard, long and protracted trials" against the U.S.-supported Government of South Vietnam, Hanoi avoided deadlines, timetables and any other assurances except open-ended prophecies of "final victory."

These policy developments came in major articles in the January and February numbers of Hanoi's chief journal Hoc Tap, and in a short article in the chief newspaper, Nhan Dan.

The January number had been suppressed in Hanoi until last Tuesday, when both it and the February issue were publicized. The newspaper article was distributed next day.

MOSCOW COOL

The occasion was the failure of a North Vietnamese mission to Moscow to reach agreement with the Soviet Union. This result of the trip was suggested by the frosty and fading treatment given the mission by the Soviet press. Departing Moscow, the delegation stopped off in Peiping early last week and arrived back in Hanoi yesterday.

To Washington, the journal articles had the appearance of position papers prepared for the confrontation in Moscow, while the brief newspaper story was an updating required by events.

The delegation's doings, the publication schedule of the three articles and their content—all indicated that the North Vietnamese regime of Ho Chi Minh finally has fallen off its neutral perch in the Sino-Soviet dispute and now is on the side of Peiping.

The delayed January article quoted Soviet Premier Khrushchev critically without naming him. It declared: "All arguments and actions for 'all-round cooperation' with U.S. imperialism and all hopes to prevent war and uphold world peace through consultation and cooperation with the United States are illusions."

"The people in the south should not pin their hope on the 'sincere desire for peace' of the U.S. aggressor, nor should they wait for 15 or 20 more years for the defeat of the imperialist camp in economic competition."

Said Hanoi: "The only way to achieve peace is to fight against imperialism."

The February article dealt in practical terms with the conduct of the war. It spoke confidently of the advantages conferred on the Communist guerrillas by their tactics and morale—calling morale the "main decisive factor" in a number of their conspicuous victories.

LOW ON WEAPONS

Morale is more important than weapons and physical means to those who lack the latter, observers here noted. They pointed out the article's stress on the fashioning of rudimentary weapons such as rusty nails and the capture of enemy weapons by the guerrillas. This suggested, too, no change in the low level of physical Chinese support of the war, and therefore no prospect of quick success.

In a key section, Hanoi said that "the U.S. imperialists can only choose one of the following three courses:"

1. To withdraw. But only by heavier and heavier defeats will this result.

2. To "introduce hundreds of thousands of more troops and large quantities of arms, and apply new techniques to carry on the war for some years."

WORLD OPINION CITED

Arguing against this course, Hanoi cited world opinion and past events in Laos, Algeria, and Vietnam. "As for the eventual use of tactical nuclear weapons by the United States," it said, the closeness and irregularity of the front lines make this unlikely. It added obliquely: "It is difficult for the U.S. imperialists to estimate beforehand all the consequences."

3. To broaden the war and invade North Vietnam in an attempt to win victory in South Vietnam. Then, threatened Hanoi, the United States "would have to cope not only with North Vietnam, but also with China or eventually with the socialist camp as a whole."

The phrase "or eventually" was taken here as a purposefully vague reference to Soviet support. The same vagueness was seen in the statement that, if the United States used nuclear weapons, "that might directly lead to retaliation with the same weapons."

MORALE A WORRY

The Nhan Dan newspaper article took up neutralization. The French have proposed such a course for South Vietnam but President Johnson has said it must apply to both north and south to be worth considering.

"Why did Johnson raise the question of neutralizing both zones of Vietnam, although he knows too well that our people will never accept the neutralization of North Vietnam?" asked Nhan Dan. It answered: "To soothe the tendencies" for peace and neutrality in South Vietnam.

Analysts, noting the possible harmful effects on military morale of talk about neutralization, said this statement was a way to reject the French proposal without spoiling relations with French President de Gaulle.

This statement was one of many which led analysts here to suspect that Hanoi is worrying about the morale of the forces it supports in the south.

Both these articles, it should be pointed out, emphasize that the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists do not see any resolution to the war in South Vietnam in the near future.

Neither, I might add, should the United States. There is not going to be a quick military victory. Even with increased U.S. help to a politically stable South Vietnam, it might be a decade or more until the Vietcong resistance is broken.

U.S. aid and combat training teams are going to be needed in Vietnam for quite some time to come. We are going to need much perseverance.

One alternative, of course, is neutralization of the two Vietnams. This course would ultimately, I am convinced, result in complete Communist dominance in the whole of the Indochina Peninsula.

For Red China is not going to be content to be buffered by neutral states. She is going to want—and need—satellites, as the Soviet Union wanted, and obtained, satellites.

As the late President Kennedy said in an important foreign policy speech last September:

China is so large, looms so high just beyond the frontiers, that if South Vietnam went, it would not only give them an improved geographic position for guerrilla assault on Malaya, but would also give the impression that the wave of the future in southeast Asia was China and the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let that happen. We cannot give way—or appear to give way before the expansionist policies of Communist China. Instead, we must make our stand in Vietnam, as long as the freedom-loving people of that nation ask our assistance in this joint endeavor against communism.

The question has been asked whether we, in terms of the American lives and resources expended, prefer what exists in South Vietnam to what we see in Laos and Cambodia.

To that I answer a resounding, yes.

In South Vietnam we see a brave and proud people battling to keep their nation free in the face of brutal attacks by Communist guerrillas.

In Laos in recent days we have seen the Communist Pathet Lao forces win more territory against the neutralist and rightist forces which are slowly, but surely, being backed to the wall. In Laos we see a sham of neutralization where each day the Communist forces commit another violation of the Geneva accords.

Some observers have all but written off Laos to the Communists.

In Cambodia we have seen a steady drift toward Peiping. Yesterday, for example, the press carried a report that Prince Sihanouk would seriously consider alining his country with Communist China and North Vietnam.

I would rather see a fight being mounted against Communist aggression than stand by while country after country, like a string of dominoes, goes down before the Communist advance.

My belief is that the American people who have three times in this century mounted major campaigns to defeat totalitarianism, will not flinch before this challenge.

Certainly we do not welcome the expenditures in men and resources which might be demanded of us in continuing our presence in South Vietnam. Every dollar spent could, no doubt, be put to good use here in our own country. Every American boy killed will leave hearts stricken with grief. We do not make these sacrifices lightly; we make them in the knowledge that if we fail to remain firm in Vietnam, then southeast Asia may be lost to the free world.

Let us not minimize the extent of our country's commitment in Vietnam. Let us not delude ourselves about how much is at stake in that beleaguered country.

True, this is a war that the Vietnamese must fight and try to win themselves. But they cannot do it alone. With the resources of the Communists thrown on the other side, the scales are weighted against them. Our Nation, as the leader of the free world, must help tip the balance on the side of freedom.

It has been questioned whether the war in Vietnam is in our national interest. That same question could, I suppose, be asked about Korea and Berlin.

As in those situations, the answer can only be affirmative. A firm stand in South Vietnam is in our national and international interests.

While we do not wish additional commitments of men and equipment in South Vietnam, let us not hesitate to provide them should it become necessary.

While we do not wish to involve U.S. troops in direct fighting in South Vietnam, let us not shrink from such involvement should it become necessary.

While we do not desire to fight a Korea-type war in South Vietnam, let us not rule out the possibility. By remaining firm in Vietnam, we prevent such a probability.

Mr. Speaker, the forces of light struggle against the forces of darkness in southeast Asia. This battleground has seen some victories for free world forces, some defeats. The war itself still hangs in the balance; its outcome is by no means certain.

Seen in that light, Vietnam becomes more than just a country of 15 million people. It is a symbol of American intentions and a test of our perseverance.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific and an American citizen, I do not want history to record that because of the narrowly construed opinion of what is in our national interest, the United States failed to stand in Vietnam, and found that such a course led it to further withdrawals and ultimate decline.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article by Mr. Hanson Baldwin which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, February 16, 1964. I am also including an article from the Christian Science Monitor by Joseph C. Harsch which emphasizes that patience and tenacity may yet pay off for the United States in Vietnam:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1964]

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM—IS VICTORY FOR THE WEST POSSIBLE?—MUCH DEPENDS ON STABILITY IN SAIGON AND NEW LEADERSHIP FOR THE ARMED FORCES—THE MILITARY SITUATION HAS DETERIORATED AND THE ULTIMATE OUTCOME IS IN DOUBT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

South Vietnam's moment of truth appears to be at hand. The 4-month dry season, when counterguerrilla operations are easier, has started but against a dismal military and political background.

Another military coup d'état in Saigon has shaken both South Vietnam and Washington. The French recognition of Communist China and Communist or neutralist gains in bordering Laos and Cambodia have made the position of a strong anti-Communist South Vietnamese Government far more difficult.

The Vietcong, the Communist-led guerrillas, have increased the tempo of their attacks and clearly have the initiative in the important Mekong Delta region and in some other areas of the country. And last week the Communists opened a new campaign of terrorism against the 16,000 U.S. military and civilian personnel in South Vietnam and brought the war of stealth and assassination, of ambush and subversion, to the homes and playgrounds of Americans in Saigon.

President Johnson said that "we are not pulling out of southeast Asia, because we are not willing to yield that part of the world to * * * communism."

Nevertheless, more and more people in Washington and abroad were asking: Is victory possible in South Vietnam?

I. MILITARY PICTURE

There is no doubt that, from the point of view of Washington and the anti-Communist leaders of South Vietnam, the military situation has deteriorated in the last 10 months.

Part of the deterioration is more apparent than real. Washington, and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor in particular, has become aware since the overthrow of the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem last November, that they had accepted too much at face value the exaggerated reports of "successes" of the South Vietnamese Government and of some top U.S. military sources in Saigon.

However, if the Vietnamese war was not going as well as Washington said it was, there certainly had been considerable improvement since the dark days of 2½ years ago, when the United States began its big buildup of effort and aid. With U.S. aid, the South Vietnamese were better trained, better organized, and better equipped, and in some areas they had cleared out the Vietcong guerrillas and undertook the slow and grueling business of wearing down the enemy.

Early last year, though the war was never over the hump, it could be said, with fair certainty, that the tide of defeat had been dammed and that it was the end of the beginning.

But a spring, summer, and fall of political instability and military deterioration have now culminated in a second military coup and the resumption by the Vietcong of extensive aggressive and successful operations. The Communists hold the initiative in much of the country, and the ultimate outcome is in doubt.

The statistics of this "war in the shadows" can be misleading, but they provide some index to the present situation. Our 1962 estimate of 15,000 to 20,000 hard core Vietcong regulars has now increased to about 25,000 and 30,000 to 35,000 may actually be a more accurate total. The increase, despite South Vietnamese claims of inflicting about 30,000 casualties on the Vietcong in each of the last 2 years, is attributable to several factors:

(1) Exaggerated casualty claims by Saigon.

(2) Defections, including some from the South Vietnamese Army, and extensive recruitment in South Vietnam by the Vietcong.

(3) Infiltration into South Vietnam during the last 3 years from North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and elsewhere of about 21,000—perhaps more—tough, highly trained Communists.

The Vietcong regulars are considerably better equipped than they were 2 years ago, as increased hits upon U.S. helicopters demonstrate. They employ many more machineguns, mortars, and recoilless rifles, and more automatic and semiautomatic small arms, either made in China, or imported through China from the Soviet bloc. But by far the greater part of their armory is indigenous; it has been captured from South Vietnamese troops or manufactured, in crude but effective form, in South Vietnam itself. The ratio of weapons captured to weapons lost still considerably favors the Vietcong, as to a lesser extent, do recent casualty estimates.

GUERRILLA STRENGTH

In addition to the Vietcong regulars, there are estimated to be 100,000 to 125,000 active supporters or part-time guerrillas, a number which appears to be increasing, plus an undetermined number, hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of civilians whose active sympathies or enforced cooperation aid the Communists—the "sea" in which the guerrilla "fish" swim.

The South Vietnamese Government's forces total about 380,000—about 200,000 of them regulars, the rest in the civil guard, self-defense corps, and other paramilitary organizations.

The Government can claim some areas. Saigon and its immediate vicinity, though not immune to Communist terrorism, is firmly held. The central coastal area is, on the whole, under fairly firm Government control. The rugged, mountainous central highlands area, home of the primitive montagnards, is less certain, but U.S. special forces teams have made considerable progress, and the area, though by no means completely pacified, is not the free and open sanctuary for the Vietcong it once was.

The delta region, which is the great rice producing area and the heart of the country, is the vital battleground, and here the dry season opens with the Government forces eagerly on the defensive and with much of the area controlled—not only by night but also by day—by the Vietcong. Nevertheless, in 1963 the Government exported surplus rice; in 1962 it was forced to import rice.

II. AREA'S IMPORTANCE

South Vietnam has major strategic, political, psychological and economic importance in southeast Asia and to the United States global image.

Perhaps most important to Washington, in any long-term assessment of the consequences of a defeat there, is the fact that the United States has been fully committed to victory. Both President Kennedy and his brother promised a fight to the finish against communism. If this finish should not be successful, or if the United States should renege on its promise, the "paper tiger" image of the United States so sedulously cultivated by Peiping, particularly after the Korean war and the French-American defeat in Indochina, would become a powerful psychological liability for Washington's policies in the Orient.

The encroachments of communism and neutralism in the threat of Chinese armies to India have already shaken Thailand. A victory by the Communists in South Vietnam would probably mean communism's eventual conquest by bloodless coup or by creeping aggression, of most of the rest of the southeast Asian peninsula and would pose a threat to Malaya and the important Singapore Strait.

SEVERE DEFEAT

No matter how viewed the loss of South Vietnam would mean a severe moral, political and psychological defeat for the United States in the Orient, and also a blow to our military image since the policies and the tactics employed there were worked out and backed to the full by Secretary McNamara, General Taylor and other military officials.

South Vietnam also has a considerable economic importance as a rice bowl and would be a welcome prize both to the Communist-controlled industrial northern part of the country and to overpopulated China.

III. MILITARY REQUIREMENTS

Additional military equipment (except for replacements and a few new specialized items peculiarly suited to the climate, terrain, and nature of the war) is emphatically not a requirement. The South Vietnamese Army is more lavishly equipped with modern weapons and equipment, and has, thanks to U.S.-operated helicopters and U.S. support, more tactical mobility and better air support than any other army in southeast Asia.

There is less agreement whether South Vietnam has enough men under arms to do the job. Most observers believe there is no requirement for an increase in numbers; the problem is to improve the combat capability of those already in uniform. But any discussion of quantitative or qualitative manpower requirements sooner or later brings up the question of whether it is necessary for the United States to intervene in South Vietnam with combat units in addition to the advisory and support forces there now. Most observers do not feel that such an involvement is essential to victory if—and the if is a big condition—other requirements are met.

What is needed, it is generally agreed, are new policies, new leaders, new tactics, and new intangibles—and it is the last named that will make all the difference between men in uniform with rifles in their hands and an army.

The new policies should aim at reducing the amount of supplies and the numbers of trained Communists flowing to the Vietcong across, South Vietnam's borders. This is a difficult but not impossible task.

AGGRESSIVE MOVES

Aggressive attempts to seal off South Vietnam's frontiers, aided by political efforts in Cambodia and Laos, and to project a South Vietnamese guerrilla effort into North Vietnam, would probably more than repay their costs. The establishment of anti-Communist guerrilla forces of any consequence in North Vietnam would be exceedingly difficult (less so in Laos) but not impossible. So far, the small and experimental efforts made have been doomed by overcaution and all sorts of caveats from Washington.

Direct and open attack, by bombing or other means, against the North Vietnamese privileged sanctuary appears to have little support chiefly because such assaults would escalate or greatly broaden the war, without compensating military results. The bombing of North Vietnam could not halt the flow of supplies to the Vietcong, particularly since most of their weapons are captured from the South Vietnamese Army.

New leadership—aggressive, tough, imaginative and with the will to fight—is essential to any prescription for victory. It is needed at many levels, particularly in the higher levels of the South Vietnamese Army. Washington has made a contribution of its own to this end by sending Lieut. Gen. W. C. Westmoreland as a deputy and apparent understudy for Gen. Paul D. Harkins, who may retire soon. At the same time, the command of the Pacific Ocean area, under which Vietnam comes, will change this spring, and there may be changes in the high command in the Pentagon.

NEW LEADERSHIP

The new leadership is needed most in the Vietnamese Army, particularly in lieutenant colonels, colonels, and division and corps commands.

Only the new leadership can foster the new tactics—or rather the old time-tested tactics that are essential for victory in any war of counterinsurgency.

Aggressive patrolling is their keynote; it has usually been conspicuous by its absence in the past. The tactics must be keyed to mobility—not only to helicopter mobility, but to shanks mare mobility, to denying the Vietcong the sanctuary of the night hours and of large tracts of jungle and swampy terrain. The mobile tactics must emphasize continuous, aggressive patrolling day and night, the utilization of ambush, the unceasing harrying of all known guerrilla units, the seizure of the initiative from the enemy, the elimination of as many static posts as possible and a definite transfer of the main emphasis to mobile warfare, utilizing the helicopter for transport where advisable, but using it also to supply jungle patrols.

The new leadership and the new tactics, which are indispensable to victory, mean also the most important of the new intangibles: a growth of the will to fight, a desire to defeat the Communists, on the part of the Vietnamese regulars and their paramilitary support forces.

IV. POLITICAL REQUIREMENTS

The most important of the political requirements for victory, and perhaps the most difficult to achieve, is Vietnamese political stability. South Vietnam, never a nation in the Western sense, but more a loose amalgam of village, tribal, and factional loyalties and rivalries, has experienced two coups in a few months. The army, the only national "cement" in the social structure, has been involved in both and it is evident there are many factions and much politics in the army. If another coup occurs, the army might well degenerate into many power-seeking factions each more intent on its own elevation than on national preservation. For South Vietnam today, threatened by a powerful internal enemy heavily supported from without, it is quite clear that two coups are enough. Political and hence military stability are essential to victory.

WAR OF ATTRITION

A major requirement for winning any long-drawn-out war of attrition is public support; both the Vietnamese Government's and the U.S. Government's restrictive and misleading public-relations policies have contributed greatly to a declining lack of support, which could be fatal. And Washington, with its tremendous bureaucracy, has sometimes hampered rather than helped those trying to win the war in Vietnam. Differences in Washington have been reflected in the American team in Saigon, on the one hand; on the other, there has been overcontrol from Washington.

Political and psychological efforts to deny the Communist fish the support of the population sea in which they swim must also be accelerated. These require a combination of military, psychological, social-economic, and civic-action activities. The fortified-hamlet program plays an important role in this process, for the civilian has to be offered some security against Communist duress. But the hamlet program is of little use when established in areas normally controlled by strong Communist forces, which can, at leisure, overrun any desired hamlet. It is far more important, however, when Vietcong units are broken up and harried; then the peasant can find real security in collective measures.

The political recipe for victory should also include diplomatic measures to strengthen the anti-Communist position in Laos and truly to neutralize Cambodia.

V. THE STAKES

There is no doubt that the stakes are high in Vietnam. They are considerably more important than the economic, political, and strategic value of the country. For in Vietnam the United States has fielded, for the first time, its concept of counterinsurgency and has made its first all-out attempt to erect a defense against Communism's creeping aggressions and Premier Khrushchev's tactics of national wars of liberation. If the defense fails, if the dam breaks, there will be no clear-cut line drawn against Communist expansion in Southeast Asia or anywhere else in the world. A new victory for communism would have most serious international and domestic consequences.

Because the United States has been morally, militarily, and politically committed in South Vietnam, because its prestige is involved and because the consequences of failure would have worldwide repercussions, most, but not all, Washington officials believe the price of victory must be paid even if the price includes some limited commitment of U.S. combat forces.

VI. THE FUTURE

The intangibles of the Vietnamese situation make nice power equations illogical and forecasts impossible. The military situation has deteriorated; in some areas it is bleak, indeed. But it is by no means hopeless—if. The greatest imponderable is the stability and ability of the South Vietnamese Government. If it fails—as it may if there is another coup, as there may be—the achievement of military victory may become politically and psychologically impossible and there will be increasing demands for a political solution, that is, some form of neutralization. From Washington's point of view this could only mean delayed defeat, for neutralization would almost certainly mean an eventual Communist takeover.

DISTANT VICTORY

On the other hand, if the South Vietnamese Government is stable and the requirements of victory are met, there will be much more blood, sweat, and tears before any definitive results become apparent. For wars of attrition, and particularly counter-guerrilla operations, are slow and wasting. Results, or the lack of them, must be measured against the yardstick of months and years, not days.

Thus, the great problem in South Vietnam today is that defeat, even though masked in terms of a "political settlement," could come quickly, whereas victory, no matter what is done, is far away.

[From Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 14, 1964]

THE RIFT IN THE VIETNAM CLOUDS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

LONDON.—Patience and tenacity may yet pay off for Washington over Vietnam.

The current general assumption is that the American position there is suspended helplessly and hopelessly between the danger of disengagement and the impossibility of winning a military victory.

But as so often happens in power politics there is now a tiny ray of light through the gloom from unexpected quarters. There is interesting evidence that the Communist Party in North Vietnam is now badly split between the Peiping and Moscow factions, even to the point of resistance to continuation of the war from within the Communist leadership.

First hints of possible trouble within the Communist ranks date from last October. Appeals for unity within the party became so insistent and persistent as to suggest a possibility that perhaps unity was less than perfect.

Since then a top party delegation has been suddenly and without advance warning sent off first to Peiping and then to Moscow. The circumstances suggest that this constitutes an urgent effort to persuade Moscow and Peiping to reconcile their differences on the ground that without such reconciliation the party in North Vietnam will be dangerously divided.

Reasons for an opposition group to form in Vietnam arise out of the fact that Moscow has cut down its aid to the North Vietnam Communists since President Ho Chi Minh refused to sign the nuclear test ban treaty and thus alined himself with Peiping in the big internal division in the Communist world.

Apparently Peiping is unable to make up for the decline in Soviet aid, thus leaving North Vietnam with a declining economy and the continuing drain of the war.

Seen from the Western side of the fence, the Communists sometimes seem to enjoy unlimited resources and energy, but, of course, this is not always the case.

We know now that the Korean war put a severe strain on the economies of all the European Communist countries. In fact, an interesting case can be made that the dislocations caused by that war were actually at the root of all the troubles Moscow has since had with its satellites.

The struggle in Vietnam has seemed to Westerners to be frustrating. There has never yet been a native Vietnamese government which could earn and hold the confidence of the people. The guerrilla tactics used by Communists in the rice paddies of the Mekong River Delta have not yet yielded to any military formula the West has ever been able to devise.

Many a Western statesman has examined and re-examined the problem and come to the conclusion that it was one of those monstrous cases where there seemed no end ever in sight—nothing but the continued frustration of being unable either to conclude or get out.

But as so often happens in war the moment comes when the side so conscious of

its own difficulties and weaknesses discovers that the opponent has his weaknesses as well.

The implication would appear to be clear that this is no time to talk or think of disengaging or calling off the military effort. On the contrary, it should be maintained as vigorously as possible because relaxing now could save the hard-line Communists by the one sure means. All Vietnam would fall to them while the Peiping extremist faction is still in control.

At the same time, exploration of the possibility of neutralization of the entire country should go on and could eventually be the solution—at such time as the Moscow faction came out on top.

Moscow-style communism would serve the West better in the Far East, just as Peiping style communism was an improvement for the West when it broke out in Albania and thus broke up Moscow's European empire.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI]. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement. As ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I think the gentleman's statement has particular significance. I happen to know that the gentleman has spent a great deal of time studying this very serious problem in Vietnam. He has visited that war-torn country to obtain firsthand information. There can be no question that for the world to turn its back now on those who continue to struggle for freedom in Vietnam would be to set back the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute today to our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON, for the service he has and is rendering this great Nation. Courageous service in an honorable cause is a supreme achievement in human life. Having served here with FRANK, my admiration for his dedication and devotion to principle has grown with our association.

It is no surprise that he has given service to his country in time of war. Certainly, he possesses the personal qualities that makes possible an unselfish choice when the battlefield was before him.

He still possesses those qualities, and now is prepared to use them in this Chamber. Indeed, his short record in Congress has already marked him as a legislator of great ability and understanding. His dedication to his principles has shown him to be a leader of great promise. He has been diligent in the unswerving service he has given to the fine district in the State of New York that he has the honor to represent here.

I am honored to join with my colleagues in expressing to the gentleman man from New York, FRANK HORTON, my gratitude for the courageous service he has rendered on the field of battle and to express my confidence that his achievements as a lawmaker and statesman will be no less meritorious.

PANAMA SITUATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the problems confronting the United States in Panama remain unsolved. The situation is serious and it should receive serious attention. Among the questions which we should pose is "To what extent is this Communist inspired?" The evidence is now beginning to confirm suspicions of Communist involvement in the Panama flareup. We should take a long hard look at the facts and in this connection, I refer the following article from the Chicago Tribune of February 1, 1964, to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 1, 1964]

IDENTIFY REDS IN CANAL RIOT—40 AGITATORS ARMED; MOST VISITED CUBA—TOOK ADVANTAGE OF FLAG INCIDENT

NEW YORK, January 31.—Communists and Fidelistas (Castroites) helped organize and develop the anti-American riots in Panama in which 21 persons were killed and several hundred injured, authoritative sources told United Press International here today.

The sources supplied photographs and identifications of participants. They included 70 known Communists and fellow travelers, 40 of whom were armed and played leading roles.

Most were said to have been recent visitors to Cuba, Communist China, or the Soviet Union.

ARREST SOME RADICALS

Despite Panamanian denials, the sources said Panama authorities arrested some of the better known radicals on American complaints.

Panama released them quickly because of their student status and government fears of adverse public reaction in Panama.

The sources said a flag-raising incident at Balboa High School in the Canal Zone for which American students were responsible gave the Communists and Castroites the incident they long had sought to provoke violence.

Their subsequent actions responded to appeals from Havana for riots and disorders throughout Latin America to divert world opinion from Venezuelan charges of Cuban aggression filed with the Organization of American States.

INTERRUPT STUDENT RALLY

UPI's sources traced organized agitation in the days immediately preceding and following the flag-raising incident as follows:

On January 9, Communist speakers interrupted a student rally at the National Institute in Panama City to announce a march on Balboa High School. The Communist orators were identified as Floyd Britton, Carlos Nunez, and Virginia Ramirez.

They called for violence after the march.

Britton, 26, has been registered as a Communist since 1960. He instigated demonstrations against the American Embassy in Panama City in 1955, participated in the Cuban-sponsored guerrilla activity in the Panamanian interior in 1959, and in student riots against the Panama Canal.

He was a guest of Fidel Castro in 1961 and 1962.

On January 10, after a night of rioting, Communist leaders appeared at the National Institute to distribute arms to demonstrators.

IDENTIFY THREE REDS

Identified in this activity, and their names reported to the Panama national guard, were Cleto Souza, Ruben Dario Souza, Jorge Turner, and Cesar Carrasquilla.

Dario Souza was arrested in Panama in 1953 while with a Russian who was carrying information about active Communists and Communist sympathizers in Panama.

Turner has been a Communist Party member since 1945. Carrasquilla was identified as a Communist cell leader in the science faculty of the University of Panama.

These men were heard urging the crowd to "kill Americans" and keep up the disorders "until all Americans have left Panama."

FRIEND OF CASTRO

Later in the day, Thelma King, a deputy in the national assembly and close friend of Castro, led a mob of 1,000 persons to national headquarters to demand weapons to "fight Americans."

Radio Tribuna, of which she is part owner, broadcast appeals for mob violence against Americans and U.S. properties.

Miss King has been a frequent visitor to Havana.

A subsequent meeting at Panama University, which led to further violence, was organized by Victor Avila, 24. He was described as a Communist student leader since 1960 and a former secretary general of the Panamanian students federation.

LINKED TO ROLES

Other Panamanian Communists linked to active roles in 4 days of anti-American sniping, rioting, looting, and burning were said to include David Turner, Samuel Gutierrez, and Alvaro Menendez Franco.

Turner, a Communist Party member since 1946, has been particularly active in recent months among student groups. Gutierrez is a Communist Party aid in Mexico. Menendez Franco is an associate of Miss King.

These men were photographed provoking violence.

HATS OFF

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, eggs are still a big bargain even after 50 years. A well-known and successful farmer and a distinguished constituent of mine, J. Prentice Weston, of Bennington, N.H., points out in a letter to the Petersborough Transcript that eggs are selling for the same price of 60 cents a dozen as they were back in 1913. "Can you think of any other product, be it food, clothing, or what have you, that is

better than it was 50 years ago, and yet selling for 1913 prices?" asks Mr. Weston. I agree with him that we should take our "hats off" to U.S. poultrymen.

I commend the letter to my colleagues:

[From the Petersborough Transcript, Nov. 21, 1963]

HATS OFF

EDITOR: I read with considerable interest your final item under heading of November 13, 1913, "50 years ago." Eggs at that time were selling for 60 cents a dozen in Manchester and hard to obtain.

And now, just 50 years later, eggs are still selling for 60 cents a dozen with no problem as to scarcity, and believe it or not, they are better eggs.

Can you think of any other product, be it food, clothing, or what have you, that is better than it was 50 years ago, and yet selling for 1913 prices?

You and your readers should certainly say, "hats off" to the poultrymen of the United States.

Sincerely,

J. PRENTICE WESTON,
Bennington.

RESEALING CCC GRAINS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have written the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting that the American farmer be given first consideration in the resealing of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of grains. It is my opinion that all grains presently stored on farms should be made available for resealing.

In view of falling farm income, the declining share of the national income going to the agricultural segment, and the tightening price-cost squeeze experienced by our farmers, it is suggested that the farmer receive first consideration in CCC storage plans this year.

The farmer should be given the decision to reseal if he chooses, and to seal the qualified 1963 grains. It would be unconscionable to deprive our farmers of this needed income in favor of commercial interests. In Minnesota alone, the income from the storage of the principal grains under CCC loan on farms could be over $15 million in 1964 out of a national total of over $105 million.

The decision on resealing should be forthcoming from the Department of Agriculture in the near future. It is hoped that this year's decision is in favor of the American farmer and that these grains will remain on our family farms across the Nation, where this storage revenue is badly needed.

ARA AND THE GORED OX

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent editorial broadcast by one of the many public spirited radio stations in our Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota. The editorial, broadcast over KBUN in Bemidji and called to our attention by James Hambacher, president of the Bemidji Chamber of Commerce, documents another in the growing list of tragic blunders by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Bemidji, Minn., is the land of Paul Bunyan and Babe the Blue Ox. But I assure you the complaint registered in this editorial is no myth.

KBUN COMMENTARY

There is an old expression which says, "A thing is good or bad depending upon whose ox is being gored." And people in this area who have viewed the increasing number and scope of Federal agencies with disinterest may suddenly discover that Bemidji's ox is about to be gored.

In this instance, the ox is the NuPly Corp.—just about the only manufacturing industry in this community. The Federal agency about to lend a hand in the goring is the ARA, the Area Redevelopment Administration.

With a great deal of political speechmaking this fairly new bureaucracy was launched to provide counseling and money to assist depressed areas in the establishment of new industry and new payrolls. It sounded good to some people. Others couldn't have cared less, and still others, including KBUN forewarned that ARA was simply robbing Peter to pay Paul, was simply moving industry into one poor industrial area by pirating it away from a thriving industrial area.

NuPly, as every Bemidjian should know, makes hardboard. NuPly has 18 competitors in the United States, and there are 188 hardboard plants in the world, in the United States the 19 hardboard plants are equipped to produce 3.3 billion feet of hardboard a year. Sales last year amounted to 2.2 billion feet or about two-thirds of what the domestic industry can produce if it operates at full capacity. It is obvious that we are not using anywhere near what existing plants can produce. And, under those circumstances, it is just as obvious that there is no need for more hardboard plants.

There is still another problem, 16 percent of the sales of hardboard in 1963 were imports, mainly from Sweden, and that 16 percent was a 30-percent increase in imported hardboard sales over the preceding year.

The U.S. Department of Commerce summed up the hardboard situation in a survey made for ARA and we quote from it. "Imports increased sevenfold during the period from 1952 to 1962. While interindustry competition is extremely intense, the problem of foreign competition is the single factor most important to consider. Foreign producers can sell standard hardboard for less in this country than domestic producers. Existing facilities are apparently more than adequate to supply all demand in the United States for several years."

That survey was made for ARA and it should certainly have killed any ideas about building more plants in a field that is already having trouble operating at full capacity, and what is ARA's reaction to this survey, this good advice, from the U.S. Department of Commerce?

ARA has studies now underway which could result in adding as many as 17 more hardboard plants in the United States. The closest one and the nearest threat to NuPly is a $6 million plant proposed for Superior, Wis., six times the size of NuPly. Investors will be asked to put up only $300,000, the Federal Government will put up 65 percent of the total in taxpayers' money, and the banks—protected by Government insured loans—will put up the balance.

The financing of this new hardboard plant at Superior is a far cry from the mostly do-it-ourselves financing of NuPly, putting men to work in the new plant at Superior will only reduce employment in Bemidji because the market does not need the increased hardboard production.

A new plant at Superior will also reduce the demand for wood in Bemidji—and local farmer-loggers and pulpcutters will lose some of their income.

We know it will serve no purpose to adopt a "We told you so" attitude toward ARA, and we know it will do no good to write to Minnesota's two Senators since they are not about to stop a new plant from being built on Minnesota's border; furthermore, they are not about to stop logrolling or vote swapping with Wisconsin's counterparts in Congress; our own Congressman ODIN LANGEN is one of the few who wisely voted against ARA and you might write to him.

But it would probably be more to the point to write to Eugene D. Foley, Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington 25, D.C., or to William Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, Washington 25, D.C. It's a little late but you might tell them that's our ox that's about to be gored.

COMBINED CHARITY DRIVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to hold investigatory hearings on a recently announced proposal of the Civil Service Commission to initiate, on an experimental basis, a combined charity drive for Federal employees.

John Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, proposed a new type of fundraising campaign for Federal employees. It would be a single campaign which would combine the united fund agencies, federally approved health agencies, and certain international agencies into the same drive. Employees will be permitted to pay for their pledges through payroll deductions.

Most of us who have long supported the united fund approach for community giving in our own areas must realize that the success of such an approach depends upon centralized community budgeting. By forcing agencies unwilling to have their budgets reviewed through a community-based committee process and unwilling to give up their regular communitywide campaigns to combine with others, in one drive with payroll deductions, the Federal Government will be weakening the united fund approach. Instead they will be encouraging separate efforts of those very

agencies which have been unwilling, in many instances, to cooperate in a communitywide campaign. Moreover, the choice of agencies participating can become entirely a matter of administrative whim.

There has been a great deal of opposition expressed to this program and I believe that, in fairness to all concerned, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee should look into both sides of this proposal, allow all interested parties to testify, and then report their findings and recommendations back to the House.

The Civil Service Commission presently has put this plan on an all-or-nothing basis. There may well be alternate proposals which will have the full support of all the affected agencies. This is the goal that we should be striving for. However, only with a public airing of all the issues involved will substitutes and alternatives present themselves.

The plan recommended by Chairman Macy is completely different from the type generally followed in business, industry, and labor. The Civil Service Commission has presented no good reasons why the plan for the Federal employees should run counter to those found in private sectors.

For these reasons, I have introduced this House resolution and I am asking other Members of the House who are familiar with and concerned about community fundraising techniques to support my resolution for an early committee hearing on this most important matter.

WHEAT BILL IS ACTUALLY A TAX ON POOR PEOPLE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is starting his war on poverty by proposing a tax on poor people.

The administration wheat bill (H.R. 9780) proposes a processing tax on flour, and this tax of course will be passed on to consumers. Poor people are the biggest users of flour and flour products. As income goes down, use of wheat products in the diet goes up.

Here are typical statistics from USDA:

Home use of wheat products per person per week

Annual income per family	Southern United States	U.S. average
	Percent	*Percent*
Under $2,000	4.44	3.83
$2,000 to $2,999	3.68	3.15
$3,000 to $3,999	3.41	2.84
$4,000 to $4,999	3.29	2.59
$5,000 to $5,999	3.11	2.58
$6,000 to $7,999	2.90	2.46
$8,000 to $9,999	2.56	2.29

It is clear, therefore, that a processing tax on flour would fall most heavily on low-income people, those least able to pay. The geographical area of greatest poverty is southern United States, and the statistics show that the use of wheat products in that area is even heavier among poor people than the national average.

In view of the current interest in civil rights, it is noteworthy that one-half of the nonwhite population has an annual family income of less than $3,000.

Further evidence of the repressive character of this tax comes in a study of the percentage of the family budget spent for wheat products.

[Percent spent for wheat products]

Annual income per family:	
Under $2,000	6.6
$2,000 to $2,999	5.9
$3,000 to $3,999	5.8
$4,000 to $4,999	5.3
$5,000 to $5,999	5.1
$6,000 to $7,999	4.8
$8,000 to $9,999	4.6

Based on current prices and futures and making allowance for the processing tax, it is likely that under the administration wheat bill, U.S. mills would have to pay about 35 cents more per bushel for wheat than this year. That can be translated into a price jump of nearly $1 on 100 pounds of flour.

SENATE HAS NO RIGHT TO ORIGINATE FLOUR TAX

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the best information available indicates that the other body in the next few days will act on a greatly amended version of the Cooley cotton bill—H.R. 6196—which was passed by this body last December.

Greatly amended is a term much too modest to describe the transformation that has occurred. The cotton bill has become a legislative monstrosity, as it now includes as a separate title the wheat certificate program which has been under consideration by the House Committee on Agriculture, but as yet has not been reported for consideration by this body.

The wheat program would be financed by a processing tax on flour. U.S. mills would be required to buy a 70-cent certificate—which can accurately be described as a flour tax—for each bushel of wheat processed into food for U.S. consumption. Certificates would be issued directly by the U.S. Government. They would be required regardless of where and by whom the wheat is produced.

Therefore, in my opinion, the certificates very clearly qualify as a tax.

Under the Constitution, revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. Therefore I appeal to Members of the other body to strike from the bill the title which would authorize the flour tax, and thus permit the House Committee on Agriculture to proceed with the orderly consideration of the flour tax proposal—H.R. 9780—so that Members of this body may work their will in the customary and proper fashion.

If the other body passes the bill for a flour tax, it will very likely come before this body only as a conference report. Thus, the House would not only be denied its constitutional prerogative to originate the tax measure, it would have only 1 hour for debate of a major new tax measure. No amendments would be possible, despite the fact that the measure has had no previous consideration in this body. Our only avenue of influence would be through a motion to recommit with instructions.

Surely this body will wish to assert its proper constitutional authority on this measure, just as it did so clearly in 1960. At that time, during an all-night session, this body rejected an attempt by the other body to originate an extension to the Sugar Act, which includes a processing tax similar to the proposed flour tax.

On July 2, 1960, Senate Joint Resolution 217, providing for an extension of the Sugar Act, came to the House. This body responded by adopting on a voice vote, House Resolution 598, stating that the Sugar Act was an act raising revenue and under the Constitution an extension of it had to originate in the House. I refer to Legislative Calendar, 88th Congress, final No. 14, page 85. Adoption of House Resolution 598 had the effect of tabling Senate Joint Resolution 217.

Those present for the House action will recall that Senate Joint Resolution 217 was rejected by a voice vote that fairly shook the rafters.

Inasmuch as the wheat program—like the Sugar Act—would raise revenue, a parallel situation exists as to constitutional authority to originate.

JOSEPH W. BARR, CHAIRMAN, FDIC, MAKES A POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Joseph W. Barr, the recently appointed Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, issued his first policy statement a few days ago. It was a good statement—an auspicious beginning. He showed commendable vision when addressing the 330 Washington office employees of the agency, calling for support of President Johnson's war on poverty, and expressing the clear intention to help where needed in dealing with any threats to the economy.

STATEMENT OF POLICY BY JOSEPH W. BARR

Three weeks ago, after I had been sworn in, President Johnson made a short speech to the audience gathered in the Cabinet room. He told one of his favorite stories about the time in Indianapolis several years ago when he was concluding a speech by urging the audience to seize a matchless opportunity to

obtain a great public servant by voting for me. His oratory was superb, but he forgot my name. When I saw that he was groping, I called out in tones that I hoped were subdued, but seemed to echo through the hall, "Barr, Joe Barr." He finally heard me, and I had a recommendation by the then majority leader of the Senate. (I also was elected.)

There is a sequel to this story which the President does not tell. Before he left town he asked me to call him in Texas the minute the polls closed. I called him to inform him that I had been elected; he congratulated me briefly and then told me to stand by for a call the next morning. At 10 a.m. the next day one of his senior staff members called to tell me precisely how to begin a congressional career. During the next few months, I saw Senator Johnson frequently for help and advice. His advice was simple: "Determine for yourself how you can be most useful. I will help you get in a position where you can make your best contribution."

President Johnson has a wide reputation for being effective with the Congress. Oddly enough, I never see any perceptive analyses of "Why." In my opinion his strength lies in two directions. To those Senators senior to him who gave him the responsibility of majority leader, his strength lies in their knowledge that he discharged his duties well and faithfully. To those Senators, and Congressmen like myself, who were junior to him, his strength lies in their knowledge that he gave them a chance to do their best. I am going to try to imitate both of those attributes.

This Corporation was born in desperate days. In 1931, 2,293 commercial banks with $1.7 billion in deposits failed. The next year there were 1,453 bank failures with $706 million in deposits, and for 1933 the total was a shocking 4,000 banks—with total deposits of more than $3.5 billion.

This tidal wave of bank failures destroyed public confidence in the commercial banking system and its demand deposits which constituted at that time about two-thirds of the money supply of the country. Recovery was impossible unless public confidence in demand deposits and in the banking system was restored.

The Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 established this Corporation and was unquestionably the single most important factor in restoring the viability of the Nation's deposit currency. There were no mile-long parades such as that which kicked off the NRA. The Corporation began quietly under the aegis of Mr. Walter J. Cummings, who certainly did not compare in dramatic or forensic ability with some of the more colorful early New Deal figures. But the Corporation's success has been little short of incredible. Bank failures are almost unknown. The possibility of losing money in a failed bank does not occur to an American citizen. The possibility of a sharp and sudden contraction in the money supply resulting from a wave of bank failures is a factor which the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury no longer take into account in their respective areas of money and debt management.

As a matter of fact the success of the Corporation is almost embarrassing. Let none of us think that we can rest secure and complacent in this lovely building on top of our almost $3 billion in assets.

My favorite lines from the speeches of the late President John F. Kennedy are these: "We are on the side of the hill, not the top. The absence of war is not peace. The absence of recession is not growth." This is the way that I view the posture of this Corporation. The horror of thousands of bank failures is behind us and I intend to devote sufficient time to our problems of regulation and examination to see that it stays behind us. But our demand deposits and our money supply face less apparent but nonetheless real challenges.

The Secretary of the Treasury faces a daily struggle to reduce and eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit. Anything that I can do, or that this Corporation can do, to assist him in his efforts, should be done without hesitation.

The President, as he guides our foreign policy in a troubled and turbulent world, may also have use for the nonfinancial resources of this Corporation in the support of the international financial institutions which we have helped to create.

Finally, President Johnson has declared war on poverty. This attack will be of necessity complicated, tedious, and demanding. However, this Corporation will not shrink from any responsibility in this area which the President may wish to delegate to us.

Neither I nor this Corporation has the competence to move in all areas of public policy and we shall not attempt to do so. But in those areas which contain a present or potential threat to our economy, we shall not hesitate to move if our help is needed. In addition to our regulatory and examination duties, we act in this Corporation as trustee for nearly $3 billion in assets of the American people. Surely our responsibility as trustees runs to more than petty bickering over details of regulatory policy.

In the past 10 days I have watched over 500 men and women, the Congress of the United States, work their way through many intricacies and controversies surrounding taxes and civil rights. Surely if they can resolve national differences in these terribly troubled and complex areas, then three men, the Chairman of this Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, can sit together and reason together about the differences that divide the commercial banking community. If we cannot, then I believe that the Congress is perfectly justified in firing us all and starting over again either with new men or a new system.

I invite you to join me in a climb up "the side of the hill." I make you only one promise—the same promise that President Johnson gave to me—the promise that I will give each of you the chance to do his best.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an eloquent and forceful resolution submitted by the Lithuanian community of Kearny, Harrison, and North Arlington, on the occasion of the 46th anniversary of that gallant nation's Declaration of Independence:

Whereas the Lithuanian nation on the 16th of February 1918 established an independent national state; and

Whereas during 22 years of national independence the Lithuanian Republic made cultural, economic, and social advancements comparable to those achieved by the Western Democracies; and

Whereas on the 15th of June 1940 the Soviet Union flagrantly violated Lithuania's sovereignty by occupying and subsequently forcibly incorporating Lithuania into the Soviet Empire; and

Whereas the United States of America, being the strongest free nation in the world, in every way possible gives encouragement and assistance to those in Africa, Asia, and other underdeveloped areas who are less fortunate than the United States, yet who strive for the fruits of freedoms; and

Whereas, by the same token, Lithuania, with its long and honorable political history and traditions, perseveres in its hope that some day its 3 million people once again will enjoy the democratic fundamental principles of liberty, as a nation:

Therefore, we, the representatives of the Lithuanian community of Kearny, Harrison, and North Arlington, N.J., assembled at the Lithuanian Catholic Community Center of Kearny, N.J., on this solemn occasion, the 16th day of February 1964, do hereby unanimously request you, our Congressman, PETER W. RODINO, in your official capacity as U.S. Congressman to keep alive, by open discussion, the cause of Lithuanian independence and to give your support to measures in the Congress of the United States of America whose ultimate purpose is to restore to Lithuania its historic claim of freedom as an independent nation in the free world.

Affirmed by our signatures:

REV. RAYMOND F. THOMPSON,
Councilman PETER W. VELEVAS,
JOSEPH N. BELZA.

In the name of the Lithuanian community of Kearny, Harrison, and North Arlington, N.J., on the 16th of February 1964.

CANAL ZONE POLICE: PERIL OF COMMUNISTIC REVOLUTIONARY INFILTRATION

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since making a statement to the House on February 7, 1964, strongly condemning a proposal of the Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., of the Canal Zone to employ alien Panamanians as members of the Canal Zone Police Force, I have looked briefly into the history of that fine body and have received additional information concerning a plan that could destroy its effectiveness as a protective force for the Panama Canal.

The Canal Zone Police Force started with the appointment in 1904 of Capt. George R. Shanton, who had served with Col. Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders in Cuba. Recruited largely from carefully selected ex-U.S. soldiers, sailors, and marines, the force adopted the khaki uniform of the Rough Riders in honor of Colonel Roosevelt who, by then, was President. Brought into public spotlight by the building of the Panama Canal, the Canal Zone Police established high standards of performance and morale, and become famous as one of the best law enforcement agencies of the world, with an ultimate record of 80 percent convictions on arrests. During the crucial tests of three major wars and serious border violence, it has rendered indispensable services in the protection of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, imagine the shock to the Members of this fine body of U.S. citizens on first learning on February 3,

1964, that Panamanian nationals would be employed as members of the police force charged with heavy responsibilities in the protection of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal against "lawlessness and disorder"—Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

Since making my February 7 statement, I have received much information supplementary to that previously stated to the House.

The facts are simple and are here summarized:

First. The Governors' program to employ aliens—Panamanians—as members of the Canal Zone Police Force was secretly formulated without consultation with the Canal Zone police membership.

Second. Police union officials did not learn of it until Monday, February 3, 1964, when they were notified that the Canal Zone Police Force would be augmented by 110 additional members, with 50 of them non-U.S. citizens—Panamanians.

Third. More than 70 off-duty Canal Zone police, in full uniform, formed a protest group on February 3 outside the Canal Zone Administration Building soon after the disclosure of the plan.

Fourth. Word about the plan reached the Canal Zone from Washington and not from Panama Canal authorities.

Fifth. One police union official has charged that the plan "is a State Department idea originated here through the U.S. Embassy."

Sixth. As a direct result of the announced program, three policemen have handed in their resignations and five have requested their retirement.

Seventh. The chairman of the welfare committee of the Canal Zone Pacific Civil Council emphasized that these separations are "a very serious thing because (they) reflect the attitude of the U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone."

Eighth. Samuel Roe, Jr., Canal Zone police officer and legal adviser of the Canal Zone Police Association, made the following statement published on February 7:

> The position of the Canal Zone police is that if we can't have the caliber of men we have today, and U.S. citizens, then we will do everything possible to destroy the entire administration plan to beef up the Canal Zone police and carry on with what we have.

Ninth. Canal Zone Policeman Roe was suspended from duty on February 8 because of his published statement.

Tenth. The Governor's plan disregards section 147—security positions—and section 149—merit system—of title 11, Canal Zone Code—Public Law 87–845—and the wise safeguards for Panama Canal security that these related sections provide.

Eleventh. The proposed hiring of aliens was planned to take place over a period of 2 years so that the process would be so gradual that the people of the United States and the Congress would not appreciate what was taking place.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing facts are the essentials of what many experienced officers in the Armed Forces of our country consider would be a serious breach in the security system for protecting the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. In view of all the facts in the situation, any other view reflects a naivete on the part of the architects of the plan that is incredible. Moreover, the proposal raises serious questions as to subversion in our Government.

In view of what has been revealed of communistic revolutionary leadership and direction of the recent Panama mobs and the failure of the Panamanian Government to prevent Castroite infiltration of Panama, it must be clear that if the proposal to employ Panamanians as Canal Zone police is adopted, communistic revolutionists will infiltrate into the ranks of those thus accepted with disastrous results. What greater folly and criminal stupidity can there be than to employ as police officers in the Zone at this time when the world is on fire and communistic revolution is everywhere aiding the conflagration to employ in security positions in the Canal Zone those who have no allegiance to the United States and who may at any time be guilty of sabotage and violence. This danger has been demonstrated as shown by the fact that during the recent violence, Panamanians employed in the Canal Zone were involved in shooting attacks.

Already we are employing large numbers of Panamanians as workmen in canal operations; but these are not security positions as are Canal Zone police. Certainly we should go no further in the employment of Panamanians. We must deal with the cruel, realistic situation at hand and not be governed by maudlin sentiment.

To the end that the people of our Nation and the Congress, especially the members of the investigating and appropriating committees, may be supplied with the documentation on which the above factual summary is based, I quote excerpts from three letters from Panama Canal employees, including two from members of the police force, and Panama and Washington newspaper stories as part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the committees of the Congress having cognizance of security and appropriation questions involved by this situation start immediate inquiries into this pending peril to Panama Canal security.

FEBRUARY 9, 1964.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am a member of the Canal Zone police force and I have been employed by the police division since 1952. It is not unusual to witness appeasement of aliens by the Governor of the Canal Zone; however, the Governor has presently carried his appeasement of aliens to extremes. The Governor has proposed the hiring and training of aliens on the Canal Zone police force. He has proposed the hiring of 100 additional policemen to bolster the Canal Zone police force, of which 50 will be non-U.S. citizens. Regardless of duties assigned to alien policemen, those 50 policemen would be aliens owing no allegiance or loyalty to the U.S. Government. The Governor's proposal should gravely concern the U.S. Congress in view of the existing crisis in the Canal Zone. Should the Governor's plan be accepted, Panamanians would know all plans of the Canal Zone police, and during times of disorder we would not only have to combat aliens from across the boundary; we would have them in our own ranks.

There is some evidence that an alien industrial guard at Cristobal, Canal Zone, turned out to be one of the snipers during the January 9 riots. If an alien is disloyal in a minor capacity, he will be disloyal when given greater authority and responsibility. Aliens employed by the U.S. Government took part in the riots in January and against the United States in 1959.

To implement this asinine proposal, agency officials are prepared to totally disregard section 147 (security positions) and section 149 (merit system) of title 11, Canal Zone Code—Public Law 87–845. Further, the implementation of the above plan will be in direct violation of the intent of Congress as outlined by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in their House Report No. 1869 (85th Cong., 2d sess.), which precedes the enactment of Public Law 85–550, of which sections 147 and 149 are part of the provisions incorporated in Public Law 87–845 (Canal Zone Code).

The Governor should realize that all aliens hired as police officers would have the same power of arrest as American officers and the same personnel regulations would have to govern both. This would mean that Americans would be subject to arrest by aliens and that alone will result in eventual chaos in the Canal Zone. They would have the same opportunities for promotion and that would mean that, in time, aliens would be in policy-making positions which would further imperil Canal Zone security.

Congress should also note the secrecy in which the Governor tried to effect his plan. He failed to notify the president of the Police Union. Policemen received notice of the proposed plan from Washington and not from local Canal Zone officials. How long will Congress allow the Governor to operate under a veil of secrecy and continue to cause a feeling of insecurity among Americans?

I, along with other Americans, am asking for the assistance and intervention of our Congress in prohibiting the implementation of the Governor's plan, which can only lead to further compromise of the United States and eventual chaos in the Panama Canal Zone. Enclosed are a number of newspaper clippings concerning the Canal Zone.

FEBRUARY 7, 1964.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am not a resident of your State. In fact, I have no residence in the United States. The Canal Zone has always been my home. I have always admired your stand on the Canal Zone and I, along with other Canal Zone policemen, solicit your support in seeing that Congress appropriates no funds for the employment of policemen other than American citizens in the Canal Zone.

It is shocking to know that the Governor of the Canal Zone would place the security of the Canal Zone in jeopardy by hiring aliens who on January 9 invaded, burned, and destroyed property and killed four U.S. soldiers. Aliens employed in the Canal Zone have been disloyal in capacities that are not of a security nature. How can aliens swear allegiance to a government other than their own?

Should the Governor's plan be accepted Canal Zone police operations would be no secret to Panamanians, and Canal Zone policemen would not only have to contend with alien invaders, we would have them in our own ranks.

The police division would also be removed from the Canal Zone merit system. The same personnel regulations would have to be established for both alien and American policemen. They would have to be given the same opportunities for promotion. This would mean that in time aliens would be in policymaking positions. They would have the same power of arrest that American officers have. Americans will not tolerate being pushed around by aliens in territory under American jurisdiction.

It is very strange that the Governor tried to secretly effect his plan and made no attempt to notify the president of the Police

Union. Policemen became aware of the Governor's secret plan from Washington and not through Canal Zone officials.

The time has come when Congress should put an end to the secret operations of the Governor of the Panama Canal, who is presently attempting to appease aliens, endanger Canal Zone security, and create a feeling of insecurity among Americans employed in the Canal Zone.

FEBRUARY 3, 1964.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The U.S. citizens of the Canal Zone have asked I call your attention to one of the most diabolical plans ever proposed by a Governor or members of the Panama Canal Board of Directors—the hiring of, and the training of aliens for positions on the Canal Zone Police Force.

It is proposed to hire about 100 additional policemen to bolster the Canal Zone Police Force of which 50 will be non-U.S. citizens. Irrespective of the duties assigned the alien policemen, these 50 policemen-to-be would still be aliens owing no allegiance or loyalty to the U.S. Government. The contemplated proposal should gravely concern the U.S. Congress in view of the existing crisis in the Canal Zone.

Due to recruitment difficulty of screening and selecting 50 desirable aliens (Panamanians) agency officials report the alien additions to the force may take about 2 years to complete. I believe the agency's 2-year target date was made to help overcome protests and budgetary problems expected by the Congress.

To implement this asinine proposal, agency officials are prepared to totally disregard section 147 (security positions) and section 149 (merit system) of title II of the Canal Zone Code—Public Law 87–845. Further, the implementation of the above plan will be in direct violation of the intent of Congress as outlined by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in their House Report No. 1869 (85th Cong., 2d sess.) which preceded the enactment of Public Law 85–550, of which sections 147 and 149 are part of the provisions incorporated in Public Law 87–845 (Canal Zone Code).

A delegation of some 40 U.S. policemen recently informed Col. David Parker, Lieutenant Governor of the Canal Zone, that they were prepared to lay down their lives in the course of their duties, however, in view of recent circumstances they could not and would not accept the plan to integrate "aliens" into the Canal Zone Police Force.

We are asking for the assistance and intervention of our Congress prohibiting the implementation of this plan which can only lead to further compromising of the U.S. position, and eventual chaos in the Panama Canal Zone.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1964]

CANAL ZONE POLICEMAN SUSPENDED FOR OPPOSING NATIVES ON FORCE

A veteran U.S. police officer has been suspended from the Canal Zone Police Force for opposing the plan to integrate Panamanians into the unit.

Sam Roe, Jr., 48, legal and technical adviser of the Canal Zone Police Lodge (AFL–CIO), was reportedly reprimanded by his superiors and suspended last week for statements against the plan. He has been a Canal Zone police officer for 29 years.

Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., Governor of the Canal Zone, last week announced plans to bring about 20 Panamanians into the police force soon. Ultimately some 50 to 75 Panamanians would be used to reinforce the peacekeeping units inside the zone, mostly in communities heavily populated by Panamanians.

It was understood that Roe was summoned before Police Chief E. C. Shipley late last week and suspended with pay after a reprimand for a statement to newsmen.

[From the Panama American, Panama (Republic of Panama), Feb 10, 1964]

CANAL ZONE SUSPENDS ROE FOR CRITICIZING REPUBLIC OF PANAMA ENLISTMENTS

Canal Zone policeman Samuel Roe, Jr., has been suspended from his job by Police Chief E. S. Shipley, reliable sources said today.

Although Roe declined to comment on reports of his suspension, the source said the long-service policeman was suspended at the weekend because of statements concerning Panama Canal administration plans to hire 110 Panamanian nationals for the Canal Zone Police Force, which were published in the Panama American last Friday.

Sources said that although Roe has been suspended from duty since Saturday he is receiving full pay.

Meanwhile local civic council sources today announced plans to circulate statements reportedly made by Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., at a civic council executive meeting held in the Balboa Heights Administration Building December 12, 1962.

Fleming, at that meeting, allegedly said that there were four classifications of employment in the Canal Zone which would not undergo changes—the police force, fire department, comptroller's office positions, and supervisory and technical jobs on the Panama Canal locks.

Civic council sources said Fleming claimed that because of the law there would be no transfer of jurisdiction and no changes in the court system. "This was violated last night when a National Guardsman from Panama entered the zone and went to the Balboa High School to escort out a Panamanian youth who was carrying a Panamanian banner," one source said.

[From the Panama American, Feb. 7, 1964]

PLAN TO HIRE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA NATIONALS FOR CANAL ZONE POLICE MEETS STRONG OPPOSITION

Officials of the Canal Zone Police Union vowed today they will do everything possible to "destroy" Panama Canal administration plans to bring 110 Panamanian nationals into the zone police force.

The Panama Canal Pilots Association and the Central Labor Union (CLU), have reportedly backed protests from the Canal Zone Police Union terming the move as a "dramatic inroad and a breach in the Canal Zone security system."

First reports yesterday said Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., intended enrolling some 40 Panamanians into the police force before Sunday "to meet any situation which might arise in relation to the proposed demonstration by Panamanian students this Sunday, in observance of the first month after the January 9 riots."

But later newscasts based on information supplied by the Panama Canal omitted previous reports that the Panamanians would be sworn in "immediately," saying they would be hired "on a normal recruiting basis." These later reports also claimed that the number of Panamanians to be hired "has not yet been announced."

Police union officials, however, said they had been told during a meeting with Lt. Gov. David S. Parker, Monday, that 110 Panamanian and United States citizens would be hired with 30 Panamanians serving in supervisory categories and 3 working as liaison officers.

Over 70 off-duty Canal Zone policemen in full uniform formed a protest group outside the Balboa Heights Administration Building Monday—shortly after rumors of the plan to hire Panamanians for the police force became known.

The protest group stayed in front of the building until one of their union officials was allowed to attend a meeting with Parker at which the official announcement to implement the force with Panamanian nationals was made.

Meanwhile it was learned that three zone policemen have handed in their resignations and five have requested their retirement as a direct result of the administration announcement.

This move was termed "a very serious thing because it reflects the attitude of the U.S. citizen in the Canal Zone," Arthur C. Payne, chairman of the Pacific Civil Council Welfare Committee, said.

"The position of the Canal Zone Police is that if we can't have the caliber of men we have today, and U.S. citizens, then we will do everything possible to destroy the entire administration plan to beef up the Canal Zone Police and carry on with what we have," Samuel Roe, an official of the Police Union said.

The first announcement of the Governor's plan yesterday said "the plan to strengthen the police force was revealed when he [the Governor] ordered special security measures along the boundary between the Canal Zone and Panama."

But an announcement read over SCN television last night claimed "the obvious solution to the problem of maintaining peace is sharing work with the greatest number of Latin Americans."

Richard Meehan, president of the Canal Zone Police Union, countered this statement, saying "Panamanians' loyalty in carrying out these tasks can be questioned. This plan will cause a large number of Americans to quit and go home."

Reliable sources said that, contrary to Panama Canal indications that the Panamanian policemen will be charged only with looking after areas housing a predominantly Panamanian population, the Panamanians will be given "technical jurisdiction over Fourth of July and President Kennedy Avenues, the Thatcher Ferry Bridge and all the territory on up to Arraijan."

Commenting on reports that the hiring of Panamanians will do away with the merit system—a system similar to the civil service system practiced in the United States—Canal Zone Police Union officials said "the only reason for doing away with the merit system is to provide the Panama Canal with the ability to commit discriminatory practices in the hiring of Panamanian nationals against these same Panamanian nationals."

Roe said that when the Panamanian policemen join the zone force, they will receive "our salary less the 25-percent differential. But no one has been able to get near the Governor to get the true picture."

Union officials also pointed out that in their opinion, the plan to hire Panamanians as policemen is far from reality. "Before this can be done permission must be obtained from the Secretary of the Army and then a go-ahead from the Budget Bureau—the people who will provide the money," union spokesmen said.

But one union official said "if the Budget Bureau doesn't give it permission then the State Department will probably go ahead and provide the money. This is a State Department idea originated here through the U.S. Embassy."

THE HONORABLE FRANK HORTON, REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, to take this time on the floor of the House of Representatives today to pay tribute and appreciation to one of our finest Members, my good

friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. FRANK HORTON. Our colleague, FRANK HORTON, has just been decorated by the U.S. Army with the Bronze Star Medal for his outstanding performance and heroism during World War II. During World War II, he received the Legion of Merit, a decoration for even greater valor than that necessary to qualify for the Bronze Star Medal.

This award, coming almost 20 years after FRANK HORTON's valiant service is significant, indeed, for up until the moment that Brig. Gen. F. W. Boye made the award, FRANK HORTON was unaware of its nature. An Army research officer had accidentally discovered our colleague's eligibility for the Bronze Star during a periodic review of Army Reserve records.

Because FRANK HORTON, now a Reserve lieutenant colonel, had previously been awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge for distinction in wartime service, he was entitled to the Bronze Star. In decorating Congressman HORTON, General Boye read from the official authorizing order which cited FRANK's "exemplary conduct in ground combat against the armed enemy while assigned as first lieutenant to the 60th Infantry Regiment, on or about July 3, 1944, in the European Theater of Operations."

We who serve in the Congress with FRANK HORTON are indeed proud of him, his background, and particularly the outstanding record he is making for the folks of New York's 36th Congressional District. He works hard, and his dedication to the cause of freedom and the preservation of individual liberty is exemplary. We need more men like FRANK HORTON. I hope the good folks of New York will return him to us in the Congress so long as he is willing and capable of serving.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a gallant colleague, FRANK HORTON.

He came to our ranks with an outstanding record of service to his community and to his country.

He has distinguished himself in whatever capacity he has undertaken, in civic affairs, as a public official in his hometown, in the Armed Forces of the United States; and most recently, as a Member of the Congress.

He has my warmest congratulations for the belated recognition which has come his way for bravery and devotion to duty.

FRANK HORTON is a fine American whom we are all justly proud to have among us.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

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

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in this tribute to my dear friend and colleague. I am proud of what he has accomplished here in Congress and of the patriotic duty that he has performed through the years to his country not only in the Army in combat but here in Congress.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, we in the State of Louisiana are also particularly happy to see this honor that has come to Congressman HORTON. You know, I guess, Congressman HORTON represents the reverse of what is often true. He was raised in Baton Rouge, La., and graduated from high school there. He graduated from Louisiana State University before World War II. Then he had a distinguished record during World War II and then left us in the Southland and left the glorious Democratic Party and turned Republican and moved to upstate New York.

We are happy to see this honor come to him, and I am certainly very happy to add my personal congratulations to an outstanding American.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his comments. I might note the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] got the proper start in life, however, for before going to Louisiana, he was born in Cuero, Tex., and there are a lot of good folks, Republicans and Democrats, who come from that part of the country. We are proud to claim at least a part of FRANK HORTON and his outstanding accomplishments.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the New York congressional delegation in congratulating our colleague, Congressman FRANK HORTON, on being awarded the Army's Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism. I can assure you that the good news comes as no surprise to me as I consider Congressman HORTON one of the outstanding Members of the U.S. Congress. He has impressed me as being one of the most able and conscientious Congressmen to be elected to this distinguished body during the 26 years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. HORTON enjoys the respect of every member of the House District Committee, of which I am privileged to act as chairman. I do not know of any piece of legislation that has been referred to the House District Committee that has not received the serious consideration of my colleague, Congressman HORTON, and he has proven to be a wealth of strength to our committee.

I want to congratulate the good people of his congressional district on their sound judgment in selecting FRANK HORTON to represent them in the U.S. Congress. I can assure each of them that their welfare in the National Congress is in good hands. I have seen Members come and go by the hundreds since I have been a Member of Congress and, as I have previously stated, I have not met one that I thought was better qualified to serve as a Member of the National Congress than FRANK HORTON.

We are all extremely happy to see FRANK receive this extraordinary recognition, being presented with the Army's Bronze Star Medal, and we wish for him continued success as a lawmaker in the most outstanding lawmaking body in the world and in all of his business endeavors in private life. I am certain that the Congress of the United States has gained a great deal by having FRANK HORTON serve as a Member of this body and I am also certain that every member of the House District Committee is of the opinion that the standing of our committee has been greatly enriched and improved by having FRANK HORTON as one of our members.

It is my sincere opinion that FRANK HORTON will go down in history as one of our greatest lawmakers the same as he came out of the Army as one of our greatest heroes.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk for hours concerning the fine manner in which Congressman HORTON has conducted himself as a Member of Congress and the good work he has done in having some of the most important legislation that has been presented to the Congress during the past 2 years enacted into law. I wish Congressman HORTON and his family all the good things of life and that we will have the privilege to have him as a Member of Congress as long as he will agree to make sacrifices from his private life to serve as a lawmaker in this body.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his remarks.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege for the past year and a few months to become intimately acquainted with our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. HORTON]. We have worked together on a committee of this Congress and I am sure that the dedication to duty which he has manifested as a member of that committee is characteristic of his dedication to duty during military service in time of conflict. It is unfortunate that this award which he earned so many years ago was so late in coming. I would not want to be a party to having it said that it was 20 years before his outstanding service as a Member of this Congress was noted by some of us who are privileged to serve with him.

I commend the gentleman from Texas for his foresight and thoughtfulness in getting the time for us to take note of this belated bestowal of the honor which the gentleman earned so long ago. It is a wonderful thing to be recognized, even late, I am sure. All of us who have had the privilege of military service during the time of the great wars in which our Nation has been engaged always feel a bond of friendship and comradeship; and I am sure that all of those who served here who are entitled to wear the

ribbon of military service appreciate the Army's taking note of this wonderful performance by our friend while he was in the military.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his fine remarks. I am sure that, having served on the committee with our friend from New York he knows him perhaps even better than I do. I appreciate the comments that he made.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride in the accomplishments of a distinguished colleague and pleasure that his accomplishments have once more been recognized, that I join with other Members of the House of Representatives in commending the Honorable FRANK HORTON, of the State of New York, on his selection by the U.S. Army as a recipient of the Bronze Star Medal Award.

Mr. HORTON has been so honored for his outstanding military leadership and heroism above and beyond the call of duty while serving with the Army for 3 years in the campaigns of Africa and Italy during World War II.

Twice, the gentleman from New York has set aside a brilliant legal career for service to his country. First, as an Infantry officer in the Second World War; and, second, as a Member of the U.S. Congress.

This Bronze Star Medal Award, earned some 20 years ago, is one more item of convincing evidence of his patriotic and devoted service to his country.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN], who has been so helpful in arranging this time.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. At the outset I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] in arranging this special order in his usual careful and thorough manner to pay tribute to our good colleague, Mr. FRANK HORTON, of New York. It has been a distinct pleasure for me to work with the gentleman from Texas in arranging to pay tribute to this gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we who are engaged in politics know how competitive our world is. This is true not only in politics but in virtually every endeavor we engage in. However, in the history of man there has been no keener competition or greater test than that found in our wartime military service.

With this in mind it is with respect and admiration that I join my colleagues today in expressing our congratulations to the gentleman from New York, FRANK HORTON, for belatedly receiving the Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism while serving as a combat infantryman. This recent award plus his previous decorations including the Legion of Merit attest to his outstanding ability and courage during wartime.

He also serves his country at peace as he is doing so admirably in the U.S. Congress. Today we especially take note of FRANK'S military feats, but I also want to congratulate him for his exemplary work with young people, in the legal profession, and in the sports world.

This Nation has benefited greatly from the services to date of the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON. Let us hope he will continue to serve in the House of Representatives for many more years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD other tributes of Members of the House honoring our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his contribution in this tribute to our distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in commending FRANK HORTON upon his selection to receive the Bronze Star. FRANK'S outstanding military leadership as a combat officer in World War II, is characteristic of the man we have come to know here in the House of Representatives.

Early in his career as a Member of Congress FRANK'S aggressive ability, depth of understanding, and willingness to accept responsibility was apparent to me because of our service together on the Committee on the District of Columbia. He quickly won the respect of senior members of this committee on both sides of the aisle and it became evident that we would hear a great deal more from this gentleman from New York. His effectiveness in behalf of his constituency is superior and his devotion to the service of his Nation has been unswerving.

It is a privilege to serve with FRANK HORTON and I congratulate him upon this recognition by a grateful Nation for heroism in time of war.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, during the comparatively short period of time that he has served as Representative in Congress from the 36th District of New York, FRANK HORTON has earned the respect and admiration of all his colleagues here. Both in his committee work and on the floor of the House, he has achieved a stature and a reputation for keenness of mind and fearless integrity.

I have been particularly fortunate in having FRANK serve as a member of Subcommittee No. 4, of which I am chairman, of the Committee on the District of Columbia. Our work has been particularly difficult and trying during this Congress, and I can say in all sincerity that no other member of that group has surpassed FRANK HORTON in diligence, intelligence, and forthright adherence to those principles of sound government and constructive legislation which are his convictions.

Knowing FRANK as I do, therefore, and holding him in the highest esteem, I was in no way surprised to learn that he has recently been belatedly cited for "exemplarly conduct in combat against the armed enemy" while serving as an officer of the 60th Infantry Regiment in Europe during World War II. The fact that because of some confusion in the records, this recognition came to FRANK some 20 years after he had displayed on the field of battle that courage and devotion to his country which exemplify the highest ideals of American manhood, does not in any way dim the luster of his courageous deeds.

We, his colleagues in the House of Representatives, see in FRANK HORTON an outstanding young Congressman with a bright future of distinguished service to his country, his State, and his community.

In addition to his other accomplishments, FRANK was born in the great State of Texas which I have the honor to represent, and Texas is proud indeed to claim as a native son this gallant soldier and statesman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with my colleagues today in this appreciation tribute and salute to an outstanding member of this body, Congressman FRANK HORTON. As a member of the influential House District of Columbia Committee, the House Government Operations Committee, and special subcommittees, he has made an impressive and exemplary record. We are proud of FRANK HORTON, not only because of his military accomplishments and awards, but particularly for the great job he is doing in representing New York's 36th Congressional District in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to learn that our colleague, FRANK HORTON, from my own State of New York, has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal for outstanding service during World War II. This recognition will be none the less pleasing to FRANK because it is belated for it will recall memories of places and people associated with the war years. His continuing service in the Army Reserve sets a worthy example of responsibility and I know it gives encouragement and leadership to Reserve activities in his home city of Rochester. We are not surprised that his military career brought repeated honors for his record in the House is one of faithful and distinguished performance. We look forward to his future years in this House knowing the same high standard of public service will be maintained. I am glad to have this opportunity to congratulate FRANK on this fine honor and to express my pleasure at having him as a colleague.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure to join with my colleagues this afternoon in honoring FRANK HORTON for his great service to his country in time of war as well as in time of peace. I am proud, indeed, to be a fellow member of the 88th Club.

During World War II he served with distinction and heroism as an infantry officer in North Africa and Italy—receiving the Legion of Merit and the Combat

Infantryman Badge. Just recently, in line with his duty as a Reserve lieutenant colonel, the U.S. Army discovered that through an error he had not received the Bronze Star to which he was entitled because of outstanding leadership in World War II—and I am happy that this error was rectified, with the Bronze Star being presented to him early this month.

In addition to serving as a Reserve officer since his discharge from active duty, FRANK has been a successful lawyer and has been very active in civic affairs. His long years of dedicated service to his country were culminated with his election to the 88th Congress in the fall of 1962. He has already clearly demonstrated his ability as a legislator; and I know that his contributions will continue to be outstanding.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to our colleague, FRANK HORTON. We salute his heroism, and we know that he honors all of us by wearing the Army's Bronze Star Medal. Having previously been awarded the Legion of Merit and the Combat Infantryman Badge, this further recognition has been long overdue.

I am happy to join with all of our colleagues in applauding FRANK HORTON and, further, to thank him for his devotion and bravery of which we, after all, are the beneficiaries.

Well done, FRANK.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying our due recognition and respect to FRANK HORTON, who recently has been awarded the Army's Bronze Star Medal for heroic service in World War II.

FRANK is a most unassuming gentleman, and no doubt wishes that we would have refrained from this public expression of recognition of his wartime service.

However, FRANK is representative of the type of civil soldier who performs so well in the crises which have confronted our Nation and his record is an inspiration to all who know him. He is an extremely conscientious, persevering, and effective Member of this body and all of us hold him in even higher respect now that we fully appreciate his outstanding military service in World War II.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, for one who has not served his country in a military capacity, but who enjoys the heritage of liberty and freedom that those servicemen and veterans have made possible, I am happy to extend congratulations to our friend, colleague, and freshman Member of Congress for the honor recently bestowed upon him.

FRANK HORTON, in receiving the Army's Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism, permits many of us to recognize his other outstanding military leadership accomplishments as an infantry officer in North Africa and Italy. It is a privilege to bask in the reflected glory that comes to one of our Members especially when it is so well deserved. During my brief service in the 88th Congress it is apparent that FRANK HORTON brings the same degree of ability and leadership to this House that he provided in the service of his country on active duty in World War II, and as a Reserve lieutenant colonel. I take personal pride in being counted among his friends.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to be associated with the tributes which have been paid today to my able and dedicated colleague, the gentleman from New York, FRANK J. HORTON. Our country owes a great debt to FRANK HORTON for his bravery and outstanding military heroism as an infantry officer in North Africa and Italy. America and the citizens of the 36th Congressional District of New York State, in particular, are fortunate to have him continue serving them in this greatest of all legislative bodies.

Since Congressman HORTON is my neighbor in the House Office Building, I can testify firsthand to his dedication to his constituents and his country in fulfilling his responsibilities as an elected representative. It is a pleasure to serve with him and to work with him in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we offer recognition today to Representative FRANK HORTON, of New York, who earlier this month received the Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism. Previously awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge, FRANK was cited for "exemplary conduct in ground combat against the armed enemy while assigned as first lieutenant to the 60th Infantry Regiment, on or about July 3, 1944, in the European Theater."

At that time First Lieutenant HORTON'S regiment had finished 18 days of combat at the front in the Cottin Peninsula in France and proceeded south of Les Bieux, France. Shortly after this, the 60th Regiment took part in the 1st Army's push to the Marigny-Coutances area. While in the Infantry, Representative HORTON also took part in amphibious landings in North Africa and Italy, serving from June 1941 to January 1946 and receiving the Legion of Merit and the Combat Infantryman Badge. We congratulate our colleague, FRANK J. HORTON, on receiving the Bronze Star and for his valorous service in the campaign in France.

As Lieutenant HORTON, he served his country well. As Congressman HORTON we know that he will continue to exert all his efforts in behalf of the best interests of the United States.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I participate in this tribute to my New York colleague, the Honorable FRANK HORTON.

FRANK HORTON has not only compiled an outstanding military record, but has made a creditable record in Congress, giving effective representation with the national interest in mind to the district he represents.

We are proud to have him in Congress. His guidance and advice has been invaluable in helping us make considerable decisions on the many important legislative matters affecting this country.

In his first year as a Representative he joined and played an important role in a bipartisan effort to find solutions to the continuing problems of communism and Cuba. His contributions to this discussion were practical and effective.

The House of Representatives is honored to have FRANK HORTON among its many Members who have served this country in its wars.

I join with the other Members of the House in congratulating Congressman HORTON for having won the Bronze Star Medal Award for heroic achievement in the military service. May he have many more years of service to his district and our Nation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in recognizing the honor which has been bestowed on our friend and colleague, FRANK HORTON, by being awarded the Bronze Star Medal of the U.S. Army.

Lt. Col. FRANK HORTON'S brilliant military record during World War II has been previously acknowledged by the award of Legion of Merit and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

During the dark days of World War II, in the campaigns of North Africa and Italy, FRANK HORTON'S valiant leadership provided strength and inspiration for the men of the 60th Infantry Regiment.

His stalwart devotion to duty while in command of an infantry company during the amphibious landing of Allied troops in north Africa in November of 1942, and his participation with British forces during subsequent landings in Italy in September of 1943 made an invaluable contribution to our final victory in Europe less than 2 years later.

Those of us who are honored to work with Congressman FRANK HORTON in committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives are well aware of his loyal adherence to the principles of truth, integrity, and fairness.

In expressing my high esteem and eminent regard for FRANK HORTON, I am profoundly grateful to the electors of the 36th Congressional District of New York for selecting a man of such exceptional stature and rare ability to represent them in Congress.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was a great addition when FRANK HORTON joined the New York delegation in Congress. I am glad that he is finally being presented with the Army's Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism. This, of course, has to do with his distinguished war record. But it seems to me he has earned some kind of a star for his work here in Congress. As we all know, he is an able, dedicated, conscientious, and outstanding Member of the House. I am proud that he was elected from my home State of New York.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable FRANK J. HORTON, who is an up-and-coming freshman Member of the House, was recently surprised, I understand, when a brigadier general of the Army appeared at his office to present him with the Army's Bronze Star Medal for his heroism in North Africa and Italy during World War II. Though he had previously been awarded the Legion of Merit and the Combat Infantryman Badge, I was nonetheless delighted to learn of this belated additional recognition of his outstanding service as an infrantry officer during the hostilities.

Representative HORTON is a fine gentleman and his outstanding service is by no means limited to the Army infantry, but is also evidenced by his record as a member of his home community, his

State, and the House of Representatives. Though a busy lawyer prior to his election to Congress, he still found time to engage in many worthwhile activities consistent with his interest in the public welfare and in the youth of our country, as, for example, his work in the areas of civil defense and the Boy Scouts. Since turning his energies to his responsibilities as a U.S. Representative, he has made a fine record both in his committee work and on the floor of the House. It is a pleasure to offer him my heartiest congratulations for his distinguished service to his country not only in military combat but also as a fine citizen and legislator.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in tribute to my colleague from Rochester, N.Y., Representative FRANK HORTON, upon the recent award to him of the Bronze Star Medal by the Department of the Army. Though this award is more than a little belated, we are glad to see the Army correcting this oversight which has existed for almost 20 years since the time FRANK participated in the invasion of Italy.

I am sure that those challenging and difficult days of World War II provided a sobering yet strengthening experience for FRANK, as they did for most of the young men who served our country in that heroic conflict. Certainly those experiences are of particular value here in the Congress where so many of our responsibilities are related to the defense and security of our Nation.

Congressman HORTON, of course, has been well prepared for his responsibilities here in Congress by many experiences, in addition to his military service. His training in the law at Cornell University and the practice of law in Rochester, his service as a member of the Rochester City Council from 1955 to 1961, his experience with Republican ward and county committees, as president of the Rochester Community Baseball Club and executive vice president of the International Baseball League, and in church, fraternal, and civic positions—all these have provided a wealth of training and experience which enable FRANK HORTON to represent so ably the broad interests of the people of his area.

In his short time in the Congress, our colleague, Representative HORTON has demonstrated that he is a sensitive and vigorous representative of his constituents' interests, and he has labored diligently on the legislative responsibilities of his respective committees. I am confident his contributions to good Government for our Nation will continue to broaden and grow with his lengthening service in the Congress of the United States. I salute him on this occasion and am happy in the knowledge of this deserved recognition.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the belated award of the Army's Bronze Star medal to our distinguished colleague, FRANK HORTON, of New York, presents us with the happy opportunity not only to offer our congratulations on his record of outstanding military leadership during World War II but also to consider the way in which our friend and associate has responded so impressively to the broader and potentially more significant possibilities for public service here in the Congress of the United States.

From a background rich in public and private service to the people of his community, Rochester, N.Y., FRANK HORTON has brought to the House qualities which have earned him an enviable reputation in just a few short months—a high degree of commonsense, a thoughtful and scholarly approach to his job, an awareness of the complexity of so many of the issues before us, a taste for hard work, a willingness to face difficult questions forthrightly and take a stand on controversial issues.

When these valuable qualities are wedded to great ability and to a conscientious sense of obligation to his country and his constituents—as they are in the person of FRANK HORTON—then we have a Congressman who is serving in the finest traditions of this body.

As a Member of Congress, as a Republican, and as a colleague who has enjoyed his friendship, it is a special pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to join so many of our colleagues today in paying deserved tribute to FRANK J. HORTON—a gentleman who has brought a positive outlook and a sound, inquiring and perceptive mind to the deliberations of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and as an admirer of my able colleague from New York, I am pleased to join in paying tribute to our distinguished associate, the Honorable FRANK J. HORTON.

In recognition of his outstanding military leadership while an infantry officer in North Africa, and Italy during World War II, Congressman HORTON was previously awarded the Legion of Merit and the Combat Infantry Badge. As is now known, by virtue of these earlier decorations, he should have also been awarded the Bronze Star. This has now been presented to him, and although 20 years late, it is gratifying to know that the Army has corrected its oversight.

Congressman HORTON has fulfilled his duties here in Congress effectively and with the same courage which he demonstrated on the battlefields of World War II. I hope that he will be a Member of this distinguished body for years to come, and I congratulate him upon this additional honor which he so deserves.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to congratulate our colleague from New York, FRANK HORTON, upon receiving the Army's Bronze Star for World War II heroism. This honor, with his previous awards of the Legion of Merit and the Combat Infantryman Badge, provides a fitting tribute to a man whose entire life has meant accomplishment and dedication to the American principles.

Although a freshman Member of Congress, his young life has been one of public service, first to his country through distinctive performance in the military service, then to his community and State through worthwhile contributions to the welfare of his fellow residents, and now through national service in this legislative body.

I am grateful to our colleagues, ED FOREMAN and DON BROTZMAN, for arranging this time for the inclusion of our remarks. They, along with FRANK HORTON, constitute three of our young Members who have made significant contributions to the work of this assembly in their first terms. Their outstanding and effective efforts are a credit to these men and the people who sent them here.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of the 88th Congress one of the most gratifying pleasures has been the privilege of meeting so many wonderful people from all parts of the Nation. Without seeming presumptious I think each of us can point with pride to the outstanding character and ability of the Members who were elected to serve in this great body at the 1962 election.

Throughout the past year it has been my privilege to learn to know Congressman FRANK HORTON, of New York, and to count him among my personal friends. Not only has the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] shown great ability and skill in legislative procedures but I feel he has become one of the most effective and outstanding Members of the House of Representatives.

I was delighted to learn of the recent honor granted FRANK in the award of the Army's Bronze Star Medal for heroism during World War II. This is indeed a high honor and I join with my colleagues in paying compliments to him today and wish him many, many years of successful service in this legislative body.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased with the news of another great honor being bestowed on my distinguished colleague from New York, Hon. FRANK HORTON.

Since I, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] am a freshman Congressman from New York, I have a ready opportunity to observe his depth of knowledge of the mechanics of New York State government, its people, their needs and problems, and his already demonstrated ability and readiness to work tiresome hours in their interest.

I am convinced that the qualities of leadership, courage, and good judgment, which earned him great honors in his military career, will bring to the Congressman great honors as a legislator and a statesman.

It is an honor to be associated with him.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the other Members of the House in a well deserved salute to our colleague, FRANK HORTON, who has been awarded the Army's Bronze Star for World War II heroism.

As a freshman Member of Congress, FRANK has worked diligently, giving his time and efforts to one task, to make this country and our system of government work just a little better. FRANK has already established himself as an outstanding Member of Congress, and we in New York feel it is our good fortune to have him as a Member of our congressional delegation.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in expressing our thanks to him for

his many accomplishments and to congratulate him upon his selection to receive the Bronze Star.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare event, indeed, for a Member of Congress serving in his first term to be commended on the floor of the House.

But our colleague, FRANK HORTON, is that rare individual who is being so commended today.

FRANK HORTON is an outstanding attorney, a Reserve officer with a distinguished war record, and a man who has made many vital contributions to his State and his congressional district.

But in addition to his civil accomplishments, I would like to join with his many friends today in extending my congratulations for the recent presentation of the Bronze Star which FRANK HORTON won as an infantry officer in Italy and north Africa 20 years ago.

By inadvertence, the War Department, at that time, never presented FRANK HORTON with the Bronze Star and, modest as he is concerning his own accomplishments, he never sought recognition for his valor. A review of his service records indicated that he was awarded the Bronze Star but, actually, it had never been officially presented to him.

Recently, Brig. Gen. F. W. Boye, U.S. Army, called on our distinguished colleague to present to him the medal which he won for bravery 20 years ago.

FRANK HORTON is now a Reserve lieutenant colonel. He has never lost his interest in Reserve matters or his dedication to the security of the Nation.

I congratulate our distinguished colleague from Rochester, N.Y., and I congratulate the people of his congressional district for their wisdom in sending a man of his ability to serve in the Congress of the United States.

FRANK HORTON is the kind of American that the Nation needs in the Congress of the United States in these troubled times. We need his judgment; we need his ability; we need his already demonstrated courage; and we need his patriotism.

I am very proud to call him my friend and colleague.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, you know, I love pleasant surprises. And who does not? That is why I would have liked to have been present in FRANK HORTON'S office the other day when Brig. Gen. F. W. Boye paid him a surprise visit to award him the Army's Bronze Star Medal—20 years overdue. It would have been worth any number of Polaroid films to get the expression on FRANK'S face.

Fortunately for the rest of us though, FRANK became a Member of our group last year, and so cannot hug this honor to himself, but must share the experience with us.

While we all have heard it said that Congress is made up of men and women from all walks of life, I like to believe it draws, too, from the "cream of the crop"; and when we suddenly find among us such heroes as FRANK, then, by golly, I just like to sit right up and say, "I told you so."

There are many in Congress—indeed throughout the Nation—who, in those dark years of World War II, so faithfully served their country; ofttimes making the supreme sacrifice. It just seems to me that America has been bountifully blest down through its history with individuals who proved they loved their country more than themselves. When one stops to recall the terrible history of that World War, then he can honestly appraise the value of such an award as the Army's Bronze Star and of the man who so dutifully won it.

We are more fortunate probably than we realize to have a man of FRANK'S caliber still faithfully serving his country to the best of his ability. And we can rest assured that the same strength, courage, and perspicacity which carried him to heroism in World War II will continuously return to carry him onward in his work, day by day. I believe we have proof of this in FRANK'S first year as a Congressman—a year ago when he came to Washington, he surveyed the field and quickly grasped the complexities of Congress, put his shoulder to the wheel and began his labor.

FRANK, to say that I am proud to serve with you is the understatement of the year; and my wholehearted congratulations on this "hour of glory"—in which we all shared.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with my colleagues today in paying a well-earned tribute to our esteemed colleague, FRANK HORTON.

The Army's award of the Bronze Star Medal to FRANK is but another in a long line of honors paid the effective Representative from New York's 36th Congressional District. Whether in his church, the Boy Scout movement, civil defense work, freemasonry, bar associations, veterans organizations, or in Congress serving the people of his district, FRANK HORTON has consistently demonstrated outstanding qualities of leadership. "No task too small; no challenge too great" could well be the motto of the man we honor today. His many accomplishments reflect this wholesome attitude.

On the floor of this body, I have had opportunities to observe FRANK both in thought and action. He is a dedicated public servant and a tireless worker.

Knowing of his courageous military service as a combat infantry officer in North Africa and Italy during World War II, I would like to salute Col. FRANK J. HORTON on his belated but much-deserved Bronze Star award.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a proud moment for us in the Congress when one of our Members is cited for extraordinary accomplishment and it is a pleasure for me, as I know it is my colleagues, to have the opportunity to participate in this tribute to FRANK HORTON.

Although it is 20 years late, I am sure that the award of the Bronze Star to FRANK for heroism does not come as a surprise to anyone who knows him. His record of achievement speaks for itself and a military award for meritorious service fits right into the pattern.

FRANK HORTON has previously been awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge for distinction in wartime service and the Legion of Merit. The specific action for which he was cited in the award of the Bronze Star was exemplary conduct in ground combat against the enemy in North Africa and Italy in 1944 while assigned as 1st lieutenant to the 60th Infantry Regiment. Through an oversight, the award had never been presented until discovery of the error was made recently by the Army.

It has been a pleasure to know and work with FRANK since he came to Congress in January 1963. He has performed his duties here in the Congress with the same diligence and devotion he displayed on the battlefield years earlier. I know he will be around for a good many years and that we will be hearing many more good things from him.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, recognition by the Department of the Army that FRANK HORTON earned the Bronze Star for his service in World War II makes this a fitting time to review FRANK'S many other accomplishments. FRANK has been an outstanding member of both the Government Operations Committee and the District of Columbia Committee and has well served the voters of the 36th District in New York as an all-round leader. Having grown up in Texas and Louisiana, FRANK moved to Rochester, N.Y., after graduation from Cornell University Law School. He distinguished himself as a community leader in municipal government, church affairs, civil defense, minor league baseball, bar association activities, and service to youth.

As a fellow freshman Member of the 88th Congress I know FRANK as a friend always able, ready, and willing to take the initiative. Hard work and conscientious effort are characteristic of FRANK'S work. His fine military record was thus but the beginning of a career of service that we can all join in hoping will continue for many more successful and rewarding years. The Republican Party and the House are stronger for having the benefit of FRANK'S service.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying a most deserving tribute to the Honorable FRANK HORTON, who serves his country so well both in war and in peace. A leader in all worthwhile civic endeavors he contributes greatly to the welfare of his State and his Nation. A devoted public servant is deservedly being honored today by his Nation. May he long continue to serve in this great body of Congress.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of the 19th of June 1944, along a stretch of beach known as the Normandy Peninsula, strong winds began to blow out of the northeast. Along that beach, and just inland from it, were elements of the most gigantic military invasion ever mounted in an overwater attack. By noon the winds had reached such velocity that ferrying operations to bring supplies to the troops ashore had been suspended. By evening the winds had increased to 32 knots along the beach and small boats were being pounded to pieces in the mountainous waves.

All night long the storm blew. By morning the artificial port built to sup-

ply the Allied troops was beginning to break up. The floating breakwater had cast loose from its moorings, and was pounding against the pier; by evening the full scale of the disaster was apparent; the pier could not possibly hold. On the 21st of June the ports pierheads were carried away, the bridging connecting the port to the shore was a twisted mass of junk; the bridge of supplies to the Allied troops ashore in Normandy had been cut.

On Normandy itself the troops crouched in foxholes and weathered the storm as soldiers have always endured hardships. But on the evening of the 21st of June, General Collins knew that he would be fighting with only the supplies he had on the beach. There was no way of knowing when the flow would begin again. There could be no waiting while the enemy built up his supplies. He ordered an attack on Cherbourg for the following morning.

The 9th, the 79th, and the 4th Divisions of the VII Corps of the American 1st Army were assigned the task of taking Cherbourg. The 9th and 79th were to carry the attack while the 4th was to seal off the city from the east. On the morning of June 22, after a heavy bombardment from the air and from the ground, the 9th Army moved to the attack, led by the 60th Infantry Regiment. The 60th, echeloned to the left to guard its open flank, captured Acqueville in the first half hour. By evening it was at the outskirts of Flottemanville, and on the following day Flottemanville fell to the 60th. They were in the outer ring of the Cherbourg fortress. On the 24th of June the 60th moved along the north flank of the 9th Division deeper into Cherbourg. On the 25th, the 60th was deep in the fortifications. On both sides the 4th and 79th Divisions pressed into Cherbourg, and on the 26th of June the capture of the first great city of the war was recorded when Generalleutnant Karl-Wilhelm von Schlieben surrendered the city of Cherbourg.

These are the facts as history will tell them as long as the stories of battles will endure. But I call up these facts from history to note another fact, another tiny grain in the sand heap of history. There was a young first lieutenant in the 60th Infantry of the 9th Division of the VII Corps of Gen. Omar Bradley's 1st Army. He had already earned his spurs in the invasion of north Africa. His name was FRANK HORTON.

From Cherbourg the 60th Infantry Regiment was to go on to win new laurels in the battle to liberate Europe. We are proud that one of our colleagues was a member of that splendid unit. We are proud that even now, nearly 20 years after that battle in Cherbourg, the Army has seen fit to bestow a new award on FRANK.

In many ways the award is necessary. The Legion of Merit which FRANK had already received is eloquent tribute to his personal bravery. And the Combat Infantryman's Badge which he wears is an award that generals have coveted. It is certainly one decoration that is an outstanding honor for all who wear it.

On this occasion I am happy to join with my colleagues who pay tribute to FRANK today. He is a man who was willing to die for his country; he is no less willing to live for his country. He has served well in time of war; he will serve no less in time of peace. If the test of a man's future is his past, then the people of the 36th Congressional District in New York can be proud to be represented by FRANK J. HORTON, as all of us here are proud to be associated with him in the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in congratulating the distinguished gentleman from New York, FRANK HORTON, on receiving the Army's Bronze Star Medal for his outstanding service in World War II. I understand that our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], served as an infantry officer in the campaigns in North Africa and Italy, and was awarded this decoration for heroism displayed on those fronts.

It has been a great pleasure and privilege to serve in this body with FRANK HORTON, and I greatly enjoy our association. He has been a leader in organized baseball and was president of the Rochester club in the International League. I have followed baseball for many years and we have had a common interest in discussing events taking place in the baseball world. If Ford Frick should retire as commissioner of baseball I consider FRANK an excellent choice for this high position.

I wish FRANK continued success in all of his activities. He is a most able and effective Member of the House. It makes me very happy to extend my good wishes on this happy occasion.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to salute my good friend and distinguished colleague from New York, FRANK HORTON.

He is an outstanding Congressman who has been in the vanguard of the bipartisan effort to secure equal opportunity now—for all Americans. Congressman HORTON was one of those in June 1963, who joined in introducing the Equal Rights Act of 1963, basing bill of rights profections firmly on the 14th amendment. This approach was subsequently adopted by the Judiciary Committee in the historic civil rights bill which passed the House on February 10.

Congressman HORTON well and effectively represents his district and Nation. It is a privilege to serve with him in this House.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my colleagues in commending my fellow New Yorker, the Honorable FRANK HORTON, upon the occasion of his receiving the Bronze Star. This medal, testifying to his personal bravery in combat, is richly deserved by a gentleman who has consistently demonstrated a deep devotion to his country in the area of public service.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, whenever a new Member comes here there are bound to be trying days and hours. In this discovery my situation has proved no exception and I am happy to join with his many friends in the House in expressing my appreciation to FRANK HORTON for his continued helpfulness and generous cooperation during these difficult times. FRANK is an outstanding Member of this body and a great credit to his district and State.

Time and again he has risen courageously to meet squarely some of the great questions we are here called upon to decide. His work on the floor, in committee, in the 88 Club and in the Republican conference has been distinguished. It is a privilege for me to have made the acquaintance of my colleague from New York's important 36th District.

I am proud also that Congressman HORTON has recently received the Army's Bronze Star Medal for heroism in World War II. I am not surprised to learn this however, for this signal recognition of valor and merit confirms the impression of an outstanding Member of Congress that has come to those of us who have observed FRANK's effective work in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in honoring the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON]. He has devoted his life to public service. As a distinguished Army officer, a veteran of the Rochester City Council, and an able Member of the U.S. Congress, he has demonstrated that he has an unusually keen mind, a willingness to work hard, a warm sense of humor, and an ability to lead and work well with his associates.

I congratulate FRANK HORTON on his valuable service to this Nation and wish him well in the coming years.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Army just recently discovered that the Bronze Star Medal was due FRANK HORTON for World War II heroism, in connection with his outstanding military leadership as an infantry officer in north Africa and Italy.

To their everlasting good fortune, the people of the New York State's 36th Congressional District also have discovered FRANK HORTON's outstanding leadership qualities, and gave him their own special kind of medal by electing him to the House of Representatives.

The Bronze Star Medal which FRANK HORTON has received from the Army can only add luster to his previous awards of the Combat Infantryman Badge and the Legion of Merit.

But FRANK has been adding his own brand of luster to his role as a Congressman, for he is one of our most conscientious and hardworking Members who spends his every conscious hour proving that the faith and trust which his constituents have placed in him is not misplaced.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in not only commending FRANK HORTON as an outstanding American, but also as one of the most praiseworthy Members of the New York State congressional delegation.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Congressman FRANK HORTON, a man who has proved to be as brave and courageous on the floor of the House of Representatives as he was on the battlefield.

Just recently, the U.S. Army awarded the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] the treasured Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism. In decorating our brave colleague earlier this month, Brig. Gen. F. W. Boye cited his exemplary conduct against the enemy while assigned as 1st lieutenant to the 60th Infantry Regiment on July 3, 1944, in the European theater of operations.

The fact that Mr. HORTON's eligibility for this high award was discovered only recently in past records by an Army research officer detracts not at all from the meaning of this honor. For during World War II, our friend and associate won a decoration for even greater valor than that necessary to qualify for the Bronze Star Medal—the Legion of Merit.

Mr. HORTON served in defense of our country during that trying and dangerous period from 1941 to 1946. With the infantry, he made amphibious landings in North Africa and Italy, in addition to his other activities as a brave soldier.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to serve with a man such as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], a man whose honor and courage has been as remarkable in this body as in battle.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to one of the outstanding newer Members, FRANK HORTON, of New York. FRANK'S latest honor, that of the Bronze Star, caps a distinguished career of public service in his community, in wartime, and here in the House, and indicates that FRANK can look forward to a future studded with more accomplishments. My very best wishes to FRANK on this occasion and for the future.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to join with other Members of the House today in congratulating our able colleague, Representative FRANK HORTON, of New York, on his receiving the U.S. Army Bronze Star Award.

FRANK HORTON'S Bronze Star, earned as an infantry officer in North Africa and Italy during World War II, represents yet another recognition of his fine record of service to his fellowman.

The citizens of the 36th Congressional District in New York are fortunate to have such a worthy representative in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take a part in this tribute to Congressman FRANK HORTON today. As a matter of record, I think it is proper to list some of the background and biographical information about this outstanding American.

Congressman FRANK HORTON, U.S. Representative from the 36th District of New York State, was born in Cuero, Tex., on December 12, 1919. He attended grammar and high school in Baton Rouge, La. He received a bachelor of arts degree from Louisiana State University in 1941, and a bachelor of laws, LL.B. degree from Cornell University Law School in 1947. He was elected a member of the Phi Kappa Phi honor society at Cornell University.

FRANK HORTON entered active duty with the U.S. Army in June 1941 as second lieutenant and was released to inactive duty January 1946 with rank of major. He holds a commission as lieutenant colonel in U.S. Army Reserve. His foreign service, from November 1942 to August 1945, consisted of various assignments in North Africa and Italy. He served in base section headquarters in Casablanca and Bizerte, North Africa, and in Naples and Leghorn, Italy. FRANK HORTON commanded an infantry company which participated in amphibious landing of American troops in North Africa on November 8, 1942, and participated in amphibious landing of American and British forces in Italy during September 1943 as a member of G–3 Section, 5th Army Headquarters.

Our colleague moved to Rochester, N.Y., in July 1947 after graduation from Cornell University Law School. He passed the bar examination in July 1947, and was admitted to practice as an attorney in September 1947. He was associated with the law firm of Moser, Johnson & Reif, 47 South Fitzhugh Street, Rochester, N.Y., in June 1947, and became a partner in January 1952.

He is past president of Federation of Bar Associations of Western New York; was secretary of the Rochester Bar Association for 4 years from June 1953, to June 1957; served on the executive committee of the Young Lawyers Section of the New York State Bar Association; was elected to Order of the Coif, legal honor society, 1947; is member of the Monroe, New York State, and American Bar Associations; is member of executive committee, Cornell Law School Association.

Congressman HORTON'S political career has been one of exemplary service. He was elected to Rochester City Council in 1955 to fill an unexpired term and was reelected for a 4-year term in 1957. He served on the council from 1955 through December 1961. He was chairman of city council public utilities and special services committee and served as member of joint city-county planning committee, joint city-county civic center committee, chairman of port survey and park subcommittees of city-county planning committee.

He served as committeeman for the 18th ward from 1952 to present; served as vice president, 18th Ward Men's Club; vice chairman, 18th ward; ward and county committee from 1957 to present. He served as campaign manager, Republican campaign 1960, and as director 1962, Republican campaign training course.

He was elected to serve in the 88th Congress, having been sworn in January 9, 1963, representing the 36th Congressional District of New York State; appointed to serve as a member of the House District of Columbia Committee as well as three subcommittees of that committee; appointed to serve as a member of the House Government Operations Committee as well as the Military Operations Subcommittee of that committee; and is a member of the 88th Club.

He is an elder—since 1950—and trustee—since 1953—of Central Presbyterian Church, past president of Central Church Chapter of Presbyterian Men, member of Men's Work Council—1950–58—and Ministerial Relations Committee of Rochester Presbytery—1954–60. He taught Sunday school; is a member of the Legislative Committee of Rochester Presbytery and New York Synod of New York since 1959.

He was master of Seneca Lodge No. 920, F. & A.M.—1962; past president of Masonic Service Bureau—1955 and 1956; director of the Masonic Service Bureau; member Rochester Consistory, Scottish Rite; Damascus Temple, Shrine; Hamilton Chapter No. 62, R.A.M.; Doric Council No. 19, R. & S.M.; Monroe Commandery No. 12, Knights Templar.

As a sportsman and civic leader, FRANK HORTON served as president of the Rochester Community Baseball, Inc.—Red Wings—from 1957 to June 1962; executive vice president, International League 1959–60; attorney for International League 1957 to 1962; chairman, Minor League Committee, National Association of Professional League, Major-Minor League Player Development Committee; served on Major-Minor League Radio-TV Committee for baseball.

In 1958, he testified before the House Judiciary Committee in connection with the problem of major and minor leagues in baseball and also conferred with Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice as a representative of the minor leagues. Also, he participated in discussions with U.S. diplomatic personnel on several occasions regarding continuance of baseball by International League teams in Cuba.

Mr. HORTON is coowner, with William Swift of Brighton, N.Y., of Camp Pathfinder, a boy's camp located in Algonquin Park, Ontario, Canada. This camp has been in operation for over 30 years and was formerly owned and operated by Herman Norton of Rochester, N.Y. The camp specializes in outdoor education for boys 6 to 16 years of age with emphasis in canoe tripping and hiking.

FRANK HORTON was sector warden, Civil Defense for Northeast sector—city and county—1951–56; taught in Civil Defense Training School and supervised instructions of wardens; past president Reserve Officers Association; member and past secretary, 18th Ward Businessmen's Association; member of executive committee, 1954 to date, Otetiana Council, Boy Scout; member Ad Club, member Downtown Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, member, Doty Magill Legion Post.

FRANK is married to the former Marjorie Wilcox of Interlaken, N.Y. They have two fine sons, Frank, 17; Steven, 12.

So goes the brief summary of the active life and outstanding accomplishments of a fine man and dedicated Congressman, our colleague, FRANK HORTON of Rochester, N.Y.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the other Members who are today acknowledging the outstanding military career of our colleague, the gentleman from New York, FRANK HORTON. Being awarded the Army's Bronze Star is indeed a great honor and we all congratulate him. However, his military service represents just one phase of FRANK'S successful and effective career.

From the end of the war and up until his election to Congress he served his community of Rochester, N.Y., with distinction as a private citizen and then as an elected official. In 1962 he was elected to the 88th Congress where he has made outstanding contributions as a new Member. We all look forward to a long and productive career for him in the House as a Congressman. I am confident it will continue to be as outstanding as his career in the military as an infantryman. In selecting FRANK HORTON to represent them, the citizens of his district have chosen well.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in this tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative FRANK HORTON.

FRANK HORTON'S bravery "above and beyond the call of duty" is appropriately recognized through the award to him of the Army's Bronze Star medal for his heroism in World War II.

In addition to his ready call to duty and personal bravery, FRANK HORTON has demonstrated his qualities for public service as a Member of Congress representing the 36th District of the State of New York. It has been my fortune to serve with FRANK HORTON as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations. From this experience, I know—firsthand—of his interest in promoting efficiency and economy in the operation of our Federal departments and agencies. I expect his record of public service in the U.S. Congress to match his outstanding military service in the U.S. Army.

I salute FRANK HORTON as a brave patriot and as a wise and able Member of the greatest legislative body in the world—the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this merited tribute to our colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON.

I am equally pleased that the Department of the Army has corrected the previous oversight and awarded Colonel HORTON the Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism.

It is interesting to note that the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON, with characteristic modesty, limited the reference to his World War II career to the simple line "service in North Africa and Italy from November 1942 to August 1945" in the Congressional Directory.

It will be 20 years next year since the end of World War II and it is good to have a reminder of this kind of the valiant and heroic service of many of our colleagues and of countless fellow Americans in that titanic struggle.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in tribute to our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MURPHY of New York]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FOR MORE EFFECTIVE FOREIGN AID: A PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the assaults on the foreign aid program in both Houses of Congress in the press and elsewhere are more than sufficient evidence that the present pattern of AID as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy is in serious trouble. Even those of us who are firmly behind AID recognize that there has to be a drastic revision of the program in order to sustain it. The shortcomings of the AID program need not be reviewed here—that was amply done in the debates in the House and the Senate. What is needed is a specific proposal to serve as a focus for public discussion, both in and out of the Government, from which will emerge a consensus on the role and organization of AID activities. Only then will the United States be able to use this essential instrument of foreign policy more effectively in the future than has been done in the past. Committed as I am to the necessity of foreign aid as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, I am concerned that without substantial revision, the program will be rendered impotent by the ineffectiveness of the drones in its mushrooming bureaucracy and its opponents in the Congress who came close to succeeding in gutting the foreign aid bill last year. This proposal is not as a result of any consultation with any branch of the Government, but contains my personal views and those of competent advisers outside of Government and legislative circles.

There are four major factors in this proposal that are submitted for consideration and public discussion. First, military aid should be divorced from other forms of aid and administered by the Department of Defense; second, nonmilitary aid activities should be placed under a new organization designed for management rather than operation; third, the new organization, much smaller in size, should be located in the Executive Office of the President and not attached to the State Department, or stand alone as the newest and least effective independent agency; fourth, the execution of the AID program should be accomplished primarily by contracts with private industries, foundations, universities, both State and private ones, and other Government agencies which administer programs similar to the ones required by AID.

First, military aid performs a specific function as a part of U.S. foreign policy. Briefly stated, its purpose is to assist countries requesting it to increase their strength to withstand Communist aggression either from without or within. This is basically a military problem or, particularly with the relatively new countries, at least a police one, and aid directed toward that end should be administered by Defense officials who carry that responsibility with our Government. Some concern will be expressed for the necessity of relating all of aid effort and some misgiving remains about the nature of the so-called "military mind" for this task, complicated as it is in most countries with involved political factors—Vietnam being a conspicuous example. Increasingly, Defense officials have demonstrated a much broader grasp of the role of military assistance to new countries. In recent years the correlation of foreign political considerations with military programs has improved with the establishment of political-military offices in the State Department and Defense. Too, the lesson at long last has gotten home to most military leaders that a military solution alone in underdeveloped areas will not suffice in the gray area between all-out war and peace. Separating military support from economic aid can be absorbed in our overall defense budget at a time when that budget can be reasonably reduced. Such a separation could reduce the overall aid figure by one-third to one-half its present total.

Second, all nonmilitary aid activities in the future should be the responsibility of a new and small organization designed to manage rather than to operate. The Atomic Energy Commission which successfully managed the exceedingly complex development of the uses of the atom is an example of the distinctive role I think the new AID agency should have. The Army Corps of Engineers with its refined techniques of managing the assignments, not itself operating them, is another example. Getting AID officials out of the operating responsibilities of a vast bureaucracy and limiting their role to management seems to be the only feasible way to free these top officials, many of whom are well qualified, for the fundamental and tough policy decisions which must be made and supervised. Limited to management functions as this proposal specifies, the overextended field activities of AID people as an agency of the Government would be reduced. The organization in turn would be freed of a large number of time-servers who originally were recruited by AID in one or the other of its earlier incarnations who are now turned into administrators more interested in the continuation of programs to insure their own tenure than in the completion of them for the benefit of the recipient countries and a subsequent saving of tax dollars.

Third, the new organization, limited to management functions, should be placed in the Executive Office of the President similar perhaps to the role performed by the Bureau of the Budget. This position in the hierarchy of the Government would give officials in the new organization better access to all the line departments which was not so easily available as an adjunct to the State Department, as it now operates. With its location in the Executive Office of the President, the new organization would be in a far better position to coordinate the involvement of other agencies concerned with aid and to

manage the contracts let to accomplish the objectives of the program. Furthermore, its new location would put it closer to the source of ultimate decisions in foreign policy, the Presidency itself. It could be assumed, I should hope, that the State Department would keep the President informed of any political considerations affecting AID programs.

Fourth, with the new organization designed for management and located in the Executive Office of the President, the operation of the AID program should be accomplished by contracts with qualified, competent organizations, both public and private. This pattern, one particularly appropriate for the mixed state, has been utilized with success in other major Government programs, as complex if not more so, as the requirements for AID. Several advantages support this proposal, already used in a lesser degree in the current AID efforts. In simple language by using contracts, it would be easier to ascertain what was being done in the AID program, at what cost, for how long, and by whom. The self-perpetuating tendency of the bureaucracy to keep its activities going would be checked by a determination before a contract is let how long it would take to complete a specific project and at what cost. The specifications for the project would be determined in advance of the letting of the contract, and the progress in fulfilling the contract could be controlled by a phased releasing of funds as specific steps are completed. Even with its shortcomings, the contract arrangement is a much better management tool than the present arrangements in that it has a builtin terminal date with a predetermined cost. In using this device, any criticism of the effectiveness of the program would be directed at the contracting organizations, thus getting some of the problems associated with AID activities off the back of the State Department. It could be anticipated, I think, and it might as well be recognized now if this proposal is to be considered realistically, that Congress would specify that all contracting agencies be American based. After all, it is American money that is involved and American interests at stake. Moreover, I have not noticed any of our allies, particularly those who are now prospering largely as a benefit of earlier U.S. aid programs—the Marshall plan, for example—using American concerns in their aid activities, modest as it is in too many instances.

Other aspects of the sprawling functions of AID should receive the attention of the Congress in redefining the role of the agency. Without discussing them in detail here, a listing of the more important ones will indicate the reorganization task that needs to be done. Development loans should be handled by the Export-Import Bank or the World Bank. These institutions have developed the machinery for evaluating loan applications. With their experience—and profits—they should be willing to make some of the "soft" loans, assuming some of the risks involved in putting capital in new countries. This activity basically is the banking business and should be handled as such and not by bureaucrats posing as bankers.

Public Law 480 should be made an integral part of the total program of AID, accounted for, and put to work in programs clearly compatible with U.S. interests and those of the countries in which the funds are located. The resources of trade rather than aid must be developed to bring the commercial activities of new countries more in line with sound industrial development.

Pompous fat such as gold-plated Cadillacs, mahogany and brass trimmed yachts, jet airliners, huge airports with little or no air traffic, must be taken out of our economic aid to new and underdeveloped countries. We are not a kingdom and as a republic we do not need to carry such competition to every friendship. These examples of use of aid funds have played into the hands of isolationist demagogues at the expense of concrete economic AID projects. The usefulness of increasing the guaranty provisions for U.S. private investment in these areas should be given careful consideration.

The task before us, Congress, the public, and countries receiving aid, is tremendous and complex, but nonetheless imperative if AID is to continue its usefulness as an instrument of foreign policy. The success of aid efforts in the Marshall plan, the support of Turkey and Greece under the Truman doctrine, and the reconstruction of Japan as a strong ally in the Pacific area, demonstrates the effectiveness of aid properly administered and utilized. There were programs in which economic and military considerations were dominant and relatively less involvement in internal political reforms was required.

President Truman's now too often forgotten point 4 declaration in 1950 recognized the drastically altered role addressed to the task of development in newly independent countries in contrast to the reconstruction of politically mature countries whose productive capacities were victims of World War II. Truman's proposition that the task of development should be shouldered largely by private industry was not taken up then and the responsibility for this role fell to successive aid organizations—ICA, MSA, and the current AID. Unfortunately the transition from reconstruction to development has not met with success commensurate with the cost and efforts. Now, before AID is the victim of its critics and its own unwieldy efforts, is the time to redefine its role and design the organization to accomplish its strategic assignment with less money doing a better job.

The vitality and ingenuity of the free enterprise system of the United States must be better utilized, and given more responsibility for future aid programs.

PROJECT PRAYER CALLS FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced House Joint Resolution 930 as a means of indicating publicly my support for and association with the national movement to bring about a constitutional amendment which would remove any and all doubts about the citizen right to make reference to belief in or reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any public or governmental facility under any and all circumstances and for other similar purposes.

Millions of Americans believe this traditional right has been injured or otherwise impaired and are concerned that a trend has developed which will eventually drain from our public life that firm reliance upon divine providence which provided our Founding Fathers with enlightenment, strength, and courage to pursue the purposes of their Declaration of Independence. Our Nation was born in the circumstances of dedicated spiritual beliefs. We grow strong and powerful by adhering to those fundamental beliefs, and our destiny demands that we remain firm and faithful in our adherence to those spiritual beliefs.

The Supreme Court decision on school prayers has given rise to many questions about the rights of our children to recognize God or a Supreme Being as the guiding light in the formative and most impressionable years of their lives. All of us are aware of the negative influences which bear upon the lives of our children as well as the need for strong spiritual motivation if they are to mature into happy and well rounded citizens of the future. The question of separation of church and state is a proper one and it is our American tradition that this separation be maintained. But this does not require that we must separate the children of our Nation from God or a Supreme Being once they enter a public institution or facility. The same principle applies to the use of any public facility whether by adults or children.

Concern over this trend to isolate God or a Supreme Being from all our public affairs has caused many Members of Congress to introduce resolutions calling for a constitutional amendment which would reverse that trend. There have been no public hearings by the Judiciary Committee on those pending resolutions. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], has informed me that he has ordered a staff study of the pending resolutions. Presumably public hearings will be scheduled when the staff study is completed, which I trust will be soon.

There is also before Congress a discharge petition to bring the pending resolutions directly before Congress for consideration and action. A number of Members have signed the discharge petition and other Members would readily sign except for the fact that in doing so they would provide the necessary number of signatures which in turn would establish a precedent with which they are not in agreement. This procedural matter is not to be confused with the substantive intent of the Members who have introduced such resolutions. Accordingly, a solution must be found which will accomplish the purposes intended and bring the issue before Congress for debate and decision.

I am, therefore, informing Chairman CELLER today that as ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary I am prepared to chair public hearings on this important public issue.

The millions of Americans who have joined in the efforts of Project Prayer have a right to have their voices heard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCCLORY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for February 20 and 21, on account of official business participating in hearings of Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations at Muscle Shoals, Alabama.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on tomorrow; and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. CAREY.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico; and

H.R. 7356. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 21, 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:

1733. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 233); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1734. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on crimes against banking institutions (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee of conference. H.R. 4638. A bill to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President (Rept. No. 1148). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 10036. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 10037. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10038. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 10039. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood and earthslide disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 10040. A bill to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by any vessel, except a vessel of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10041. A bill to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10042. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10043. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 10044. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide medical care for certain members of the Armed Forces who are entitled to retired or retainer pay, or equivalent pay, and who served on active duty for at least 90 days during time of war or conflict, and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 10045. A bill to authorize the payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10046. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of optometrists; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 10047. A bill to grant credit for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act for service performed by Federal employees under a cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and the State of North Carolina with respect to the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 10048. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, by creating single-officer general and special courts-martial, providing for law officers on special courts-martial, affording accused persons an opportunity to be represented in certain special courts-martial proceedings by counsel having the qualifications of defense counsel detailed for general courts-martial, providing for certain pretrial proceedings and other procedural changes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10049. A bill to further insure to military personnel certain due process protection by providing for military judges to be detailed to all general courts-martial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10050. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, to authorize the Judge Advocate General to grant relief in certain courts-martial cases, to extend the time within which an accused may petition for a new trial, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 10051. A bill to amend Public Law 86–272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date; to the Committee on the Judiicary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 10052. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 10053. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 10054: A bill to grant credit for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act for service performed by Federal employees under a cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and the State of North Carolina with respect to the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 10055. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 10056. A bill to limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any food grains and feed grains owned or controlled by it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10057. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10058. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 10059. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which presently prevent an individual from simultaneously receiving both a full old-age or disability insurance benefit and a full widow's, widower's, or mother's insurance benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 929. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate April 9, 1964, as a day for observance of the courage displayed by the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto against the Nazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 930. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 931. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 633. Resolution to investigate solicitations of certain contributions from Government employees for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Res. 634. Resolution to investigate solicitations of certain contributions from Government employees for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 635. Resolution to investigate solicitations of certain contributions from Government employees for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H. Res. 636. Resolution to investigate the solicitation of certain contributions from Government employees for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take notice of a declaration of an emergency relating to the operation and effect of chapter 125 of the sessions law of 1963, 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. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 10060. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Clinton Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 10061. A bill for the relief of Vito Giammona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 10062. A bill for the relief of John J. Tavormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10063. A bill for the relief of Dimas Pereira Tavares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 10064. A bill for the relief of Maria Coutoupidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 10065. A bill for the relief of John Raymond Witt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10066. A bill for the relief of Joe C. Oden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10067. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dickranouhi Barsamian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 10068. A bill for the relief of Miss Dimitra Petta and Miss Demetra Koutroumbi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1964)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of truth, Father of our spirits, all is Thine except the drifting clouds of unrighteousness which in the end cannot hide Thy light, which no darkness can put out.

For those who here in perilous times, sent to this body by those who put their trust in them, and who speak for the people's best welfare, we pray for their deliverance from the subtle lures of office and from the arrogance which lurks always in power, and for the unswerving determination to bow to no compulsion, save the sovereignty of their own conscience.

Steady us in all our decisions and in all our ways, with the knowledge that only in Thy will is our peace and our victory.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 19, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. BROOKS, of Texas, had been appointed a manager at the conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon to the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, vice Mr. HOLIFIELD excused.

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

H.R. 7381. An act to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9640. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO FILE REPORT UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would be willing to have a little more time allowed, if necessary. So far as I am concerned the committee can have until tomorrow night—although, so far as I am concerned, I shall be ready by 6 o'clock tonight.

As I understand, one or more members of the committee wish to file minority views. Whether they will be ready by tonight, I do not know.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with that proviso, I should like to have my unanimous-consent request acted on; and if any difficulties arise in the meantime, I shall be most happy to withdraw the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee will be allowed until midnight tonight—as requested—to file a report.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

SUSPENSION OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 315 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, there is at the desk a privileged matter—a message from the House, in connection with House Joint Resolution 247 and the Senate amendment to that measure. I ask that it be taken up at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PROUTY conferees on the part of the Senate.

BEEF IMPORT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday, the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture announced a voluntary agreement with Australia and New Zealand on beef imports. These two countries provide approximately 80 percent of our imports of fresh and frozen beef and veal. The agreement, as I understand it, is subject to review after 3 years.

In brief, the agreement guarantees foreign exporters of beef to the United States approximately 11 percent of our domestic market, holding Australian and New Zealand exports to the United States at the 1962–63 average, allowing for consumption growth.

Mr. President, this is a small step—a very small one—in the right direction; but it is not enough. It provides little protection for our domestic industry at a time when prices are down. During the current calendar year, it will provide a 6-percent reduction, as compared with 1963 imports.

The idea of a voluntary negotiated agreement with these two major beef exporters is excellent—but certainly not one that guarantees foreign suppliers such a major foothold on our beef market. We cannot blame Australia and New Zealand when they can get an agreement which will permit them to continue to export to the United States at a rate comparable to those of the two highest years in history. The American cattle industry is the one that is being hurt. It would have been far more realistic if the average imports had been computed over the past 5 years, instead of the last 2 years.

In addition, I am somewhat concerned about the effect such an agreement will have on efforts to aid the domestic livestock industry, in light of the delicate state of our international trade negotiations. Frankly, I am anxious to see a much more realistic quota established, either through U.S. Tariff Commission recommendations or congressional action. It is for this reason that my colleague [Mr. METCALF] and I have prepared, for introduction, legislation which would establish a quota system on beef imports, based on the past 5-year average.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], and the Senators form Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER]; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of this proposed legislation and a letter on the same issue which my colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I addressed to the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the bill held at the desk, for additional cosponsors, until Monday, February 24.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 2525) to restrict imports of beef, veal, and mutton into the United States, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the total quantities of beef, veal, and mutton (in all forms except canned, cured and cooked meat, and live animals) originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any period of 12 months shall not exceed the average annual quantities of such products imported from such country during the 5-year period ending on December 31, 1963: *Provided,* That beginning January 1, 1965, there may be an annual increase in the total quantities of such products which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for such purpose, corresponding to the annual rate of increase in the total United States market for such products, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The letter presented by Mr. MANSFIELD is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1964.

Mr. BEN DORFMAN,
Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are informed that on February 20, the U.S. Tariff Commission will consider copper for possible inclusion on the President's list of articles for consideration in trade agreement negotiations. Because copper is the leading mineral in the State of Montana's active mining industry, we wish to take this means of opposing any reduction on rates of duty on copper imports. We can find no justification for lowering the present duty on foreign copper; in fact, the original 4-cent tax should be restored, based upon the statistical position of the industry.

The domestic copper mining industry is at present at a disadvantage because of excessive production of high grade ores in Africa and South America. Should the tariff be lowered and the demand for domestic copper fall off, the domestic mines would be in severe economic difficulties. In addition, our foreign suppliers often enjoy cheaper water transportation and certain tax advantages.

We wish to remind the Commission that copper tariffs are not and never have been for the purpose of keeping out or penalizing foreign metal, but principally are to provide a balance of relative costs of those who supply world markets. Under present conditions, the excise of 1.7 cents per pound is too low to provide the necessary protection; therefore, we endorse the industry's request that the tariff be restored to 4 cents per pound. This would then put domestic mines on a competitive basis with foreign mines.

In reviewing the tariff on copper, we ask that prime consideration be given to national security demands. We also urge that no recommendations be made which will be adverse to a healthy domestic copper mining industry operating under a reasonably balanced situation.

Thank you for your consideration, and we ask that this letter be made a part of the printed proceedings of this hearing.

With best personal wishes, we are,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.
LEE METCALF.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today President Johnson will fly to California, where he will hold 2 days of meetings in Palm Springs with President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico. The Chiefs of State will discuss problems of mutual concern to our two countries, as well as of concern to the hemisphere and the world.

A quick glance at history reveals that all has not always been well between our two countries. However, history also shows that no problem between nations can long defy solution when negotiations are entered into a spirit of friendship and good faith and a genuine desire to succeed. Fortunately, this has been the tenor of United States-Mexican relations over the last three decades, beginning with the good neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and reaching a high point under the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Recent approval of the Chamizal Treaty—whereby a longstanding border grievance was settled—removes a great barrier to further understandings. The Chamizal problem, which has been a divisive factor between our countries for nearly a century, could not have been settled without the friendship and statesmanship of the Mexican Government; and we are most appreciative of the role played by its great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos.

I am confident that the one remaining serious border problem—that of dealing with the salinity of water which flows from the Southwestern United States into northern Mexico—can be resolved in a similar spirit. Certainly President Johnson is eager to maintain and improve existing relations on the high plane to which Presidents Kennedy and Lopez Mateos helped bring them, and in which President Johnson played a highly significant but unpublicized part. And I know I speak for my colleagues in both Houses when I say that we look forward to the visit of the Mexican Congressmen to Washington on March 3, 4, and 5, when we shall discuss this and other items of mutual interest.

Mr. President, in his meeting with President Johnson, President Lopez Mateos will encounter a neighbor of Mexico whose friendship for that great land is of long standing. Coming as he does from a State with a large population of Mexican extraction, President Johnson has long been aware of the contributions which these people have made. A short excerpt from the history of Texas-Mexican relations, and of a part which President Johnson has played in them, is told in an article by columnist Drew Pearson which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. I commend its reading to my colleagues, and ask that it be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

JOHNSON HOLDS MEXICO'S ESTEEM

(By Drew Pearson)

For almost 100 years any Texan was always suspected, sometimes hated, by Mexico. Its people remembered—just as vividly as Texans remember the Alamo—the war of 1848 when a good slice of Mexico was chopped off by fire-eating, pistol-packing, land-hungry Texans.

Fifty years ago, perhaps even 20 years ago, no one would have believed that a President of Mexico would sit down on American soil to confer with a Texas-born President of the United States.

The fact that it is happening this week is due in part to the more commonsense shown by both nations; in part to the two men who are meeting in Los Angeles; and in part to the people of San Antonio who elected a Spanish-American, HENRY GONZALEZ, to Congress, and to the people of El Paso who elected another Spanish-American, Raymond Telles, as their mayor.

President Adolfo Lopez Mateos is a moderate who has continued the land and economic reforms of the Mexican revolution—at first bitterly opposed by the United States. Lopez Mateos has realized that American tourist trade and American investments mean the difference between prosperity and poverty; so, without sacrificing anything in the way of Mexican pride and sovereignty, he has gone out of his way to work at friendship.

He became the first Mexican President in history to cross into Texas, when he visited the LBJ ranch while Mr. Johnson was Vice President. And previously he conferred with Mr. Johnson at Acapulco when Johnson was Senate majority leader.

JOHNSON'S FRIENDSHIP

President Johnson, in turn, is revered in Mexico as perhaps few other American Presidents. Mexicans remember how he toured San Antonio in an old pickup truck campaigning for HENRY GONZALEZ and conceived the brilliant idea of bringing Pepe Cantinflas, popular star of "Around the World in Eighty Days," to San Antonio to help GONZALEZ.

But most of all, Mexicans remember an event which occurred during the Korean war when the people of Three Rivers, Tex., refused to bury a Mexican-American boy killed in battle.

The brother of the Governor of Taxco told the story when Johnson went to that city in 1958. Tears streamed down his face as he spoke, and Johnson, who doesn't speak Spanish well, couldn't understand the reason. But here is what the Mexican said:

When a Mexican boy, drafted into the American Army, was killed in Korea, his body was brought back to Three Rivers, Tex., where he had lived. But the one funeral parlor in that little town would not give him a burial because he was a Mexican.

"Whereupon the Senator from Texas who is with us today telephoned from Washington: 'I can't make the funeral parlor bury this boy, but I can bring his body to Arlington National Cemetery in Washington and bury him alongside Presidents.'

"And that," said the Mexican speaker, "is what the Senator from Texas did."

PROGRAM FOR PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF COTTON AND WHEAT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader, I announce that if there are no difficulties connected with the filing of the report on the wheat and cotton bill by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by midnight tonight, it would be the hope of the leadership to bring up that bill tomorrow at the conclusion of the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senate's making progress, but we have not yet received a bill from the committee. I do not see how we can intelligently debate a bill we have not yet seen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wonder if we would not make better time if Senators had an opportunity first to read the bill—which will not be available until tomorrow morning—to study it and then proceed to consider it next week. I shall not object if that is what the Senator wishes to do, but I think the Senators would be trying to debate something they do not know anything about. We do too much of that as it is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has a good argument, as always. It is my understanding that the report will be available this afternoon. I, of course, made the request—which would have to be a unanimous-consent request—with the idea in mind, though I did not state it, that the report would be available.

But if the Senator desires, I would be most happy to change the tentative announcement to make it applicable to Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Unless we are sure we will get the report and have time to read it, I think it would be better to carry it over until next week. However, I would be willing to wait until later in the day to see how much progress is made toward completing the report. I understand that the committee has until midnight to file it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has a point, and I will discuss it with the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that in order to make the unanimous-consent request valid, the Senate would have to adjourn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is correct; it would require unanimous consent to bring up the report while the Senate is in recess.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Would the majority leader say he is not expecting any votes tomorrow, but only statements on the bill about which he is talking?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the bill is brought up tomorrow, the joint leadership could assure the distinguished Senator from Maine that there would be no votes tomorrow.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request made previously, I now ask unanimous consent that the minority and supplemental views on the bill to be reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may have until midnight tonight to be filed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ET CETERA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FEE FOR SERVICES PERFORMED IN CONNECTION WITH THE ARRIVAL IN, OR DEPARTURE FROM, THE UNITED STATES OF A PRIVATE AIRCRAFT OR PRIVATE VESSEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY PROCUREMENT BECAUSE EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS WERE OVERSTATED BY WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, NEW MEXICO

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement initiated or planned because equipment requirements were overstated by White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, Department of the Army, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OVERPAYMENTS MADE UNDER A COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE CONTRACT FOR PROCUREMENT OF NUCLEAR SUBMARINE COMPONENTS FROM COMBUSTION ENGINEERING, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overpayments made under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for the procurement of nuclear submarine components from Combustion Engineering, Inc., New York, N.Y., Department of the Navy, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—RESOLUTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans, in Elizabeth, N.J., on February 16, 1964, relating to Lithuanian independence, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H.R. 6196. An act to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 874); with minority and supplemental views.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD relating to the report on the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 2525. A bill to restrict imports of beef, veal, and mutton into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2526. A bill for the relief of Wright G. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2527. A bill to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2528. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2529. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 2530. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes; and

S. 2531. A bill to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 2532. A bill to aid in the administration of the Pribilof Islands, in Alaska, by the Secretary of the Interior and to provide for the self-sufficiency of the inhabitants thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2533. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson Unit, Chelan Division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 2534. A bill to authorize outpatient medical services to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2535. A bill for the relief of Wong Gar Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide a means for determination of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE BUSINESS

Mr. TOWER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 299); which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized

subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining—

(1) the extent to which departments and agencies of the Government are engaged in the production or furnishing of goods and services which can be supplied by private enterprise;

(2) the extent to which necessity or the national security require that such goods and services be produced or furnished by departments or agencies of the Government; and

(3) the means and methods by which the function of producing or furnishing such goods and services may be transferred at the earliest practicable time and to the greatest practicable extent to private competitive enterprise within the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1964, through January 31, 1965, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized, at its discretion, to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent to the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1965.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

A BILL TO PROVIDE OUTPATIENT TREATMENT OF VETERANS BY VA HOSPITALS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill which would permit outpatient treatment by the Veterans' Administration hospitals for veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict who are in receipt of a pension under chapter 15, title 38, United States Code.

This is an area where more study is needed. The veteran population is growing older and its health problems are more acute. This bill will give the appropriate committee of the Senate an opportunity to look deeply into this matter.

This bill would extend the outpatient program, which presently exists for veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippines Insurrection, to include the veterans of both World Wars and Korea.

Under existing law veterans other than those above mentioned must be admitted to a Veterans' Administration hospital before they can be treated. It might be far less expensive to provide those veterans who do not need extended hospital treatment with this outpatient care.

In any event, I feel that this is a worthy area for extensive study, and this bill provides a vehicle for exploration of the needs and solutions in this area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2534) to authorize outpatient medical services to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND DISABILITY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 20 I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 147 which would provide a method to select a new Vice President in the event of a vacancy in that office. It would also provide a method to fill vacancies in the offices of the President and the Vice President should these offices be vacant at the same time.

I have testified in support of this joint resolution before the Subcommittee on Consitutional Amendments. That subcommittee had before it eight resolutions dealing with the questions of Presidential succession and disability. Because of the variety of solutions to these vexing problems proposed by these resolutions, I would like to discuss the reasons why I think my resolution best meets the country's needs. Following my remarks on the problem of succession, I shall discuss the problem of Presidential disability and introduce a resolution on that subject.

These are problems of very serious proportions and it is most fitting that so much thought has been given them. I am pleased that there have been proposed a number of constructive solutions to these problems, and I congratulate our distinguished colleague, Senator BAYH, who, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, has conducted hearings on this vital subject.

The system which I have proposed has the advantage of utilizing the same method for filling vacancies in the office of Vice President and in the offices of President and Vice President together. I think that it is necessary to prepare for the possibility, however remote, that both of our top executive positions might be vacant and I think it highly desirable that the same method be used to meet both contingencies.

For this reason, I do not support the system of succession embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 139 or that in Senate Joint Resolution 148. These resolutions provide that upon the succession to the Presidency of the Vice President, he shall nominate a candidate—in the case of Senate Joint Resolution 139—or between two and five candidates—in the case of Senate Joint Resolution 148—to fill the office of the Vice President. Upon confirmation by the Congress of the new President's choice—under Senate Joint Resolution 139—or upon selection by the House of Representatives of one of the new President's nominees—under Senate Joint Resolution 148—the candidate so selected assumes the office. This system, of course, could not be used to fill vacancies in both executive offices because it presupposes the existence of a Vice President who will nominate his successor once he has succeeded to the Presidency.

Uniformity, in this instance, is not dictated solely out of consideration for form. All have agreed that a new Vice President should be selected upon succession to the Presidency of the former Vice President. One of the main reasons for favoring such a plan is the fact that we want the successor to the Presidency to be selected on the basis of a considered judgment that he possesses the characteristics necessary to make a good President. We do not want the potential successor to the Presidency to be a man who, while eminently suited to be Secretary of State or Speaker of the House, lacks the qualities necessary to make a good President. We therefore want to guard against a system of succession which places a man in the Presidency by virtue of the fact that he holds a certain designated office.

If this is true in the case of the man who is to serve as Vice President, it is certainly even more compelling in regard to an individual who is chosen to serve as President. Thus, I feel that we should not provide for the contingency that both our highest executive offices will be vacant at once with a different plan than that which we employ to fill the single vacancy in the Vice-Presidential office.

For this reason, I do not favor a resolution which makes no provision for filling a dual vacancy as is the case of Senate Joint Resolution 148. Nor do I favor meeting this contingency by providing that the Secretary of State succeed to the Presidency, as does Senate Joint Resolution 139. Again, I do not favor this arrangement because the Secretary of State is selected by the President on the basis of his ability to serve in that position; he is not selected by the people or their representatives as President.

I might point out that those who advocate that the members of the Cabinet be first in line of succession in order to avert a situation where a member of one party succeeds a President elected by the other party will also not avoid this possibility. In every recent administration members of both parties have served as Cabinet officers and while, I am sure they faithfully execute administration policy in their particular departments, I have no reason to believe that they share their Chief's views on all policy questions.

Turning to another facet of this question, Mr. President, I want to recall the objection to the Succession Act of 1886 voiced by President Truman. That law, which was in force until 1947 when the present succession law was enacted, provided that the Secretary of State, followed by other members of the Cabinet in stated order, would succeed to the Presidency. President Truman believed that it was undemocratic for a Vice President, who had himself succeeded to

the Office of President, to be able to pick his successor and therefore advocated that elected representatives of the people, the Speaker of the House, and the President pro tempore of the Senate, be first in the line of succession. I believe that as a practical matter the same objection can be made to succession measures which allow the new President to nominate his successor while the Congress merely confirms.

It is my view that during a time of crisis, such as exists following the death of a President, all responsible political factions will rally to the administration. For this reason, it appears to me that a system which allows the new President to nominate his successor would, in practice, be subject to President Truman's objection—it would allow the new President who had not been elected to the Office to handpick his successor. This is true because Congress would be loath to rebuff the new President by refusing to confirm his choice.

Yet this same reluctance on the part of Congress to rebuff the fledgling administration would be an asset in a system which gave to the Congress the authority to select the new Vice President. This reluctance would impede any attempt to cause a change of party in midstream and at the same time would allow the President's successor to be democratically selected.

I think it very important that any President or potential President be selected by a democratic process. The very cumbersome mechanics of a country-wide popular election prevent recourse to this solution when time is of the essence. Nor do I think it feasible to appoint an interim President or Vice President by one method and then fill the office or offices permanently by a future popular election. This would give the interim official no real mandate—a state of affairs we can ill afford in this nuclear age when the events of a week or a day can alter the course of history.

Because the Members of Congress are elected by the people, they best reflect the popular will. Election of executive officers by Congress, puts selection only one step removed from popular vote. Furthermore, my resolution provides that Congress shall meet and vote in joint session, each Member having one vote. Under this system, the preponderance of voting strength rests with the House of Representatives. This is justified, I think, because all the Members of the House are elected every 2 years while only one-third of the Senate is elected concurrently with the President and Vice President. For this reason, the House is more likely to be in accord with the views of the administration. I do not think it is wise to allow one House of Congress to defeat a candidate for whom a majority of the total membership of Congress indicates approval.

I might add, at this point, that I see no reason to restrict the class of persons from whom Congress can select. I think that there are many State Governors or, indeed, distinguished men in the private sector of national life, who are as qualified as any to serve in our highest executive office.

I do not think that election of two Vice Presidents at the time of presidential elections is a felicitous solution to the problem of Presidential succession. For one reason, I share the fear of those who express doubt as to whether the type of person who we would want to be second in line to the Presidency would be willing to serve in this position. It is only recently that we have seen the Vice Presidency become an office of major importance; bisecting it might well impede this salutary trend. I think this plan has another serious defect. It is not inconceivable that tragedy could strike, vacating both Vice Presidential offices and that of the President. It is not rare, at occasions of state, for all our top executive officers to be present, and we cannot forget that ours is the age of the nuclear bomb. An adequate succession plan, I feel, must provide a method to fill any and all vacancies that occur when they occur, a short list of successors will not do.

To those who feel that our present succession law is adequate, let me say that I consider it vital to have at all times a Vice President who can be briefed on and participate in important matters of state. Only in this way can continuity in our Government be assured. But I want to reiterate the statement which I made before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee that my objections to the present system do not in any way reflect doubt on the abilities of the Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK, or on the President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. HAYDEN. Each, I think, would make a fine and able President should he be called upon to serve in that capacity.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. President, I now would like to address myself to the question of Presidential disability. I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to Presidential disability which I would like to have printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

While the country has had three different laws relating to succession, none of which we have had to utilize, we have never promulgated a law relating to disability and there have been at least two situations when such a law was needed. Perhaps this deficiency is due to the fact that disability raises thornier and touchier problems than does succession. For solving the problem of Presidential succession involves deciding who can best fill a vacant office. Providing for Presidential disability necessitates selection of those who must make the awesome judgment to remove from office our highest executive officer.

I think that we must look to the Constitution to solve this difficult problem. The Constitution provides a method of impeachment for cause. I see no reason why this same method cannot be invoked to render decision on physical or mental disability. The fifth clause of article I, section 2, of the Constitution gives to the House sole power of impeachment. To the Senate is given the power to try all impeachments in article I, section 3, clause 6. This clause further provides that a two-thirds majority is necessary for removal. The Chief Justice presides over the deliberations.

My resolution follows this system to the extent that that is possible. Under it the House must declare its belief that the President is disabled, and the Senate, presided over by the Chief Justice, must so find by the vote of two-thirds of the Members present.

Impeachment proceedings, of course, contemplate permanent removal from office. Disability, it is always hoped, will be a temporary affliction. Therefore, I have added a second section to provide a mechanism to determine when disability has terminated. The section provides that whenever the President declares in writing that he is no longer disabled, the Senate, sitting as before, shall determine by majority vote whether this is the case.

I know that many will say that this system is unwieldy. But make no mistake, removing a President from office, even temporarily and without blame, is serious business. It is not work for a small group of men, operating out of the searching light of public scrutiny. It is nothing that should be done hastily and without serious deliberation. While its consequences for the individual involved are not so serious as successful impeachment, its consequences for the country are every bit as serious.

Therefore, I oppose all plans for deciding when a President is disabled which place on the Cabinet or on any small group of men this awful burden.

Let us not delude ourselves, either, in a belief that Cabinet members are always united as one behind their Chief. The fact that Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War, in Andrew Johnson's Cabinet actively conspired against the President, while feigning loyalty to him, is well known. One authority on Johnson's impeachment has referred to Stanton as "Iago in the War Department." Johnson's inauspicious inauguration as Vice President perhaps laid the groundwork for the machinations which followed his tenacity as President in maintaining convictions, which he believed in accord with constitutional government and his conscience.

Again, a lesson from the period of President Wilson's disability is instructive. It was well known that the President felt that Secretary of State Lansing was not supporting his policies. If the Cabinet had had the power to remove Woodrow Wilson, there would always be nagging suspicions that their action was motivated out of personal disagreement with the President's policies. This is because the Cabinet, unlike the Congress, does not deliberate in public; it does not marshal the facts openly nor are its conclusions open to public scrutiny.

Therefore, I feel that removal of the President should only be made by a deliberative body whose actions are subject to public scrutiny. The Senate is such a body and such procedure is in keeping with the constitutional precedent for removal from office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and,

without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 157) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide a means for determination of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Whenever the House of Representatives, by proceedings taken as in the case of an impeachment, declares its belief that the President has suffered an inability to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Senate shall determine whether such inability exists. When the Senate is sitting for that purpose, Members thereof shall be on oath or affirmation, and the Chief Justice shall preside. No determination that such disability exists may be made without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present.

"SEC. 2. Whenever a President as to whom any such determination has been made makes written declaration to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, before the end of the term for which he was elected, that his inability has been removed, the Senate shall determine whether said inability has been removed. Any such determination shall be made in the manner provided by section 1, except that a determination to the effect that the inability of the President has been removed shall be made upon the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the Senate present. Upon the making of any such determination by the Senate, the President shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of President unless the term for which he was elected shall have expired.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILLS FOR PAYMENTS TO SENECA INDIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will hold a hearing on H.R. 1794 and S. 1836, two bills that provide for payments to the Seneca Indians for lands required for the Kinzua Dam and Reservoir in New York and Pennsylvania.

The hearing will be held on Monday, March 2, 1964, at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, and all parties who are interested in testifying on this proposed legislation should contact the staff of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at the earliest opportunity.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING OF NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. BRENNER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled a public hearing on the nomination of Edward J. Brenner, of New Jersey, to be Commissioner of Patents.

The hearing will commence on Friday, February 28, at 10 a.m., in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the subcommittee, room 349–A, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4–3121, or Government code 180, extension 2268.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself.

A TRIBUTE TO A KENNEDY AID—THEODORE C. SORENSEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday the Washington Evening Star carried an article by Max Freedman about Theodore Sorensen, one of the late President Kennedy's closest aids.

Occasionally in the limelight, more often in the background, Mr. Sorensen was a principal assistant in the design of the President's domestic policies. Because his thinking on most issues was close to the President's and because he was an expert at translating ideas and ideals into tangible policies, his work in the White House was of immense value to the Nation.

After the assassination, Mr. Sorensen agreed to stay in the White House at the request of President Johnson. But now that the critical period of transition has been successfully passed, Mr. Sorensen is leaving the Government to write a book about President Kennedy. His qualifications for this task are unique, and I am sure that the product of his labors will be an enduring contribution to the historical literature of our times.

Mr. Freedman's article is a fitting tribute in which the outstanding nature of Mr. Sorensen's service to the Nation is revealed with great clarity and perception. I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 17, 1964]

A TRIBUTE TO A KENNEDY AID—THEODORE SORENSEN'S ROLE SEEN MORE THAN JUST THAT OF SPEECHWRITER

(By Max Freedman)

On Wednesday, a few days before his departure from Washington, Theodore C. Sorensen, the special counsel for President Kennedy, will be honored at a public ceremony sponsored by the present and former members of the Cabinet and by his closest associates in the Government. It is difficult to recall any other public servant who has received such a tribute, and impossible to think of anyone with an equal claim to public recognition.

It is a strange misconception of Mr. Sorensen's role to think of him primarily or essentially as Mr. Kennedy's most trusted speechwriter. He is the last man to minimize the power of eloquence as the champion of great causes. But he knows that the art of politics consists in turning ideas into achievements; and he towered into greatness as an architect of policy and a master of strategy. He was so valuable to Mr. Kennedy in the drafting of state papers precisely because he was so familiar with the ideals and hopes of the leader whom he delighted to serve.

This surely is the central point, the one which means the most to Mr. Sorensen. He saw in Mr. Kennedy the leader who embodied and fulfilled his own highest principles of government. It was never necessary for Mr. Sorensen to attribute to Mr. Kennedy any spacious ideals of his own. His task was rather to draw out and express the ideals which glowed with quiet passion in Mr. Kennedy's mind and heart.

One tiny story will illustrate the almost unique gift which Mr. Sorensen and Mr. Kennedy both had in being able to laugh at themselves without ever laughing at their principles. Within a few days of its delivery, President Kennedy's inaugural address, with its soaring eloquence and majestic idealism, was universally recognized as a noble affirmation of the faith which has often glorified America in times of challenge. The overflowing praise rather embarrassed the President, and one day Mr. Sorensen drew gusts of laughter from Mr. Kennedy by bringing him a hilarious parody—never published to this day—of the inaugural address.

Now Mr. Sorensen would have put his hand in the fire to protect the principles of that speech, and Mr. Kennedy served those ideals with gay courage to the moment of his death. For both of them what mattered above everything else was the victory of principles, not the glory of words; and they shrank with wise reserve from turning the tributes to the speech into the exaltation of the speaker.

We are fortunate beyond the usual measure of men in knowing that before many months have passed we will be able to look at President Kennedy and the record of his administration through the eyes of Mr. Sorensen and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Their two books will not be competitive, for they will approach their subject from different points of view, and will throw accumulated light on a gallant and unforgettable figure.

Mr. Schlesinger came to the White House with an established reputation as a historian, a biographer, and an interpreter, and defender of democratic values. His years in the White House add another notable chapter to his record of public service. But with Mr. Sorensen it is rather different. He will not only be rearing a monument to Mr. Kennedy; he will also be going on a pilgrimage into his own past. He has it within his power to write a book about President Kennedy that will be at once unique, invulnerable and immortal, if it is no exaggeration to use Augustine Birrell's words in tribute to Gibbon.

Then, his task completed, Mr. Sorensen will be on his own. That may well be the beginning of a new career of great significance for the American people. Mr. Sorensen will not seek elected office for himself; but in the world of ideas and in the clash of debate his influence will often count de-

cisively, and it will be an influence with which scrambling politicians will have to reckon. Countless people, especially young people with an adventurous faith in the destiny of America, look to Mr. Sorensen as a spokesman for their hopes. Not even the cruel changes of a democracy can dim our memory of his valiant services, nor extinguish our conviction that in service to President Johnson and other Presidents he will many times place the whole country again under obligation to him.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FATHER MAZZUCHELLI—WHAT ONE MAN DID FOR HIS COUNTRY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today marks the 100th anniversary of the death of Father Samuel Charles Mazzuchelli. Father Mazzuchelli did not ask what his country could do for him but he spent 34 years doing for his country in educational, civic, architectural, and religious fields. One hundred years ago, when pioneers were building the West on the constitutional rock of the Founding Fathers, Samuel Charles Mazzuchelli, missionary, died a victim of doing for others, having contracted pneumonia on an errand of mercy for a neighbor in southwestern Wisconsin.

Citizens of Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois have long honored Mazzuchelli in their territory as "Builder of the West." On the centennial of his death, February 23, 1864, we wish to go on record here today in the Congress of the United States as striving to make him known to a wider circle of Americans.

As a missionary builder, his transforming touch—both apostolic and architectural—helps to make "America beautiful for patriots' dream that sees beyond the years." In 1830, Samuel Mazzuchelli was the solitary priest from the waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan to the Mississippi across the widespread prairies of Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois. Italian born, he came to the United States as a Dominican missionary in 1828. Newly ordained in Cincinnati, he set out from there to serve the inhabitants of Michigan Territory, beginning at Mackinac and Green Bay.

Reared in the Old World refinement of a comfortable Milanese family, he bore the privations of the wilderness with urbanity and courage. He traveled by canoe, on foot, on snowshoes, and on horseback. He shared the Indian's tepee and the white man's cabin. He was a friend of tribal chieftain and fort commandant. He planned the first curriculum for Indians in native idiom and cooperated with the Indian agents in Green Bay and Fort Winnebago to improve the lot of the Menominee, Winnebago, and Chippewa. He published the first book to be printed in what is now the State of Wisconsin in 1834.

Father Mazzuchelli also planned an adult education class for Indians as well as a curriculum for their children in the mission school, including a program of agriculture, manual training and domestic arts hitherto unknown among the aborigines. He attempted to redress the wrongs committed against the Indians and petitioned the Indian Affairs Bureau in Washington for money to further the red man's education. He once wrote, "It is just as hard for the Indian to leave his home as it is for a white man." He could say this with feeling as he himself was a voluntary exile.

From 1835 to 1843 the missionary followed the direction of the Mississippi through Portage, Prairie du Chien, Benton, Galena, to Dubuque, Garryowen, Bellevue, Muscatine, Davenport, and Burlington, teaching, designing, sharing, ministering to the sick in numerous epidemics.

Always a participant in civic concerns, he discoursed with preachers of other beliefs, some of whom donated to his church-building funds. He was always amiable, excluding no one from the scope of his charity, whatever their rank, means, race or religion.

Political assemblies, public ceremonies, national holidays, social gatherings were all opportunities to speak about God and the moral obligations of citizens to serve their country which he constantly praised as a gift of God's bounty. These are his words from a public address in 1835:

> The Supreme Maker has opened before us the treasures of His benevolence by locating us in a country which His almighty power and infinite providence has made to abound with all that is necessary and useful to human life.

Friends of Father Mazzuchelli included all classes: Indian braves, French traders, German farmers, Irish miners, pioneer Americans, all won over and charmed by his courtly Old World manners and his priestly example. Civic leaders like Henry Dodge, Wisconsin's first Governor; George Wallace Jones, Iowa's first Senator, and Chief Justice Dunn sought his advice.

One historian recorded that "the esteem in which he was held by all classes marked him not only as a great priest but also as a great citizen." When the first legislature of the Territory of Wisconsin convened in Belmont in 1836, he was the chaplain and at the opening session addressed the members on government.

At the first Independence Day rally held in Dubuque, Iowa, that same year he gave the following toast:

> May the American Republic be lasting, glorious, and powerful and may Wisconsin Territory whose birthday we celebrate shortly be not inferior to any of the States.

Wisconsin Territory included both Wisconsin and Iowa until 1838.

When the legislature next convened in Burlington he persuaded the Senate to hold its sessions in his yet undedicated church of Saint Paul.

Mazzuchelli's understanding of the principles of American law and life amazes the native born. Though foreign by birth and education, he understood and loved America and applied for citizenship in 1842. A chapter in his "Memoirs"—written in 1844—notable for its correctness of thought and lucidity of exposition, is that which describes the relations of church and state in the American Republic. It reads in part:

> The Constitution of this great Republic was framed by the representatives of the people, who all on one plane of equality, were not willing to yield to the law the very least right over their particular and multiform religious creeds; on the other hand, the design of the Constitution was simply to provide for the well-being of each individual, giving him a guarantee for everything pertaining to him as personal property.

Again:

> The legislators of the United States had in view the establishment in their law of that straight line which separates the civil power from conscience, leaving to this last, all doctrines, true or false, with all their present and future consequences, good or bad. The very fact that the civil authority is obliged to protect the citizen in the practice of his devotions is the very strongest proof that the majority is religiously inclined. Woe to that country if the mass of its people shall ever become unbelievers. Then will religion lose that protection which makes it now so free to act * * * a republic demoralized is worse than any form of government whatever.

From the "Iowa Historical Annals" comes the following summary tribute of Father Mazzuchelli's role in the building of the Nation:

> Of all the pioneers of civilization in the interiors of our frontiers, few have contributed more largely to its diffusion, less numerous still are those who are identified more intimately in the formation of the States. And among those, no one has loved more profoundly the institutions of our country and foresaw more clearly our splendid successes than Samuel Charles Mazzuchelli.

The last 20 years of his life were devoted to forming good citizens through pastoral and educational pursuits. Sinsinawa Mound College for men, St. Clara Academy for girls; and the American Congregation of the Most Holy Rosary, a teaching sisterhood that today perpetuates the social principles he enacted during his busy apostolate—these institutions were among the first to be chartered by the new State of Wisconsin. The latter two foundations still function usefully as the crowning achievements in a life of teaching and building. Twenty-four churches as well as a number of public buildings, making some 30 establishments in all, are credited to his apostolic zeal and architectural skill.

This patriot-preacher designed the courthouse and markethouse at Galena, Ill.; the courthouse at Fort Madison, Iowa, and is credited with being consultant architect of the old State capitol of Iowa City. He planned streets for Iowa City and named many of the streets in Shullsburg, Wis. This town has acquired some fame due to the uniqueness of those names, including faith, charity, justice, truth, goodness, and judgment.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that with his draftman's tools, this "Builder of the West" literally carved for himself a niche in the Hall of Fame in our Nation's Capitol. Whether or not his adopted country will ever place his statue there, he remains a creditor

whom no material monument could in fact repay.

The Galena Gazette of September 26, 1835, quoted from Father Mazzuchelli's speech at a cornerstone laying:

Be it then our most sacred duty to defend the rights and liberties of this land, even to the cost of our lives when so required because having our patriotism strengthened and invigorated by the love of God and our neighbor, we are necessarily induced into the obligation of becoming useful members of society.

From the same speech:

The land in which we dwell together becomes a strong bond of union between us. Thus, we become animated by a noble and patriotic zeal and courage in the defense or protection of all its interests, either ecclesiastical or civil.

And finally:

The peaceful man must see that Christianity is the most powerful promoter of peace and tranquillity of states; and the patriotic mind has to be convinced that it inspires men with that love of their own country which has ever been the peculiar characteristic of great and exalted minds.

Father Mazzuchelli scorned the American dollar in his own interest, but lived his life under its motto, "In God We Trust." His varied interests and multiple talents are expressed in the American slogan for the union of States: "E Pluribus Unum." Like the American eagle he drew great lines across the sky of American life. He carried the twin standards of faith and freedom into unchartered areas of the Midwest and because of his lone and early passage, the migration of many others was made easier.

Unaware no doubt of the symbolism which is apparent today, the missionary chose the Mound of Sinsinawa, which is the Indian word for eagle, to build the foundation which makes Sinsinawa a significant word through the 132 schools and the 102,000 pupils taught by his Dominican Sisters of Sinsinawa throughout the United States.

Men of action must first be men of dreams. If the realization of patriots' dreams falls short of building those "alabaster cities that gleam undimmed by human tears," it is the failure of their successors that cause the tears and not the stuff of which the dreams are made.

When Father Mazzuchelli died in 1864 the story of his career was widely printed in newspapers across the country. The San Francisco Monitor, the Cincinnati Telegraph, and the Metropolitan Record of New York carried eulogies. From the Record, May 28, 1864, the following is an exerpt:

Today he [Samuel Mazzuchelli] is found at the mansion of the affluent; tomorrow in the hovel of the poor; but for all alike he had that modest look of persuasive eloquence whose command was irresistible. There he is, high upon the scaffold of a church, with coat off and sleeves tucked up, industriously at work in brick and mortar. In the evening, you see him in the pulpit discoursing on * * * Christian philosophy, and tomorrow he lectures on the science of political economy, but always and everywhere present when sacred duties of the ministry required. Wonderful little man.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year the Senate considered the International Coffee Agreement. At that time I protested that it was a long step in the direction of international, worldwide price supports.

In view of the unfortunate consequences of domestic price supports, with the enormous burden on our taxpayer, and the pitiful results for our farmers, I felt that it was a mistake. A constituent of mine in Milwaukee, Leonard Campbell, has written to me, pointing out eloquently the impact of the coffee situation on his business, the great increase in cost, and what it has done to him.

I have had occasion to talk with a large number of restaurant owners in Wisconsin in recent days, and they also report that the international coffee situation has developed to the point where they have to pay an extremely high price for their coffee, which is, of course, essential for their operation.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent letter from Mr. Leonard Campbell and two clippings on the matter from the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

HOT COFFEE SERVICE,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 15, 1964.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: We are faced with a problem that to us is quite serious, and it appears to be getting steadily worse. Whether or not you can be of help to us is a matter of conjecture. We will assure you of our sincere appreciation for any assistance that you may find possible to render in the amelioration of our situation.

Our problem is basically the adverse effect that the recent drastic increases in coffee prices is having on our business. We are a small business operating in the traditional manner under our American free enterprise system, which we believe to be the finest and fairest of them all. We are sure that you share our opinion in this point of view.

We genuinely try to make the most of our opportunities and thereby contribute our modest share to the growth and welfare of our community, our State, and our Nation, in the true spirit of good citizenship. In so doing we provide self-sufficiency through steady employment, for five families, and are able to make our share of tax dollars continue to flow into the proper channels in support of our various levels of government, local, State, and National. We are indeed proud to have the opportunity of participating in this great American way of life, but we are likewise finding it more and more difficult to maintain our normal incentive, which is, of course, the opportunity to earn a reasonable return on our investment of funds, time and effort devoted to our business enterprise.

We are particularly restricted in our ability to defend our position against the inroads of increasing costs of our basic commodity ingredient, namely coffee, inasmuch as we cannot merely "pass along" the increases in price which comes to us, by raising our selling price. Were we in the ordinary channels of trade such as the wholesale or retail outlets, or restaurant or catering fields, we could probably minimize the effect of higher costs, by corresponding increases in our selling price. But, sir, we are not able to do this because we sell our coffee a cup at a time through coin operated vending machines. We are virtually "locked in" as far as our selling price is concerned. It is actually neither feasible nor desirable to undertake "odd penny" pricing in our business, due to mechanical and other practical considerations.

Now our purpose in writing to you about this dilemma, Senator, is to ask whether you can help us to try to get some relief from this sharply increasing price of coffee. We understand that the recent spurt in coffee prices is largely caused by the action of the International Coffee Agreement, which is aimed at raising world coffee prices for the benefit of the coffee producing countries.

We enclose a couple of clippings from the Milwaukee Journal which comment on this situation. It is interesting to note that one of these contains the statement that this International Coffee Agreement's effect largely depends upon the ratification of the U.S. Senate, without which the agreement becomes virtually useless, and by implication, coffee prices will cease to be artificially skyrocketed, and will be restored to their normal levels based upon world supply and demand. If this bit of reporting by our local paper is accurate, you can understand of course why we hasten to appeal to you as our U.S. Senator, to support our pleas for help. We want to avoid being "bled to death" in order to subsidize the coffee producers.

Rightly or not, we have the impression that much of the effort on the part of our Government in rendering economic aid in whatever form it may take, to the Latin American countries, is intended to overcome the influence of communistic subversion being so actively directed by the Castro regime from Cuba. We wholeheartedly support this objective. However, we note from a recent statement in the Milwaukee Journal, a copy of which is attached herewith, that our contribution to 11 of the principal coffee producing countries, under the Alliance for Progress program, amounts to $1,101 million during the past 2 years.

We cannot help but wonder how far it is deemed necessary and prudent to go in pursuing this program of financial aid to our neighbors to the south of us, especially when the effect of it begins to hit our own citizens here at home so hard, in the form of sharp increases in commodity prices such as the present coffee situation reflects, in addition to inevitable increases that must be expected in the form of further tax burdens that will have to come in order that such programs can be maintained.

It would be our hope, that the benefits of the general aid extended under the Alliance for Progress would suffice to illustrate our unmatched benevolence to these people, without the necessity of further penalizing our already overburdened business people and citizens in general with painful price increases on our daily cup of coffee.

You may or may not realize it, Senator, but we speak for a fairly substantial group in the vending industry in making this plea. Not officially, of course, but what goes for us as individuals, also pertains to the entire vending industry which is dependent to a considerable extent on the sale of coffee through coin operated dispensing machines, for a satisfactory livelihood. The latest estimates of sales of coffee by this means, for 1963, is from $250 million to $260 million which is a lot of cups of coffee. Each and every cup sold is subject to the inexorable price squeeze inflicted upon the businessmen who operate these coffee vending machines.

We respectfully ask you to pause in reflection of the problem that this Interna-

tional Coffee Agreement imposes upon this group of hard-working Americans, who are completely helpless to combat the adverse affects of this coffee price squeeze.

If it is true that the ratification of this International Coffee Agreement is still to be acted upon by the U.S. Senate, we urge that you use whatever influence you may deem proper in explaining our situation to those Senators whose direct vote will determine the acceptance or rejection of this agreement on behalf of the United States.

We would greatly appreciate your comments on this matter, at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD CAMPBELL.

1961–63 aid granted to 11 coffee-producing nations, Alliance for Progress program

Country:	*Million*
Mexico	$191
Guatemala	23
El Salvador	46
Nicaragua	21
Costa Rica	25
Panama	34
Honduras	16
Ecuador	73
Colombia	202
Venezuela	112
Brazil	358
Total	1,101

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

SEEK TO HALT RISE OF COFFEE PRICES

LONDON, ENGLAND.—An emergency meeting of the 58 member International Coffee Council has been requested for February 10 to consider ways of halting recent sharp price rises.

Joao Santos, executive director of the council, said the request came after a week of discussion by the organization's 14 member executive board.

Reliable sources said the board had agreed to bring about 2 million extra bags of coffee into the market to counter price increases.

GROUNDS IN THE COFFEE

Certainly most people sip their morning coffee without a thought to the international economic and political implications of the steaming black liquid.

In terms of global trade, coffee is the second most important commodity in the world exceeded only by petroleum. It is cultivated in 70 countries and in 9 of these accounts for more than 50 percent of all foreign exchange earnings.

New problems are now percolating in the world coffee market. Wholesale prices, which dropped to a 14-year low last summer, have since spurted more than 30 percent. The executive board of the International Coffee Agreement, a pact drafted last year by 57 producing and consuming countries in an effort to stabilize the market, now has under consideration a request immediately to increase coffee export quotas. The intention is to inflate supply of world coffee and thereby depress prices.

Source of the present trouble seems to be a shortage of supply, which Brazil and other coffee lands attribute to recent drought and fire damage to trees. This explanation is challenged in some quarters as a counterfeit excuse for driving up prices.

Whatever the reason, the situation is raising doubts about the entire coffee agreement in the U.S. Senate, which has yet to ratify the pact. Without U.S. approval the agreement is virtually worthless, since Americans consume more than half the world's coffee.

The principal motive behind the international agreement—to help insure a stable source of income for some of the world's poorest lands—is basically sound. It would be most unfortunate if an apparently temporary market condition were allowed to dash such a worthy goal.

NEW HAMPSHIRE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS SUPPORTS DETERGENT CONTROL

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs supports congressional action to banish detergent residues from our streams and ground water. The Senate has passed amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act which include a measure of control over the water problems created by nondecomposable detergents. These problems include persistent foaming, increasing ability to penetrate substrata to contaminate wells, changes in oxygen content of streams, and impaired efficiency of municipal sewage treatment works. I am highly gratified by the public-spirited response of the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs to this problem and ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by their midwinter meeting at Concord on January 22, 1964, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL 1964

Whereas the lakes, rivers and streams of New Hampshire are vital to its very existence; to its economic and social progress; and to the public health and welfare of its people; and

Whereas the domestic agricultural, fishing, wildlife, industrial productive capacity and recreational uses are seriously threatened because of pollution of our streams, rivers and lakes, and

Whereas prevention and control of pollution is necessary to serve the widest possible range of human needs; and the presence of nonbiodegradable chemicals in detergents is causing serious problems in municipal and private sewage treatment plants; is polluting our rivers, lakes and streams, and has already reached the underground water table, thus polluting both public and private wells;

Whereas the responsibility of water pollution control is primarily State and local: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs urges its members to promote a program of education emphasizing the urgency of prevention and control of water pollutants; and further

Resolved, That the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs urges that (1) private industry, local, State and Federal agencies encourage research and that they cooperate to accomplish adequate water supply and pollution abatement; that (2) pollution control be developed as an integral part of river-basin programs; and that (3) stronger regulatory laws including the ban on nonbiodegradable detergents be enacted to improve water pollution control.

HELEN P. MADAN
Mrs. Edwin S. MaDan,
Chairman, Conservation Department, New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE PIONEERS IN ENGINEERING EDUCATION

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the United States is engaged in an undramatic effort to solve a critical problem, the shortage of well qualified scientists and engineers. We have heard a great deal about the "brain drain" of senior scientists and recent Ph. D.'s from Great Britain to the United States. The reservoir of top-flight scientific manpower upon which a nation may draw is obviously a matter of central concern. The Engineering Manpower Commission is a private body that has done excellent work in this field. Their 1963 report stated:

In the face of growing need, the year-by-year decline in engineering enrollments and graduations poses a severe threat to our Nation's wholesome industrial and economic growth, as well as to its influence as a stabilizing force in the free world.

I am pleased to note, Mr. President, that the National Science Foundation will devote the principal part of their effort, in the first year of implementing President Kennedy's scientific manpower program, to the critical need for more graduate degree awards in engineering. We must increase not only the number of engineers working for government and industry, but also the number who will become teachers of engineering. Thus I welcome the leadership of the University of New Hampshire in this area of critical national need.

I ask unanimous consent that W. Arthur Grant's article, "University Pioneers a Plan for More Engineers," from the University of New Hampshire Alumnus for February 1964 be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

UNIVERSITY PIONEERS A PLAN FOR MORE ENGINEERS

(By W. Arthur Grant)

Amid mounting evidence that cold war skirmishes of the late 1960's and early 1970's will increasingly be waged on the production line, many informed voices are echoing concern over the fact that during the next decade, Russia will graduate 1.4 million engineers as against an estimated 435,000 in the United States.

The predicted shortage of trained engineering talent is a particularly vexing one for the United States. Declining enrollments in the Nation's engineering colleges—and shrinking graduating classes—come at a time when hard-sell recruitment programs seek to excite would-be engineers with salaries, status and other inducements considered the acme in careerism today.

A committee on engineering student attrition, appointed by the Engineering Manpower Commission to make a nationwide survey of the problem last spring, pointed its finger at the Nation's colleges as a major factor.

Attrition rates of from 30 to 50 percent among technology colleges in the United States are "discouraging large numbers of capable students from even considering engineering as a career," the committee reported. It observed:

"A surprisingly large number of students who have both the talent and the desire for engineering fall by the wayside in educational systems that are archaic, haphazard, impersonal, and lacking in vital motivation."

The University of New Hampshire's College of Technology arrived at a similar judgment nearly 4 years ago after a critical examination of its engineering student attrition rate. From that exhaustive review emerged a new philosophy and a fresh approach, a

prototype of programs now under consideration on the campuses of many engineering colleges.

The UNH plan has two distinct phases:

1. A reduction in the traditionally high attrition rate among student engineers to preserve their thin ranks and thereby increase the number of graduating engineers;

2. The seeking out and encouraging of more talented young men and women to enroll in the university's College of Technology.

Four years have passed since the university came to grips with the problem. The effort began in 1959 shortly after Dr. Robert N. Faiman became dean of the College of Technology. After 18 months' service with the engineering sciences program of the National Science Foundation in Washington, D.C., Dean Faiman was deeply concerned over the Nation's critical demand for engineering talent and the tremendous loss of potential engineers on college campuses.

A statistical survey of the class which entered the College of Technology in 1958 revealed that nearly 50 percent had voluntarily withdrawn from the college, transferred to nonengineering courses, or had failed to satisfy the college's academic requirements in their first year. The casualty rate was typical of experience in America's engineering schools over the past 40 years. But New Hampshire decided to do something about it and this winter the college could report that 85 percent of its 1962 freshman engineering class had successfully completed its first-year studies.

During the intervening years, a variety of committees had investigated and made recommendations on a wide range of problems bearing on the engineering-student attrition rate. Almost to a man, the investigators underscored the importance of student motivation. To deal with this factor, the college developed a new basic technology course for freshman engineers. Dr. Oswald T. Zimmerman, chairman of the department of chemical engineering and one of the founders of the course, explains:

"These youngsters come to us to become engineers but, traditionally, they have spent their first 2 years in basic science and mathematics courses that afforded little or no contact with engineering. We wanted to introduce the engineering fields to them and, at the same time, demonstrate the tie between these subjects and their future careers."

The new course strikes directly at one of the biggest weaknesses among today's students—an inability to translate word problems into mathematical formulas for solution purposes.

"These students are adept at understanding the principles of mathematics and engineering but they falter when they have to use precise measures to determine exact answers," reports Prof. Alden L. Winn, chairman of the department of electrical engineering and one of the eight veteran faculty members who teach the course.

The basic technology course also introduces computer programing, formerly reserved for the junior and senior years.

Motivation and problem-solving deficiencies also figured in the development of a revised basic physics course for freshman engineers.

In colleges across the country, students in basic courses have traditionally studied only classical material—developments within the physics field prior to 1900. Modern physics, encompassing such post-1900 developments as atomic, nuclear, and relativity theories, have generally been left for specialized study in the upper-class years.

"In essence, our youngsters have been studying the same material and doing the same experiments their fathers and grandfathers did," explains Dr. Robert E. Houston, Jr., associate professor of physics who directed development of the revised program.

"While interested and quite knowledgeable in the terminology of modern physics—which they read about in their daily newspapers—they had little classroom contact with it," he adds.

The new physics program is a 1½-year course which stresses the teaching of about 10 fundamental conservation principles as they apply to both classical and modern physics, and thus demonstrate the unity of the entire discipline.

The course, with revised experimental work each year, offers a quick look at the highlights of physics and, in its second and third semesters, goes into the conceptual and mathematical details of those highlights. It has helped reduce the failure rate among physics students from 35 percent in 1959 to less than 10 percent last year.

In yet another area, the College of Technology has dramatically overhauled the 1½-year mathematics program required of all freshman engineers. Calculus is now the basic course, replacing a previous combination of algebra-trigonometry and calculus-analytical geometry in separate semesters.

A remarkable new placement test has been devised to place freshmen in graded math sections. About 80 percent of entering freshman engineers have a better than 3-to-1 chance of earning a grade of C or better and are assigned to a main or fast track calculus course. The other 20 percent—students who would be quite probable casualties in the fast course—are placed in slower sections offering more time for individual and remedial attention.

Dr. M. Evans Monroe, chairman of the department of mathematics, states that nearly 40 percent of the 1959 freshman engineers failed the new calculus course without the benefit of the ability-graded sections. Last year, only 14 percent failed and withdrawals have dropped from 24 in 1959 to only 4 this past year.

Many other factors enter into the UNH plan. They include revamping of the faculty adviser program, an emphasis upon use of the college's most experienced teachers to instruct first-year courses, and a sweeping study of outside-the-classroom influences upon students—ranging from the environment in which they study to the off-campus professional contacts available to them.

Dr. John B. Hraba, associate dean of the college, sums up the college's new philosophy:

"With very few exceptions, we know that every student admitted to this college is capable of succeeding—if he wants to. Our attention continues to be centered on the factors which cause otherwise able students to fail."

With New Hampshire's pioneering work behind him, it was not surprising that Dean Faiman should be selected by the engineers joint council to serve on its committee on engineering student attrition—or that many of the recommendations proposed by the committee to the Nation's engineering colleges should reflect actions undertaken at UNH.

Fortified with the brightened prospects for success which their college can now offer, teams from the College of Technology are today beating a path to secondary schools throughout the East in search of engineering candidates. This is the implementation of the second phase of the UNH plan.

The importance of their mission is underscored by the Manpower Commission's admonition: "Competition with Europe, Russia and Japan will mount at an accelerating pace, jeopardizing large sectors of American industry. Beyond our own needs, there is our growing moral commitment to the free world to assist newly emerging nations in their educational and technological growth. The technological manpower pools of these competitive nations (Russia and the United States) could be a decisive force in the struggle between communism and the free world."

MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a great deal has been accomplished in recent years in the area of mental health, on both the National and State levels.

Of this we can be proud, but we know that much remains to be done. This Congress last year enacted into law a provision for Federal matching funds for the construction of community mental health centers throughout the Nation. I consider this one of the most important actions of the Congress, and believe it to be a significant step toward the solution of the problems of the mentally ill.

In a recent address before the annual convention of the Georgia Association for Mental Health in Macon, Ga., Mr. Mike Gorman, executive director, the National Committee Against Mental Illness, rightly pointed out that it is now up to local communities to translate this new legislation into specific programs.

Mr. President, Mr. Gorman's splendid address is deserving of wide dissemination, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NEW MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By Mike Gorman, Washington, D.C.)

The gauntlet was thrown down by our martyred President less than a year ago when he sent to the Congress the first message on mental health and mental retardation ever submitted by a Chief Executive of this Nation. In that message, he said: "This situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone and despairing of solution. * * * The time has come for a bold new approach."

The Congress responded to the challenge and enacted into law a bill providing Federal matching funds for the construction of mental health and mental retardation centers in the heart of the community. In affixing his signature to this legislation on October 31, 1963, former President Kennedy noted: "The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to all who have made this legislation possible. It was said, in an earlier age, that the mind of man is a far country which can neither be approached nor explored. But, today, under present conditions of scientific achievement, it will be possible for a nation as rich in human and material resources as ours to make the remote reaches of the mind accessible. The mentally ill and the mentally retarded need no longer be alien to our affections or beyond the help of our communities."

There is really no way in which I can adequately convey to you the historic, precedent-shattering importance of this legislation. In very simple terms, it repudiates two centuries of isolation and custodial confinement of the mentally ill, and it proclaims their inalienable right to skilled and compassionate treatment in the milieu in which they live, love, work, and aspire.

Describing this legislation as "one of the boldest programs in the field of mental health in the history of the world," Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY told the annual convention of the National Association of Mental Health last November that if the 1st session of the 88th Congress had achieved noth-

ing more than the passage of President Kennedy's mental health program, it could lay justifiable claim to a memorable record.

The task before all of us now, here in Georgia and throughout the Nation, is to translate these new concepts for the care of the mentally ill from broad generalities into specific programs.

In the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Go put your creed into your deed."

Let us remember that we must honor a solemn commitment to the Congress and to the American people in putting this community mental health concept into effect.

Your program for this convention lists separate panels on attitudes and services. I submit that these two areas are closely related—that through the provision of intensive care for the mentally ill when it is needed and where it is needed, you will do more to change community attitudes than through a hundred pamphlets or a thousand speeches.

As a first step you are engaged here, as are your sister States throughout the country, in comprehensive planning designed to develop solid foundations for new mental health services tailored to meet the specific needs of each community.

This is a precious opportunity which must not be missed. Noting that this is the first time such a total planning effort has been made in any health area, Dr. Robert Felix observed recently that "the mental health field, which for so long lagged behind other health areas, has an opportunity to demonstrate on a national scale the value of comprehensive, long-term planning in a broad medical-social problem area."

Hundreds of professional workers will be involved in hammering out these plans over the next several years, but they must be augmented and guided by thousands upon thousands of citizens who care so deeply that they will insist upon a clean break with the custodial past.

First and foremost, we must realize that this is a long, uphill fight. Equally important, we must abandon the mendicant, somewhat apologetic approach we take when we ask for a few crumbs from our national bounty. Our stance must be vigorous, aggressive and unwavering in our continued efforts to shape a new and enlightened national policy for the care and treatment of the mentally ill.

In doing this, we must adhere to a boldly proclaimed set of minimum standards short of which we will not compromise under any circumstances.

In testifying before a congressional committee last year, I said that in the same manner as we talk of the right of a child to a good public education, we must talk of the right of every individual who needs it to early psychiatric treatment designed to make him a happier and more effective individual. Dr. B. H. McNeel, commissioner of mental hospitals of Ontario in Canada, summed up this minimum medical demand concisely when he said recently: "Adequate treatment should be available for all psychiatric patients as early as possible, as continuously as possible, with as little dislocation as possible, and with as much social restoration as possible. Treatment should be available on the job, but if that is not possible, with the patient still living at home, and if that is not possible, it should be done in the community, and if that is not possible, then without breaking the ties which commit the patient to his community."

As a statement of our national objectives in the mental health field, I commend to you the words of Dr. Felix, who told the Congress last year that "public mental hospitals as we know them today can disappear in 25 years" if all levels of government and the public at large unite in this great endeavor.

We must devote particular attention to the several millions of Americans who need psychiatric treatment, but cannot get it today because it is too expensive. There is no point in establishing a chain of community mental health centers designed to apply psychiatric band-aids to neurotics from middle-income and upper-income groups. We must first of all guarantee treatment in depth to those who are seriously ill.

We have been much too gentle in calling health insurance plans to task on this point. Many health insurance plans still discriminate against the hospitalized mentally ill. Furthermore, as we move out into the community, we face a real challenge in convincing these health insurance plans that it is wiser and far less expensive to cover the patient on a short-term ambulatory basis than in any expensive hospital bed. In a long and somewhat wearying experience dealing with executions of these plans, I am convinced that they will take no forward steps of this kind unless the public pressure is intense.

We must supply that pressure.

We face an exciting challenge in providing psychiatric services for emotionally disturbed children. Here again, we have often settled for the bare minimum—a separately designated ward in an overcrowded state nospital or, infrequently, a 10- to 20-bed unit which is almost immediately overloaded with a backlog of cases.

Happily, there are places in this country where the mendicant approach is being abandoned.

Several months ago, I spent a day visiting the Massachusetts Mental Health Center in Boston. Its buildings are not very prepossessing, but its services to suffering mankind are magnificent. With a full-time staff of 14 psychiatrists, plus 59 psychiatric residents, it handles 4,000 patients a year. Its doors are open to all, yet it has no waiting list. In its emergency walk-in clinic, it handles more than 2,000 patients a year. It assigns patients to its various services—the 24-hour hospital, the day hospital, the night hospital, or the emergency clinic—on the basis of psychiatric need, not on the basis of ability to pay or the comfort of the staff.

As we go about the task of building a nationwide chain of community mental health centers, we will run up against the negativists who argue that the goals we set are impossible because we do not have the manpower.

In 1947, the National Institute of Mental Health was allocated $1 million to inaugurate a training program in the various psychiatric disciplines. In that first year, it supported the training of 219 professionals. The negativists argued that this was about the limit—the field of mental illness was too discouraging and dreary to attract many new people.

How wrong these naysayers have been. Federal and State training programs more than doubled the number of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, social workers and psychiatric nurses in a decade—from about 22,000 in 1950 to 45,000 in 1960. The current training program of the National Institute of Mental Health is supporting close to 4,000 trainees a year, and a most conservative estimate indicates that there will be 85,000 professional workers in the key mental health disciplines available to this country by 1970.

Furthermore, we have just begun to tap the potential of professional and nonprofessional people in related fields. For example, during the past 5 years, thousands of family physicians, pediatricians, and other nonpsychiatric specialists have enrolled in formal, postgraduate courses designed to increase their psychiatric skills. These physicians, who will be given the opportunity to hospitalize their emotionally disturbed patients in the new mental health centers, will provide an enormous complement of additional skilled manpower.

By the same token, we must avail ourselves of the skills of other members of the medical team. Your use, here in Georgia, of the public health nurse as the contact and followup person with mentally ill patients and their families is but one of the many illustrations of the new flexibility we must adopt.

If and when we satisfy the negativists as to the adequacy of psychiatric manpower, they will then move two steps to the right and tell us that this country cannot afford to treat the mentally ill on the same basis as it now treats the physically ill.

We must make a strong, factual case in answer to these people. We must point out to them that the direct and indirect costs of mental illness and mental retardation now exceed $3 billion a year. The States alone spend more than a billion dollars a year for the maintenance of large institutions for the care of the mentally ill. These present costs are a tremendous drain upon our economy. More important, the loss of effective, functioning people is a constant hemorrhage which this democracy can ill afford.

We have impressive documentation to the effect that early, intensive treatment, while more expensive on a day-to-day basis, is considerably cheaper per patient than long-term custody at supposedly economical rates.

You have proven this here in Georgia over the past few years, and I have cited your experience in talks in many parts of the country. To me, the most dramatic result of your experiment in hospitalizing mental patients in general hospitals in some of your larger cities is not the economic saving—it is the saving of human beings who have not only been kept from going to the State hospital but, in a remarkably large number of cases, have found successful employment. I commend Georgia industry and the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce for this remarkable program of placing the mentally restored in job situations.

Our critics may grant us the point that early, intensive treatment pays off in human and economic terms, but they then will argue that taxes are already too high—that this democracy cannot bear this further financial burden.

I am willing to grant the point that these community mental health centers will be relatively expensive to operate, and that we do not have detailed cost statistics from every State in the Union. Suppose the average cost is $20 a bed—this is still $15 a bed under the comparable cost for care of physical illness in our general hospitals.

Because of the nature of our affluent society, many of us who have testified before Federal and State legislative bodies for increased financing of intensive treatment services have been forced on many an occasion to restrict our case to the economic savings which accrue from support of such services. Over the years, a very good case has been made against the unimaginative construction of huge State mental hospitals which eat up tax dollars at a staggering rate.

However, I would like to submit the proposition that the issue of economic savings has a relatively low priority in the field of mental health.

The overriding consideration is the treatment and return to society of thousands upon thousands of sick individuals. This is the true measure of our worth as a society.

However, when we talk about increased financing of mental health services so that thousands upon thousands of mental patients can be returned to productive living, we run up against the hoary argument that public taxation has reached a confiscatory level and that the individual citizen is groaning under a tax burden which he is increasingly unable to handle.

Have we, indeed, as a people, been increasing our expenditure for public services at a rate which is too burdensome for the individual taxpayer?

In his beautifully documented study "The Question of Government Spending," Francis M. Bator notes that in the years from 1929 to 1959, nondefense spending as a percentage share of the nondefense output of our economy rose only slightly: "We have been committing in the postwar period only a slightly larger fraction to such communal uses as schools, roads, sanitation, urban renewal, etc., than we did in 1929 and a smaller share than in 1939 and 1940."

When we consider the rapid rise in our population—a record growth of 3 million in a year—added to a sharp jump in individual personal income, we cannot but conclude that the so-called heavy burden of increased taxes for public services is an undocumented myth.

What are we spending our money on these days? A 1962 Bureau of Labor Statistics survey reports that our gains in income have far outstripped our basic living costs since 1957; we now spend a smaller share of our income on the basic necessities—food, clothing, and shelter.

In 1961, for example, we spent $20 billion on recreation; $11 billion for alcoholic beverages; more than $7 billion for tobacco products, and $3½ billion for TV sets, radios, and phonographs. We also managed in that same affluent year to spend $323 million for chewing gum. Over and above these and many other expenditures, we managed to accumulate the record sum of $78 billion in savings and in durable assets.

Now, and much more to the point, how much of our booming personal income did we spend on these onerous State taxes about which we hear so much talk? In 1961 we spent, measured in constant dollars, 4 percent of our personal income for State taxes as against 3.7 percent in 1948. In other words, in a period of 13 years there was a rise of only three-tenths of 1 percent in the portion of our individual incomes which went to State government in the form of taxes.

Zeroing in on the target, how much did we spend on mental hospitals as a percentage of our personal incomes? In 1961 we spent eighteen-hundredths of a percent of our personal income on mental hospitals, as against seventeen-hundredths of a percent in 1948. In very simple terms, in 13 years we devoted only an additional one-hundredth of a percent of our personal incomes to the support of mental hospitals.

How about State mental hospitals operating expenditures as a percentage of total general State expenditures? According to a survey jointly conducted by the American Psychiatric Association and the National Association for Mental Health, less than 3 percent of general State funds went to mental hospitals in 1961, a significant drop from the 3⅓ percent which was devoted to these facilities in 1956.

Is this a fair proportion of State expenditures? By way of contrast, State governments in 1961 devoted 28 percent of their funds to highways. In that year, as a nation, we spent $10 billion for highways. Furthermore, the Department of Commerce recently estimated that the accelerated national highway program inaugurated in 1957 would, upon completion in 1972, cost the American people $55 billion.

I know that you here in Georgia, and your sister States throughout the South, will not be a party to any defeatist gospel.

Ten years ago, I participated in a 4-day meeting of the Southern Regional Educational Board in Atlanta at which the pioneer regional program for interstate cooperation in mental health research and training was hammered out. Over the past decade, the Southern Regional Council on Mental Health Research and Training has played a significant part in welding the 16 States of the southern Governors' conference into a coordinated effort to lift the mental health standards of this entire region.

While taking pride in these accomplishments, I know that you will agree with me that much yet remains to be done. In a report released last November, the Southern Regional Education Board called for increased State support for research and training, and for bold steps so that existing institutional services could be decentralized and mental health services brought closer to the community.

You have responded to this challenge in many ways here in Georgia, starting with the magnificent series of articles by Jack Nelson in the Atlanta Constitution. You have accomplished a top-to-bottom revamping of Milledgeville State Hospital which has earned the admiration of the Nation. Under the skilled administration of Dr. I. H. MacKinnon, that vast institution has been broken up into eight separate units, each operating as a complete hospital in itself. Most exciting is the fact that Milledgeville is training personnel in all of the psychiatric disciplines, and that much of this training is being made possible by State training stipends.

In an effort to strength your mental health research and training potential, you are now embarked on the construction of the Georgia Mental Health Institute in Atlanta which, when completed, will surely be one of the outstanding facilities in the country for service to patients, for the training of your own native sons in the various psychiatric disciplines and for the furtherance of research knowledge.

Your division of mental health, now under the skilled direction of my good friend Dr. Addison Duval, is pioneering in the close coordination of your State hospital and community mental health services. I am sure that representatives of many States involved in planning efforts will come to Georgia in the near future to learn from you how you have used facilities such as your general hospitals, and personnel such as your public health nurses, to establish a close, continuing contact with the mentally ill from the point of their admission to hospitalization to their aftercare needs in the community.

In his magnificent inaugural address in January 1961, our late President told us that the road would not be easy: "All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

Here in Georgia and throughout this great land, let us continue.

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for over 30 years the National Conference of Christians and Jews has sponsored an annual Brotherhood Week, which in 1964 is being observed this week. It seems to me like a particularly appropriate time for all of us to think about the meaning and spirit behind this special civic observance.

This is a time when the pressures on all of us, from our top leaders down to each citizen, to meet new and difficult problems seem to mount daily. It is a time of change and challenge on the local, the national, and the international levels. We must meet these challenges with the patience, determination, and imagination which can only be derived by every man putting forth his best effort to work in cooperation with every other man. We must seek justice and unity through a continued dedication to the principles on which this country was founded. This is a year-around job, a day-to-day task.

I commend the National Conference of Christians and Jews for their work in urging all citizens of every race, creed, and color to rededicate themselves to the true spirit of brotherhood in their every endeavor. And I say let each one of us take up this cause—this week, and every week.

RIGHT OF THE FEDERAL TAXPAYER TO CHALLENGE THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXPENDITURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, when the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 was debated before the Senate last fall, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and I offered an amendment to make it certain that any Federal taxpayer suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers could question the constitutionality of disbursement of Federal funds to church-owned, controlled, or operated colleges and universities. Some time ago, Mr. Kenneth Culp Davis, John P. Wilson professor of law at the University of Chicago Law School, made an excellent address entitled "Standing To Sue in Religion Cases," which deals in an illuminating manner with this subject and expresses the opinion that the Federal taxpayer is adversely affected in fact by an unconstitutional expenditure of Federal funds and is entitled to challenge such expenditures notwithstanding the language used by the court in Frothingham against Mellon. This excellent article should be made available to all Members of Congress, and for this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed as follows:

STANDING TO SUE IN RELIGION CASES

(By Kenneth Culp Davis)

The Constitution is still the Constitution and is still the supreme law of the land even when no one has standing to enforce it in court. Yet we in the United States have become so accustomed to relying on the courts for enforcement of the Constitution that we often make the untenable assumption that a constitutional provision that cannot be judicially enforced is the equivalent of no constitutional provision. We tend to forget that in most countries of the world, courts are not used at all to enforce constitutional limitations on legislative powers. When no one has standing in court to enforce the Constitution, we ought to think of ourselves as having a system to assume that the Constitution is nonexistent to that extent.

This observation gives standing a rather special importance that it ought not to have.

My subject is standing to challenge violations of the religion clauses of the first amendment. This subject is one small portion of the general law of standing, which is especially confused and contradictory in both Federal courts and State courts. One major reason for the confused case law is is that judges often give their primary attention to the law of standing, and that judges sometimes manipulate the law of standing so as to produce the substantive results

they deem desirable. But those who believe that the law of standing is nothing but the product of manipulation are just as wrong as those who believe that it is nothing but the product of logical analysis. My opinion is that the law of standing is a mixture of logical analysis and manipulation. In some cases manipulation motivates, in some logical analysis motivates, and in some combination of the two elements motivates. I think that time spent in logical analysis of the law of standing can be time well spent, so long as we remember that it is not the only factor at work.

One who tries to produce some order out of the chaotic law of standing must construct his own philosophy of standing or at least his own approach, and before I begin my discussion of standing in religion cases, I think I should disclose my basic assumption. My whole philosophy of standing, elaborately developed in more than a hundred pages of my "Administrative Law Treatise" and in the supplement to the treatise to be published this month, can be stated in one extremely simple sentence: One who is adversely affected in fact by governmental action should have standing to challenge it. I use the words "in fact" to indicate that theories about a legal right or a legal wrong are unnecessary. The test should be adverse effect in fact. The view I have been advocating was the basis for the Supreme Court's sound decision in the Bantam Books case of 1963; the Court said the plaintiffs had standing because they "have in fact suffered a palpable injury." (372 U.S. 58, 64 (1963).)

Now I find that the Supreme Court has decided about 60 cases involving the religion clauses of the first amendment, although I am often in doubt as to what cases to include or exclude. Of the 60, 9 seem to me to have significance to the law of standing. Surprisingly enough, in view of the general confusion about the law of standing, I think that the nine cases form a largely coherent body of law, both more orderly and more satisfactory than the rest of the Supreme Court's law of standing. Indeed, eight of the nine opinions I am inclined to approve rather fully. The only opinion I shall criticize adversely is the McGowan opinion of 1961. Lest you think I am mellowing in old age, I shall disagree all along the line with some of the commentators.

The nine cases raise two questions—whether taxpayers as such have standing, and whether other parties have standing. It is important to keep the two questions distinct, even though both questions may come up in the same case. Let us look first at standing of taxpayers.

TAXPAYERS

The 1899 decision in *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, 175 U.S. 291, is without modern significance. A taxpayer was allowed to challenge validity of an appropriation by Congress for a District of Columbia hospital allegedly operated by a sisterhood of the Roman Catholic Church. The Court simply passed over the question of standing without either deciding or discussing it. The Court found its position on the standing question just 24 years later, when it held in *Frothingham* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, that a Federal taxpayer lacks standing to challenge a Federal expenditure. That the Court in the Bradfield case found it easier to decide the merits than to decide the question of standing had little or no effect on development of the law of standing.

In the *Cochran* case, 281 U.S. 370 (1930), citizens and taxpayers of Louisiana sued in State courts to restrain the State board of education from spending for supplying free schoolbooks to schoolchildren, including those in church-affiliated schools. The main thrust of the challenge went not to religion but to use of public funds for private purposes. The Supreme Court considered the merits without discussing standing. The case contributes to the orthodox and consistent theory that a State or local taxpayer who has standing under State law to challenge a substantial public expenditure may have his case considered by the Supreme Court of the United States. That question has arisen many times and the Supreme Court has always given the same answer.

The next case in our series, *Everson*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), is consistent with the Cochran case and is consistent with all later Supreme Court law on standing. A taxpayer of a school district was allowed to challenge the school district's reimbursement of parents of parochial school students for bus transportation. The theory is clear: An unconstitutional expenditure of public funds adversely affects a local taxpayer, who therefore has standing to challenge the expenditure.

The *Doremus* case, 342, U.S. 429 (1952), was perfectly consistent with the Cochran and Everson cases. A taxpayer was held without standing to challenge a New Jersey statutory requirement of Bible reading in the public schools. In distinguishing Everson, the Court said that for a taxpayer to have standing, his action must be "a good-faith pocketbook action," and that the injury in the Doremus case, unlike that in Everson, was not "a direct dollars-and-cents injury." The Court very helpfully added a remark that some of the commentators have apparently failed to understand: "It is not a question of motivation but of possession of the requisite financial interest that is * * * injured by the unconstitutional conduct."

A financial interest of a State or local taxpayer is injured by an unlawful expenditure, but a financial interest of a taxpayer is not injured when the Bible, instead of some other book, is read.

In determining the standing of a taxpayer as such, then, the important distinction is between State or local action which involves a substantial expenditure and State or local action which does not involve such an expenditure. The Supreme Court consistently allows standing to challenge a State or local expenditure but denied standing in the Doremus case because an expenditure was not involved.

Nearly every State court that has passed upon the question allows standing when expenditure is involved but only a handful do when expenditure is not involved. My statement is directly at variance with that of Professor Jaffe in the Harvard Law Review, who has written that 40 States allow a taxpayer to challenge local action "whether or not it has an impact on the expenditure of funds," 76 Harv. L. Rev. at 1280. In this, Professor Jaffe is clearly in error; most of the cases Professor Jaffe relies upon involved an impact on expenditure and his statement is simply a mistake.

PARTIES OTHER THAN TAXPAYERS

The standing of parties other than taxpayers to raise questions under the religion clauses of the first amendment is also the subject of Supreme Court law that is reasonably clear, consistent, and satisfactory, except for one opinion. The first case was *McCollum*, 333 U.S. 203 (1948). The parent of a child currently in school was held to have standing to challenge a system of allowing religious teachers to come into public school buildings and provide religious teaching. Although the Court disposed of the standing question in one sentence, citing a case which was unhelpful, the ground for standing was clear. The parent was clearly adversely affected in fact. The school had a system which influenced children toward religion distasteful to the parent. That ought to be enough for standing. The Court held it enough for standing.

The Doremus case is easy to distinguish, for the child of the plaintiff parent had already graduated, and furthermore, no charge was made that the Bible reading conflicted with convictions of either the parent or the child. For all that appeared, the plaintiff was in no way adversely affected in fact.

On the question of standing of a parent to challenge the constitutionality of what a school does, I think that both the McCollum case and the Doremus case are clearly sound. The parent was adversely affected in fact in McCollum and therefore had standing. The parent was not adversely affected in fact in *Doremus* and therefore lacked standing.

In the *Zorach* case, 343 U.S. 306 (1925), the basis for standing was again clear, for the plaintiffs were parents whose children were currently attending the public schools and who were affected in fact by the released time program. Because the children were influenced, the parents had standing.

The same is true and seems to me to be even obviously true of the *Engel* case, 370 U.S. 421 (1962). The parents of current pupils asserted that the prayer in the public schools was contrary to the beliefs of themselves and their children. Although pupils were free to be excused during the prayer, the Court declared: "When the power, prestige, and financial support of government is placed behind a particular religious belief, the indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform to the prevailing officially approved religion is plain." The pressure, without coercion, surely should be enough for standing, as the Court silently assumed in the Engel case.

Although some commentators have expressed consternation about the Court's failure to mention any problem of standing in the Engel case, it seems to me that the standing was sufficiently clear that no such mention was necessary, especially in view of the fact that no party was urging lack of standing.

Prof. Arthur Sutherland, in 76 Harv. L. Rev. 25, 27 (1962), says that the Engel case suggests that the Supreme Court has somewhat revised its previous ideas concerning standing because the Court did not require the plaintiff to show a direct injury. But I think a direct injury was shown. The injury, in my opinion, is to parents whose children must choose between listening to a prayer that is offensive to their religious sensibilities and absenting themselves from the prayer ceremony, perhaps at the psychological expense of overriding a child's instinctive dislike for nonconformity. Professor Kurland has suggested in his discussion of the *Engel* case, 1962 Sup. Ct. Rev. 1, 22, that "Perhaps the Court is starting down the road toward justification of the 'public action' that Professor Jaffe has advocated." I do not at all agree. The tradition of the Supreme Court against the public action is strong and clear and almost uniform. Professor Jaffe does not cite a single case in which the Supreme Court has entertained an action brought to vindicate the public interest by a citizen having no legal interest of his own. Because the plaintiff's in the Engel case were adversely affected, the Court's action with respect to standing in the Engel case seems in all respects in accord with conventional doctrine, and resort to a doctrine the Court has consistently rejected is unnecessary to explain the case.

The *Schempp* case, 374, U.S. 203 (1963), is entirely orthodox in its holding. Schoolchildren and their parents were held to have standing to challenge Bible reading in the public schools in which the children were students. The Court properly said that the children and parents were "directly affected by the laws and practices against which their complaints were directed. These interests surely suffice to give the parties standing to complain." The holding is clear and simple and consistent with other cases. I like the language, "directly affected." That the children could be excused from the

Bible reading did not affect their standing; one parent had decided against having his children excused "for several reasons, including his belief that the children's relationships with their teachers and classmates would be adversely affected." I am fully in accord with a footnote statement of Mr. Justice Brennan in his concurring opinion that "these parents have very real grievances against the respective school authorities which cannot be resolved short of constitutional adjudication," 374 U.S. at 267.

THE DOCTRINE EMERGING FROM THE CASE LAW

Now, the standing law I have discussed so far seems clear, simple, and consistent: A State or local taxpayer who has standing under State law to challenge a substantial public expenditure may have his case considered by the Supreme Court, but such a taxpayer may lack standing in the Supreme Court if no such expenditure is challenged. A party whose interest is in protecting his child from what he deems to be the wrong religious influence has standing to object to that influence. The clarity, simplicity, and consistency of this case law seems to me highly meritorious.

The only feature of the law I have discussed that I would change is the holding in *Frothingham* v. *Mellon* that a Federal taxpayer has no standing to challenge a Federal expenditure. I think that is unsound because I think a Federal taxpayer is adversely affected in fact by an unconstitutional expenditure.

If we have a Federal budget of a hundred billion, and if General Motors pays more than a billion Federal income taxes, then I think that when the Government undertakes a program costing $10 billion, the cost to General Motors is more than $100 million, and I think that General Motors ought to have standing to complain of unconstitutionality of the program. My figures show the utter and complete unsoundness of the language of Mr. Justice Sutherland in the Frothingham opinion. (For a full discussion of my reasons for thinking the Frothingham doctrine unsound, I refer you to section 22.09 of my treatise.)

Yet I acknowledge that the Frothingham doctrine is deeply embedded in our legal system and is unlikely to be changed, even though Mr. Justice Douglas has recently announced in a separate opinion that he has great difficulty with the Frothingham doctrine. *Public Affairs Associates* v. *Rickover*, 369 U.S. 111, 114 (1962).

If the Supreme Court were inclined to allow a Federal taxpayer to challenge a Federal expenditure, I could come up with a pretty respectable analytical argument that would allow this result without overruling Frothingham. At the time of Frothingham we had no Federal statute on standing. We have such a statute now, the Administrative Procedure Act, which provides for challenge of administrative action at the instance of one who is "adversely affected."

The committee reports of both Senate and House committees said that meant adversely affected in fact. The action to challenge the disbursement could be brought against the disbursing officer to challenge his administrative action, and the APA would be fully applicable. The applicability of the APA, enacted in 1946, would be the ground for distinguishing Frothingham.

THE UNSATISFACTORY M'GOWAN OPINION

The only unsatisfactory standing law the Supreme Court has produced in cases involving religion stems from the *McGowan* opinion, 366 U.S. 420 (1961), which in turn spilled over into a footnote in the Schempp opinion.

The McGowan case, involving challenge by a store's employees who were indicted for violating Sunday closing laws, held that those who assert only an economic injury (1) do not have standing to assert infringement of religious freedoms of others, and (2) do have standing to raise the question of violation of the establishment clause.

My appraisal of the McGowan case rests heavily upon a distinction that seems to me essential to sound thinking about standing even though the Supreme Court has never recognized it. The distinction is between standing to initiate a proceeding in court and standing to take a particular position in a proceeding to which one is already a party. If you stop and think of all the cases we have discussed before we came to the McGowan case, you will observe that in every case the problem of standing was whether the particular party could be a plaintiff, that is, whether he could start the judicial machinery in motion. But in the McGowan case, the question was not whether the store's employees could be plaintiffs; they were defendants in a criminal prosecution that had already been properly commenced. The question in the McGowan case was not whether A could go into court to get a declaratory judgment that the Sunday-closing statute would interfere with B's religious liberty. If it had been, the Court might properly have held that A lacked standing. The question was whether A, in a criminal proceeding already commenced against A, could point out to the Supreme Court that the Court's own action would infringe the religious liberty of B and others. The Court in my opinion should not have disposed of that question on the ground of lack of standing.

If the Court had understood the McGowan problem, it would have used *Barrows* v. *Jackson*, 346 U.S. 249 (1953), as authority in favor of standing. In that case, whites were permitted to assert the constitutional rights of Negroes; not only that, but the Negroes whose constitutional rights were asserted were Negroes in general and not any particular or identified ones. The plaintiffs, whites, sued the defendant, a white, in a State court for damages for breach of a restrictive covenant against use or occupation of land by non-Caucasians. The defendant prevailed on the ground that an award of damages would infringe rights of unknown non-Caucasians; the white defendant was allowed to assert the rights of Negroes not before the court. In trying to explain why this could be done, the Court confessed a rather complete intellectual poverty; it approved the rule that a party cannot challenge constitutionality of a statute unless he is within the class whose constitutional rights are allegedly infringed, and then said little more than that this case was "a unique situation" in which the reasons for the standing rule were outweighed by the need to protect fundamental rights.

The Court should have enunciated a principle that a party always has standing to call to a court's attention the illegality of a course of action which the court is contemplating. A party who lacks standing to initiate a proceeding may have standing to ask the court to refrain from a course of action which the court may take on its own motion or refrain from taking.

The McGowan holding that the criminal defendants lacked standing to assert that the Court's enforcement of the statute would infringe the religious freedom of others is contrary to at least eight Supreme Court decisions in which parties to proceedings already initiated have been allowed to assert the constitutional rights of nonparties. All these cases are discussed in sections 22.05–22.07 of my treatise.

The McGowan opinion seems to me further unfortunate in so sharply separating the two religion clauses of the first amendment. The Court seems to overlook the plain fact that both clauses, as applied to State action, necessarily rest upon freedom or liberty. Logically, both clauses as restraints on State action have to be brought within the word "liberty" in the "life, liberty, or property" provision of the 14th amendment. The only way a State can violate the establishment clause is by depriving a person of "liberty" within the meaning of the 14th amendment.

The McGowan opinion's unfortunate separation of establishment from free exercise for purposes of standing led the Court in the Schempp opinion to make the flagrantly unsound statement that "the requirements for standing to challenge State action under the establishment clause, unlike those relating to the free exercise clause, do not include proof that particular religion freedoms are infringed," 374 U.S. at 224. I do not see how the establishment clause can be violated by State action unless some person is deprived of "liberty" under the 14th amendment. In other words, a State can no more violate the establishment clause without infringing freedom or liberty than a State can violate the free exercise clause without infringing freedom or liberty.

FEDERALISM

Now I want to go back to one complicating factor about the law of standing that I have heretofore omitted from consideration—federalism. We must know not only who has standing in a Federal court and who has standing in a State court but also whose law of standing governs Supreme Court review of a State court decision. May a party have standing in the Supreme Court if he lacks it in a State court, and may he lack standing in the Supreme Court if he has it in the State court?

Although some commentators seem perplexed about these questions, I think that the main answer is entirely clear: The Supreme Court does and must maintain its own law of standing, and no State court decision for or against standing is binding upon it; at the same time, the Supreme Court keeps its system of standing flexible and goes along with the State law of standing whenever in particular circumstances it sees fit to do so.

To the extent that Federal law of standing rests on the constitutional concept of case or controversy, State courts obviously lack power to bind the Supreme Court about interpretation of the Federal Constitution. The holding in the *Summers* case, 325 U.S. 461 (1945), that the Supreme Court would decide for itself whether a case or controversy exists, after the Illinois court had held that a case or controversy was absent under Illinois law, is clear law and necessary law. So is the holding in Doremus that even though the New Jersey court had reached the merits despite doubts about standing, the Supreme Court was still free to apply its own law of case or controversy. The Doermus case even seems to me obviously sound in its view that Supreme Court law of standing must override State law of standing, for otherwise the Supreme Court could be compelled to give advisory opinions to State legislatures in reviewing the decisions of State courts in the half dozen States (including Massachusetts) in which the highest courts give such advisory opinions.

Of course, nothing binds the Supreme Court to have a rigid system of standing or to make its system logical or consistent. The Court is entirely capable of throwing logic to the winds, and sometimes I am inclined to defend it in doing so. For instance, even though some minds prefer the beauties of logical symmetry, I think the Court behaves sensibly when it refuses to decide an especially difficult question of standing and disposes of a case by deciding the relatively easy question of the merits. This is essentially what it did in the 1899 Bradfield case; it simply backed away from deciding what it called the "alleged defect of parties."

When no question about standing is urged by the parties, the Court has a discretionary power to decide on the merits, skipping the question of standing, as it did in the *Trial Examiners' Conference* case, 345 U.S. 128, 129

(1953), and in the old case of *Heim* v. *McCall*, 239 U.S. 175 (1915), or it can consider the standing question on its own motion, as it did in *Storer*, 351 U.S. 192, 197 (1956). The Heim case can also be explained away as having arisen before the Supreme Court created its modern law of standing. But in *Wieman* v. *Updegraff*, 344 U.S. 183 (1952), the Court considered the merits in a suit by a State taxpayer even though the issue was a nonfinancial one. Since the Court did not mention the subject of standing, the case can be explained as (1) an oversight, (2) as an exercise of discretion to skip the problem of standing when the parties do not urge lack of standing, (3) as a decision that the Supreme Court will bend to the State law of standing when it wants to, or (4) as a decision that a State taxpayer has standing to raise the nonfinancial issue.

That the Court can go in either direction in such circumstances is emphasized by a really extreme case in the opposite direction, *Gauge Lumber Co.* v. *Rowley*, 326 U.S. 295 (1945), holding that an employer in a workmen's compensation case lacked standing even though he had a financial interest at stake, even though the State specifically provided that judicial review could be had by an "employer," and even though the State court had recognized the employer's standing.

The combination of the Gauge case with the Wieman case, two cases at opposite ends of the scale but involving the same abstract problem of standing, shows that the Court keeps a discretionary power which it is quite capable of exercising inconsistently. Or, if you prefer, this pair of cases shows that the Court is willing to manipulate the law of standing to consider the merits when it wants to and to avoid the merits when it wants to.

The most flagrant indifference to the law of standing that I have encountered is the *Adler* case, 342 U.S. 485 (1952). The Court refused to discuss either standing or ripeness or even to state the facts that bore on the problems of standing and ripeness, even though a dissenting opinion vigorously asserted that the plaintiffs lacked standing and even though the most direct precedent supported the dissenting opinion.

WHO CAN CHALLENGE FEDERAL AID TO CHURCH-AFFILIATED SCHOOLS?

Now let's take up the burning question that I'm sure you want me to try to answer: If Congress appropriates funds for schools, including or excluding all or some church-affiliated schools, who, if anyone, has standing to raise the question whether the religion clauses of the first amendment are violated?

The answer is probably no one, unless *Frothingham* v. *Mellon* is changed or violated or unless a statute provides for standing. I use the word "probably" because real life so often outruns imagination; the constitutional problem can conceivably bob up in complex litigation in some totally unexpected way.

More important than that remote possibility is the clear congressional power to provide for standing. A commentator who says that because case or controversy is a constitutional requirement it cannot be satisfied by a statutory provision seems clearly on the wrong track.

One idea is that legislation could provide that a Federal taxpayer shall have standing to challenge the constitutionality of any disbursement under the particular statute. Although constitutionality of such a provision is not wholly free from doubt, I think it would be constitutional for many reasons, three of which are: (1) The Supreme Court even without such a statute considered the merits of the Bradfield case in a suit by a Federal taxpayer to challenge an expenditure; the statute would merely provide for what the Supreme Court on its own motion has already done. (2) Judicial tolerance for a legislative judgment ought to be sufficient to allow Congress to enact a law of standing that most State courts have developed; in nearly all States that have passed upon the question, a taxpayer has standing to challenge an expenditure. (3) On the merits, one who is hurt by governmental action ought to have standing to challenge it, and I think a Federal taxpayer is hurt by a Federal expenditure. I agree with the State courts that allow State and local taxpayers to challenge expenditures, and the impact of Federal taxpayers is much greater than the impact of State and local taxes.

Another way of creating standing to challenge Federal disbursements for education is preferable to conferring standing on Federal taxpayers, although I think a good statute would provide for both methods. The orthodox law of standing is that one whose legal right is at stake normally has standing to go to court to enforce the legal right. All that Congress has to do to confer standing is to create a legal right in a party who will raise the question. For instance, Congress could appropriate for all schools to which Congress is constitutionally empowered to appropriate, it could instruct the administrator to deny funds to any school whose right to receive the funds is constitutionally doubtful, and it could provide that any school whose application for funds is denied is entitled to judicial review of the question whether the funds may be granted to the school without violating the Constitution. Such a system would validly confer standing upon a parochial school, and such a system would assure a judicial determination of the constitutional limits.

That a statutory provision conferring the right of judicial review can create standing where no standing exists without the statute can be beautifully demonstrated with two cases, both involving Federal appropriation of money to States and both involving the question of standing of the State to challenge the validity of the action of the Federal Government. Without a statute providing for judicial review, Massachusetts had no standing to challenge the Maternity Act. This is the prominent case of *Masachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 1923. But when the statute provides for judicial review, as did the Hatch Act, Oklahoma was held to have standing to challenge a determination by the Civil Service Commission which would have reduced Federal highway grants to Oklahoma. The Supreme Court declared: "By providing for judicial review of the orders of the Civil Service Commission, Congress made Oklahoma's right to receive funds a matter of judicial cognizance. Oklahoma's right became legally enforceable," *Oklahoma* v. *Civil Service Commission*, 330 U.S. 127, 137 (1947).

I think it safe to say that the power of Congress to confer standing by providing judicial review by one who seeks to enforce a legal right is beyond reasonable doubt.

SOME PERSPECTIVE ABOUT STANDING

My guess is that most violations of the first amendment's religion clauses may be beyond judicial challenge because no one has standing. Perhaps we shall never know whether trusting in God on all our coins and some of our currency is unconstitutional, because no one can raise the question in court. Similarly, we probably have no means of knowing whether prayers in the Houses of Congress are constitutional, or religious services in Federal hospitals and prisons, or use of the Bible in administering oaths, or including God in the pledge of allegiance, or allowing income tax deductions for contributions to religious organizations, or exempting religious organizations from income tax, or giving them postal privileges.

Are we not allowing the law of standing partly to defeat the purpose of the bill of rights? Does not the law of standing largely cancel out the religion clauses of the first amendment?

State constitutional provisions against use of public funds in support of religion are relatively effective, because State taxpayers generally have standing to challenge the constitutionality of State expenditures. A striking illustration of this is the administration of the National School Lunch Act, under which Federal funds go to the educational agency of each State, except that when the State educational agency is not permitted by State law to disburse directly to schools with religious affiliation, the Federal Government makes the disbursement directly to the schools. According to a memorandum furnished by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1961 to a Senate committee, "In more than half of the States the educational agency has considered that it could not make the funds available to nonprofit private schools and as a result in those States the Secretary of Agriculture makes funds available directly to such nonprofit schools, including those with religious affiliation." Hearings before Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 87th Congress, 1st Session, 146 (1961).

Relatively, the State constitutional provisions are obeyed and the Federal constitutional provisions may be ignored. We don't know whether the school lunch program for church-affiliated schools violates the Federal Constitution and, judicial enforcement being unavailable for lack of standing, we go ahead with the program despite unresolved doubts about constitutionality.

Again I ask: Are we not allowing the law of standing to eat away a large portion of our constitutional limitations on government?

I see no escape from saying "Yes" to that question.

Our theory that the legislative and executive branches are bound by the Constitution whether or not the judicial branch enforces it is largely overriden by the reality that constitutional issues usually remain open until the judges close them. Constitutional provisions that are not judicially enforced tend to become the equivalent of no provisions.

The law of standing does largely cancel out some constitutional protections.

Then what should we do?

One proposal is that we should open the doors to the courts to suits by "any citizen" whenever a public interest is involved. I oppose this idea because it goes much further than is necessary to correct the known deficiencies in the law of standing and, unless all the relevant Supreme Court decisions on the subject are overthrown, it could be adopted only by a constitutional amendment. I think *Marbury* v. *Madison* should remain the foundation for judicial review of legislation, that the main business of courts should continue to be to resolve controversies between parties whose interests are at stake, that the courts should continue to close their doors to citizens who have no interests at stake, and that the Supreme Court was right in 1793 in refusing to give advisory opinions to two citizens by the name of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson.

I am not opposed to throwing all our traditions into the fire if we must do so in order to solve serious problems of our own generation. But I see nothing to gain by allowing "any citizen" to be a plaintiff on any question of public interest. I have never seen a real case, and I have never yet been able to imagine a hypothetical case, in which a plaintiff who is without an interest of his own should in my judgment be allowed to initiate a proceeding in court. If anyone here can think up such a case, I wish he would call it to my attention.

What the law of standing needs is not a demolition of the whole framework within which our courts now work but a slight shift of attitudes within the existing framework. What we need is consistent judicial acceptance of the simple proposition that any party who is adversely affected in fact by governmental action should have standing to challenge it in court. And, contrary to *Frothingham* v. *Mellon*, I think that a Federal taxpayer is adversely affected in fact by an unconstitutional expenditure of Federal funds.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE COUNCIL OF THE JUNIOR ORDER, UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, during its 1963 session, the North Carolina State Council of the Junior Order United American Mechanics adopted certain resolutions and reciting its position with respect to some of the crucial issues confronting our country. These resolutions merit the consideration of the Congress, and for this reason, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered printed as follows:

RESOLUTION 3: SUPPORT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (MCCARRAN-WALTER ACT)

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act, which was passed in 1952 over a Presidential veto, has been subject to unremitting attacks by Communists, hyphenated Americans, political auctioneers and liberals, and continuous efforts have been made to have it repealed or altered by amendments detrimental to the best interest of our country; and

Whereas the maintenance of our protective national origins immigration system, embodied in the Immigration and Nationality Act, is vital to the preservation of this Republic, and to the welfare of its citizens; and

Whereas there is deep concern by officials of Government, labor unions and taxpayers' associations about the problems posed by the high degree of unemployment, the anticipated further loss of jobs resulting from automation and the mounting numbers and costs of welfare cases, all of which increased quotas will aggravate, not correct; and

Whereas those opposed to the act have resorted to the technique of chipping away at the act by law enforcement, administrative interpretations and amendments which have the effect of undermining the foundations of our cultural integrity and threaten our security; and

Whereas there are now pending in the Congress proposals to increase the quotas 36 percent or more, to expand the classes of aliens who are admissable for permanent residence outside quota limitations; to pool unused quotas; to abolish the National origins quota system and to recompute the entire basis of alloting quotas to the end that our historic immigration policies will be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Council of North Carolina, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in session assembled this 9th day of August 1963, at Greensboro, That it favors the law as it now stands and reaffirms its confidence, trust and reliance in this law, and is most strongly opposed to its repeal or amendment, the admission of additional numbers of aliens, or relaxing the requirements for admission or deportation; and be it further

Resolved, That the State secretary be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the Members of Congress representing this State.

J. L. WHITE.
ERNEST I. STRICKLAND.
K. C. LONG.

Approved by the Good of the Order Committee:

J. A. PRITCHETT.
W. G. SUGG.
JAMES E. MASTELLER.

RESOLUTION 4: OUR STAND

Whereas during the past 110 years, the Junior Order United American Mechanics, as an American patriotic society, has adopted hundreds of resolutions in the field of Americanism; and

Whereas certain of these resolutions, together with current ones, have been reviewed by competent officials of the order and judged to be pertinent and vital to the welfare of the Nation and each American; and

Whereas most of the resolutions set forth below can be acted upon by Members of the U.S. Congress, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Council of North Carolina, Junior Order United American Mechanics, assembled this 9th day of August, 1963, in the city of Greensboro, respectfully petitions the U.S. Senators and Representatives representing this State to:

1. Preserve the sovereignty of the United States, its Constitution, institutions, and laws;

2. Preserve intact the Immigration and Nationality Act and to oppose any liberalizing amendments thereto;

3. Maintain the separation of church and state, and to oppose the granting of Federal or State aid to parochial or sectarian educational institutions;

4. Encourage the study of the U.S. Constitution and American history in the educational institutions of the Nation that American youth may have a fuller understanding of our unique form of constitutional government and a truer concept of national patriotism;

5. Never cease combating communism and its efforts to control and colonize areas in the Western Hemisphere;

6. Support the House Committee on Un-American Activities;

7. Oppose the recognition of Red China and the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

8. Protect desecration to the flag of the United States of America by anti-American agitators abroad and provide penalties for deliberate and malicious violators of the Flag Code (Public Law 77-829) at home;

9. Halt postage-free flow of communistic propaganda in the United States.

10. Preserve the Conally Reservation as a necessary safeguard to our national security;

11. Seek enforcement of the financial responsibility provisions of the United Nations Charter and seek suspension in voting rights of all nations which are delinquent in their United Nations dues and assessments, so long as the United States remains a member of the United Nations; and make an investigation of the United States-United Nations relations to determine whether it is in the best interest of the United States to remain a member of that which is being increasingly confused and preyed upon by Socialist and Communist politicians;

12. Request assurances from the President of the United States that the Guantanamo Naval Base will not be surrendered to communistic Cuba and that said base shall be maintained at the highest state of military and naval preparedness;

13. Sponsor legislation which would reassert, reactivate, and effectively maintain the principles of the Monroe Doctrine;

14. Preserve our historic, indispensable and time-tested policies for the U.S. control in perpetuity over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal;

15. Secure the enactment by Congress of a bill containing a minimum loyalty oath which will clearly bind all governmental officials and employees to defend the United States of America; and (a) make it obvious that an American citizen's loyalty should be directed toward his Nation and not to a given administration in Government; and (b) endorse the loyalty oath required for Government loans under the National Defense Education Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the State Council of North Carolina, Junior Order United American Mechanics, request the subordinate councils under its jurisdiction to urge their members to appeal to relatives, friends, neighbors, and fellow citizens to write their Senators and Congressmen that the voice of the American people may be heard on these issues; and be it further

Resolved, That the State secretary be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the Congress representing this State and to the local press.

J. L. WHITE.
ERNEST D. STRICKLAND.
K. C. LONG.

Approved by the Good of the Order Committee:

J. A. PRITCHETT.
W. G. SUGG.
JAMES E. MASTELLER.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CONSTITUTIONALITY OF USE OF FEDERAL TAX MONEYS TO ACQUIRE LANDS AND BUILDINGS FOR CHURCH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and I attempted unsuccessfully to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to make it certain that there could be a judicial review of the constitutionality of the use of Federal tax moneys to acquire lands and construct buildings for church colleges and universities. The Charlotte News, of Charlotte, N.C., carried thoughtful editorials on December 18 and December 27, 1963, commenting upon this matter. Since this question will undoubtedly continue to arise until it is settled either by congressional action or judicial decision, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered printed as follows:

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Dec. 18, 1963]

DUCKING A PRINCIPLE

Comment on passage of the $1.2 billion college aid bill generally has approved the absence of abrasive debate over what is called the religious issue. The implication of much of this comment is that the religious issue is a sham raised for reasons having nothing to do with education. The implication is false; worse, the thinking it reveals obscures a critical issue having everything to do with education.

The broad issue is how Americans wish to spend public funds for education; whether they wish to support private and church-supported institutions and, if so, in what ways and to what degree. In past sessions of Congress the clash of opposing philosophies on this issue brought stalemate. In 1962 the college aid bill died in the midst of such controversy. This time it passed but with the central issue relatively muted.

Senator ERVIN posed the constitutional question. He called up a string of Supreme Court decisions dealing with the first amend-

ment's prohibition of the establishment of religion. In *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (1947), Senator ERVIN pointed out, the Court majority, approving a State law reimbursing parents for transportation of children to parochial schools, stated that the law went to the verge of the Constitution.

"If that statute went to the verge of the Constitution, certainly a statute which would authorize the appropriations of hundreds of millions of dollars to construct buildings for church owned or controlled or operated colleges and universities would go beyond the verge of the Constitution," he said.

Senator ERVIN was speaking for an amendment he offered with Senator COOPER which would have permitted a taxpayer to file suit challenging the constitutionality of a grant or loan under the program. The amendment was dropped in House-Senate conference and we are left with Senator ERVIN's fear that for technical reasons a constitutional test of the law may not now be possible.

We hope that this is not the case. Senator ERVIN's doubts of the constitutionality of the legislation are well founded. Nor is this legislation necessarily granted immunity by a clause forbidding grants or loans for sectarian use. We have Justice Douglas' opinion to the contrary in a case decided earlier this year:

"Financing a church either in the strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause," Justice Douglas wrote.

Beyond the issue of constitutionality lie the issues of a purely practical nature. The money appropriated for a 5-year program of college construction will be available in theory to all of the Nation's 2,100 colleges and universities, including at least 700 church-related institutions belonging to the American Council on Education, which lobbied for the bill. Officials concede that this is spreading the available public resources a bit thin.

It is surely no exercise of religious bigotry to question whether the larger public interest is served by this thinning process. Yet this vital question was all but submerged by the desire to have a bill at all costs.

This desire produced a bill that is being hailed in educational circles as a landmark comparable to the Morrill Act which created State universities through land grants. This may be. Yet it is hard to believe that a constitutional test of the law will not arise. It is hard to believe the law would survive, or should survive, such a test.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Dec. 27, 1963]

IT WILL RISE AGAIN

In the editorial reprinted in the columns to the right, the Greensboro Daily News suggests that we placed too much emphasis on the religious issue in our discussion last week of the higher education bill. The Daily News cautions against being affrighted by the bugaboo of the absolute wall of separation between church and state and suggests that we consult our own editorial position on the New York Regent's Prayer decision for comfort.

But we are no more dismayed by an imaginary wall of separation than by any fears that a Catholic in the White House would sell out to the Vatican. Our editorial position in the Regent's Prayer case was simpler than that: We thought that the Supreme Court had stepped where it need not have stepped; that it had senselessly wasted its prestige on customs which were firmly fixed in the traditional pattern of public education and which offered no significant threat to constitutional liberty.

Our concern in last week's editorial was with the appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars in public funds for use in improving private and parochial institutions. We are concerned with this and dismayed that it was accomplished with such a tenuous recognition of sudden and drastic departure from American political tradition.

The constitutional issue is not as simple as the Daily News seems to think. There is room for lively debate between observers who agree that the "establishment" clause in the Constitution was not meant to forbid any and all contact between church and state. Degree is important in constitutional matters. One may doubt that the reading of a prayer before class fatally offends the Constitution and still believe that the massive expenditure of public funds for private education does.

Other powerful considerations stand. Having opened the door to the expenditure of public funds for private schools on a college level, have we not invited the same kind of thing on an elementary and secondary level? Does this not raise new and delicate questions of Federal control of education?

In short, we do not fear what the Daily News fears we fear. We are concerned, instead, with the politics of the entering wedge of support for private education. We are mightily concerned about whether the education bill just passed isn't too great a compromise of resources. We detect a measure of euphoria in the Daily News observation that, after all, the act responsible for this thinning out of support for education "will surely be renewed and augmented in the future."

Surely. And augmented and augmented some more unless it is declared unconstitutional. But the significant question is whether this augmentation is desirable as a matter of public policy. The significant question is the one we posed as quoted by the Daily News * * * "whether Americans wish to support private and church-supported institutions and, if so, in what ways and to what degree."

This issue was not debated fully by a Congress preoccupied with other concerns. The very Congressmen who might have been expected to raise the issue instead suppressed it in the name of wringing out passage of some kind of higher education bill.

The issue will not disappear because Congress wishes it would disappear. It will rise to haunt us all as the Nation tackles the complex of educational problems ahead. It will rise and rise again—until it is met.

THE STATUE OF FREEDOM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, atop the Capitol dome is a lady who, in statuesque and symbolic form, has just passed her 100th birthday.

She came to us from Italy. Her trip to the United States was delayed by storms and there were moments when she might have rested on the ocean floor instead of high above this Chamber. She is clad in flowing garments. A wreath of stars is around her head, and over this are perched plumes reminiscent of the American Indian. Her right hand rests on the hilt of a sheathed sword. Her features are classic in the Grecian manner.

She is the Statue of Freedom. With some deference I mention her age, but chiefly I call attention to the variety of her composition; for freedom is composed of many elements, and significant aspects of freedom have come to us from foreign shores and through stormy difficulties. Indeed, such a lofty position for this lady immigrant is not inappropriate, especially in these times when we would seek to provide greater immigration opportunities for access to the United States.

She may not be modishly gowned in modern fashion; a contemporary artist might produce a different conception. But she stands with historic poise and as a reminder of the continuing diversity of our life. Her placement on the dome was heralded by a 35-gun salute from Capitol Hill a century ago.

Mr. President, as an indication that the past can be combined with the present and to illustrate the vitality of this lady, I ask unanimous consent that a most interesting and somewhat whimsical article from VFW, the monthly publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

SHE'S 100 YEARS OLD—AND DOING THE TWIST

(By Mrs. A. R. Forbush)

The Statue of Freedom (not of Liberty—that's in New York Harbor) which surmounts the dome of the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C., is misbehaving.

This year, the lady is 100 years old. She is clad in the flowing, bulky garments of an indefinite period of antiquity, and both her hands are holding a sword, shield, and wreath.

Yet, uncomfortable as her perch may be, and however awkward her costume and accessories, Freedom is doing the twist.

In fact, J. George Stewart, Capitol Architect, said recently that pressures caused by the movement of the dome, which has shown to twist from 3 to 4 inches a day following the course of the sun, were affecting the west front of the building.

Freedom, the dear girl, has had an adventurous life. She was born, so to speak, in Rome, Italy, where her sculptor, Thomas Crawford, had his studio. He was the father of F. Marion Crawford, the novelist.

Such a rugged time did Freedom have getting here that it often seemed she would never reach the United States, let alone the top of the Capitol where she is now, and has long been, it seems, twisting at the rate of 4 inches a day.

She arrived in this country, as a matter of fact, all in pieces. (Which is what some doctors say teenagers will be in if they overdo their twisting.)

Crawford modeled his impressive figure in Rome, and for the plaster model which was to be cast in bronze in the United States he received only $3,000. After Crawford's death, under his wife's supervision, the model—almost 20 feet high—was completed, packed, and shipped on the bark, *Emily Taylor*. Then excitement for Freedom really began. Storms, leaks, repairs—a stop at Gibraltar to caulk the ship and restore the shifting cargo—resailing, new storms, worse leaks—part of the cargo had to be jettisoned and it proved a desperate ordeal to keep the ship afloat across the Atlantic—and finally the battered *Emily Taylor* put into British-owned Bermuda on July 27, 1858, 750 miles off the American coast. There, the ship practically disintegrated.

Freedom, as part of the miscellaneous cargo remaining, was unloaded and stored in a shed along the Bermuda waterfront. The Bermuda Royal Gazette, in November 1858, announced on its front page there would be a sale of, "sails, hull, boats, anchors, and spars" of the *Emily Taylor*, "which vessel

put into the port in distress"—but luckily, the part of the cargo listed as "statuary" was not included. The plaster lady spent a quiet, though disjointed, 8 months in Bermuda, one of the first travelers to enjoy a rest cure on that lovely island. As she was all in pieces, she undoubtedly needed it.

Finally, the bark *G. W. Horton* arrived with part of the statuary. The rest eventually arrived at New York, March 30, 1859, and was shipped in disconnected chunks of plaster to Washington by water aboard the schooner *Statesman*—the final portions arriving late in 1859. Poor Freedom. Her troubles were not yet over. She was reassembled at the Clark Mills foundry northeast of Washington at Bladensburg to be cast in bronze.

The Civil War was the next catastrophe for her. In May of 1861, work was ordered stopped on the statue because, "the Government has no money to spend except on self-defense."

Though much of the contract had been completed, everything was loaded on a railroad flatcar and taken to Washington where work was progressing on the Capitol Building. After a time the lady was returned to the foundry and work proceeded with her casting in bronze.

A gap in available records at this point would make it appear that Freedom, like some other ladies, is coy about revealing her exact birthday. If the date should be that of her first assembly, it could have been in November 1862, for then she was set upon a temporary pedestral on the Capitol Grounds. The annual report of Thomas U. Walter, architect of the Capitol extension, dated November 1, 1862, states that "the statue of Freedom, which is intended as the crowning feature of the dome, is completed, and removed to the grounds east of the Capitol, where it has been placed on a temporary pedestal, in order that the public may have an opportunity to examine it before it is raised to its destined position."

So there was one more step, much delayed, before Freedom attained her permanent position of prominence. It was not until late in 1863 that she was hoisted by steam apparatus to the dome, again in parts because of the terrific weight—and on December 2, the final section, the head and shoulders (this in itself weighing 2,700 pounds) was put in place.

The Federal City of Washington was circled by camps at the time from which thousands of soldiers eagerly watched the Capitol dome for the unfurling of the Union flag which was to signal completion of the installation. Curiously, it was forbidden that any of those engaged in the task make any noise whatever or even wave their hats.

Less difficult to enforce was the prohibition "that anyone get on the head after it is up."

At noon, the signal was given and the head was elevated; the flag was broken out 15 minutes later, whereupon 35-gun salutes were fired, first from a field battery on Capitol Hill, then from one fort after another.

Freedom was officially home.

The immensity and strength of the Capitol dome upon which the statue rests, draws the admiration of most visitors.

Above the outer colonnade, and resting directly over and bearing upon a strong foundation, 36 immense ribs of iron ascend, of a semiellipsoidal shape. These are the skeleton of the huge creation. Hundreds upon hundreds of iron panels, with clamps and screws innumerable, riveted into one circuit of architectural symmetry around these metal ribs, constitute the dome.

The influence of the sun upon this vast iron structure is great. The sun sways its 4,455-ton weight even as it causes the fragile sunflower to bend and follow the course of its flaming path. This fact has been tested by interesting vibratory experiments, made in August 1865, by Mr. B. B. French, Jr., civil engineer, in conjunction with Professor Henry of the Smithsonian Institution. The experiments indicated that the dome oscillated a distance of between 3 and 4 inches. The motion is south, southwest, then west, and as the retiring sun declines and finally disappears, north, northeast, and east, returning to its original position.

Visitors to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington can view the original plaster cast. Freedom's right hand rests upon the hilt of her sword while her left holds a wreath and shield. A medallion below the bodice bearing the letters "U.S." gathers her draperylike attire. Her headdress is the most startling ornamentation. The classic "liberty cap," with which Crawford had crowned his creation, had been rejected because in ancient Greece the insignia was that of freed slaves.

Ironically, it had been Jefferson Davis, Confederate President at the time of Liberty's rise, who had carried through the project to replace the "liberty cap" with a curious feathered helmet, encircled with stars and surmounted by an eagle's head. Davis arranged this alteration when he was U.S. Secretary of War prior to the War Between the States. This change vaguely suggests an Indian bonnet and results in the frequent guess by some that the statue represents Pocahontas. The redesign pleased very few at the time; there was strong pressure to have Freedom hauled down and her headdress again restyled. The cost and difficulty of this proposal, however, resulted in general agreement to let well enough alone.

Ornamentation has since been added by 10 platinum-tipped lightning rods; 1 on the head; 6 on headdress feathers; 1 on each shoulder, and 1 on the shield. A ring of lights, recently installed, illuminates the base of the statue. These additions, of course, have not been duplicated on the plaster model at the Smithsonian. Though just as tall—19 feet 6 inches—it also does not have the immense weight of the giant bronze figure on the Capitol dome.

There she stands and twists—all 14,985 pounds of her. As an awed visitor, hearing of her steady, rhythmic motion, once exclaimed—"Some shimmy!"

THE STATUS OF THE FIGHT AGAINST NARCOTICS ADDICTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the report, finally published last month by the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, should have marked the historic break with the past which I have long advocated, by beginning to treat addiction as an illness and not merely as a crime. The Commission set the stage for this new look by backing, in its comprehensive report, what I have continually urged—along with my colleague, Senator KEATING—as the basic minimums of an enlightened view of this social disease:

1. Legislation to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments and nonprofit organizations for broad treatment and rehabilitation programs in the metropolitan environment of those afflicted.

2. Legislation authorizing Federal civil commitment for treatment of narcotic abusers as an alternative to criminal conviction and imprisonment.

3. Development of a comprehensive Federal research program within the National Institute of Mental Health.

4. A massive effort to achieve effective international control of the distribution of dangerous drugs.

I have hoped that with this distinguished expert support behind the recommendations, the executive branch and the Congress would now act speedily on these recommendations. So far there has been no indication of action, perhaps because of controversy over the Commission's recommendation that the Narcotics Bureau be removed from the Treasury Department and split between the Justice Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This may or may not be advantageous, but whatever the dispute on its merits, it should not sidetrack the administration from acting on, and recommending to the Congress, the basic requirements of a modern program to solve the drug abuse problem.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in my remarks at this point a recent editorial from the Wall Street Journal bearing on this problem.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 7, 1964]

DISMANTLING A NARCOTIC THEORY

One proposal in the newly published report of the President's Commission on Narcotics and Drug Addiction is that the Treasury's Narcotics Bureau be dismantled, with the Justice Department assuming its police functions.

The response to this suggestion could not have been much chillier if the Commission had come out for dope smuggling. Officials of the Treasury, the Justice Department, New York City's Police Commissioner—just about everyone who commented condemned the idea.

That reaction is not only strange but disquieting. It is symptomatic of the whole rigid policy which for so long has made the narcotics problem even worse than it has to be.

To consider the administrative setup itself, it has never made much sense to have the Government's fiscal agency engaged in battling a major criminal problem; the transfer to the Justice Department would merely be a step toward more logical organization. In fact, the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization proposed just such a move as long ago as 1949.

But it is more than a matter of administrative efficiency. For the Narcotics Bureau has become a symbol of a single theory of dealing with drug addiction. This theory rests on the premise that addiction is a crime and, for all practical purposes, little more than that. It is to be dealt with largely by "strong" laws and "strong" enforcement.

This is the theory the Government has followed for half a century; for the Bureau it has become almost a narcotic. Yet the drug problem remains with us; if anything, it is more virulent than ever. It is clear that strong laws and strong enforcement are hardly deterring addicts.

As the President's Commission commented, "It is difficult to believe that a narcotic addict who is physically and psychologically dependent on a drug will forgo satisfaction of his craving for fear of a long prison sentence. The weakness of the deterrence argument is proved every day by the fact that illicit traffic in narcotics continues."

In seeking a more effective approach, a start can be made by recognizing that addiction is a medical as well as criminal problem. Some people become hooked accidentally through medical treatment to relieve pain. Some fall into the habit because of psychological aberration, curiosity, many other reasons.

Therefore, says the Commission, Federal regulations should be amended "to reflect the general principle that the definition of legitimate medical use of narcotics and legitimate medical treatment of a narcotics addict are primarily to be determined by the medical profession."

As matters now stand, the rules of the Narcotics Bureau often confuse the physician. From fear of prosecution he may refuse to use drugs to treat addicts or, more often, he may refuse to treat them at all. For the same reason the addict may shun physicians. In his mind, at least, he has little recourse but to seek out the dope peddler whose exorbitant profits batten on the addict's seemingly uncontrollable urge for drugs.

With that in mind, the Commission suggests that the law should be changed to discriminate between the dope peddler and the addict who possesses drugs only for his own use. Changes also are overdue in the present heavy mandatory sentences and restrictions on parole. These not only deny courts and enforcement officials any exercise of judgment but make the addicts outlook practically hopeless.

Neither the Commission nor we are suggesting the unrestricted sale of narcotics. Nor are we urging changes just to be soft on addicts; the aim is to find a more sensible approach that would be of some help to some of them. Above all, perhaps, future policy and practice must be flexible, for there is much still to be learned about drug addiction. It would be folly to replace the current status quo with new rigidity.

Dismantling the Narcotics Bureau, the symbol of that status quo, would accomplish little by itself. But if it marked the beginning of a more humane, more fruitful approach to the problem, it would be a good place to start.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many fine articles and editorials have been written regarding the recent Presidential prayer breakfast.

David Lawrence, one of our Nation's outstanding columnists, wrote an article entitled "Prayer Breakfast a Voluntary Affair." It is an excellent discussion and analysis of the breakfast.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks.

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

PRAYER BREAKFAST A VOLUNTARY AFFAIR

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps a Presidential prayer breakfast, such as is held here annually, may seem like a paradox. But the name describes a meeting of more than 1,000 persons, most of them in the Government, who sat down together in the ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel one morning to pray together.

Since Chief Justice Earl Warren himself was at the head table, the event could hardly be criticized on constitutional grounds, and President Johnson took particular pains in his speech to point out that there is a difference between prayer that is voluntary and prayer that is directed by the state itself. He said:

"We who hold public office are enjoined by our Constitution against enacting laws to tell the people when and where or how to pray.

"All our experience and all our knowledge proves that injunction is good. For, if Government could ordain the people's prayer, the Government could also ordain its own worship—and that must never be.

"The separation of church and state has served our freedom well because men of state have not separated themselves from church and faith and prayer.

"I believe that these annual prayer breakfasts serve a most useful purpose in both reminding and reassuring the people that those who hold their trust are themselves godly and prayerful men and women."

It was impressive to see in the audience such an array of Government officials and some Ambassadors. The Speaker of the House was there, as well as Senators and Representatives from both political parties.

Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, presided. Businessmen, lawyers, and public officials from various States, including some Governors, also participated in this nonpolitical affair. The occasion was sponsored by the International Christian Leadership, and the audience was comprised of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

President Kennedy made a speech to a similar gathering just a year ago, and President Eisenhower before him did likewise. The program was devoted entirely to the spiritual theme. It began with a song from the Navy Choir, and the invocation was delivered by George Hayes, a prominent Negro layman.

Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, made an impressive talk on the meaning of prayer, and then Dr. Billy Graham delivered an impassioned address on the need for spiritual help in these troublous times. He sketched the grave situations that exist throughout the world and pointed regretfully to the many emotional controversies of today, including the racial question. He said this would never be settled in the streets, but only in the homes and in the hearts of men.

President Johnson in his address made an interesting suggestion—that in the city of Washington, the seat of Government, there must be "a fitting memorial to the God who made us all."

He added:

"Our Government cannot and should not sponsor the erection of such a memorial with public funds. But such a living memorial should be here. It should be a center of prayer, open to all men of all faiths at all times.

"The world is given many statistics about the per capita vices of Washington, but the world knows all too little about the per capita virtues of those who live and labor here."

The occasion was an extraordinary one. Not a word of politics—implicit or explicit—was expressed. Nor was there any comment on the policies of the Government.

The meeting was devoted entirely to the encouragement of prayer breakfast groups throughout the country. These are voluntary meetings held by small groups in every city and State. The movement was founded by Dr. Abraham Vereide who also initiated the breakfast groups at the Capitol in the two Houses of Congress more than 20 years ago. Now there are many breakfast groups, composed of personnel of State as well as city governments.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S STEPCHILD: THE U.S. MINING INDUSTRY—A NEW APPROACH IS LONG OVERDUE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, during my service in the Senate, I have repeatedly expressed my great concern that more attention should be paid by the Congress to the importance of our mining industry in the United States. As I have said before, it frequently seems as though the mining industry is the one part of our economy which has been completely neglected over the years in planning national policies. As chairman of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I had repeatedly called to my attention the real needs of the mining industry for assistance which have been either ignored or opposed by the executive branch of the Government.

In the case of the gold miners, a group uniquely damaged by arbitrary Government action, it has been impossible, so far, to enlist the very important support of the Treasury and Interior Departments for the enactment of legislation that would be important in reviving this almost extinct enterprise. Gold miners cannot now produce gold profitably because of an arbitrary price set by the executive branch of the Government 30 years ago which cannot be changed. The unduly stringent Order No. L–208 of the War Production Board during World War II which closed all the gold mines was another example of arbitrary Government action directed against the gold miners which proved to be a blow that has never been fully or fairly compensated.

No other gold mining country among our allies and associates in the war took a similar step. Canada, South Africa, Australia all continued to produce gold. The U.S. Government alone put its gold miners out of business. It seems to me inexcusable that the executive branch has never been willing to recognize that the gold miners deserve special assistance not only because this is a very important industry but because the difficulties it faces arise entirely from repressive measures imposed by the executive branch from which there has been no appeal.

I hope there will come a time when a different attitude will prevail and legislation to revitalize the gold mining industry can be enacted.

The negative attitudes of the executive branch of the Government toward the mining industry are not restricted to gold miners alone. In fact, this lack of sympathy toward the mining industry is apparent in almost every context. For example, I introduced an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1964 which was designed to eliminate an existing restriction on amounts mining industries may deduct for exploration expenditures. This modest proposal to aid the miners was strangled by opposition of the Treasury Department. It is, again, my hope that patient exploration of the issues involved will develop a new attitude on the part of the Treasury Department and that eventually we may be able to obtain at least some tax relief for the mining industry.

The premise on which I have sought legislation to remove restrictions on exploration expenditures in the mining industry has been that, in modern days, exploration techniques for minerals are wholly comparable with research programs of other industries, which expenses are entirely deductible.

The significance of the great changes in mining exploration techniques which have occurred are evidence in reading a most interesting article in the New York Times of Sunday, February 16. The article "Modern Sourdoughs Bring New

Techniques to Ancient Search for Minerals" describes the new world of prospecting in which highly sophisticated scientific methods are used to explore for mineral deposits. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this time together with another related article in the same issue of the New York Times dealing with a new look in silver mining in the State of Utah.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1964]

MODERN SOURDOUGHS BRING NEW TECHNIQUES TO ANCIENT SEARCH FOR MINERALS

(By John M. Lee)

Mining has long held a romantic fascination for Americans.

Almost 100 years ago, when Bret Harte wrote "The Luck of Roaring Camp," easterners delighted in the crusty color of the California mining country.

Although the sourdough and his burro have yielded to the engineer in light plane or station wagon, mining remains a great adventure. Its contemporary dimensions include political turmoil abroad, world price competition and the technology of the computer age.

Mining also faces the mundane problems of rising costs and declining grades of some domestic ores. But these problems are being tackled through the cost-cutting and improved efficiency of automation and mechanization. Employment, however, is declining.

Some 2,500 minerals specialists who grapple with these issues are in New York this week for the annual meeting of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers.

Most of their 150 technical sessions at the Astor and Statler Hilton hotels will deal with the techniques of finding, extracting, refining, and using mineral products.

But mining has broadened its horizons, and some sessions will deal with international financing, the exploitation of minerals in underdeveloped countries and the social consequences of closing a mine.

For the next few days, Manhattan can stake a claim as the world's biggest mining camp.

The importance of the minerals industries can hardly be exaggerated. From the days of King Solomon's mines and the Damascus sword, minerals and their effective use have formed the base of national wealth and power.

Broadly speaking, the minerals industries comprise metals, such as iron ore, copper, and silver; nonmetallic minerals, such as gypsum, potash, sand, and gravel, and mineral-derived fuels, like coal, oil, and gas.

The value of mineral production last year climbed to a record $19.7 billion, the U.S. Bureau of Mines reports. The 1963 figure was some $800 million above the previous high in 1962 and continued the upward trend begun in 1959.

OUTLOOK CALLED BRIGHT

With the uses of minerals and mineral fuels so intertwined with an expanding industrial economy, the outlook is bright. Charles White Merrill, Chief of the Bureau of Mines' Mineral Divisions, writes in the February issue of Mining Engineering:

"It is clear that the overall demand for minerals is not only assured but is certain to expand for many years ahead."

Mr. Merrill warns, however, that not all minerals can be expected to expand their use at the same rate. He notes, for example, the decline in importance of anthracite coal and the rise of natural gas.

Other observations are that the mineral supply of the future must be won from lower and lower grade materials, often at greater depths; that mechanization and automation will continue to advance, and that mineral demand can often be reduced by more efficient consumer use.

Other factors that can influence mineral use are the competition between metals, such as between aluminum and steel, and the competitive challenge of metal substitutes, such as plastics.

SEARCH CONTINUES

He also notes the enormous investments needed for efficient mining today and warns of the need for political stability when considering investing in underdeveloped nations.

"Engineering judgments," he says, "frequently involve political appraisals more difficult than the technologic ones."

With the demand for minerals taken for granted, the search for new, higher grade or more accessible mineral deposits continues. The newer techniques of geophysics and geochemistry have been supplementing the older geology.

P. W. Guild of the U.S. Geological Survey illustrates modern corporate practices in a current Mining Engineering article by quoting Paul A. Bailly, president of the Bear Creek Mining Co., to this effect:

"At the reconnaissance stage, we have done regional geologic map compilation and quite a lot of literature search. Our reconnaissance in the field involves the use of airplanes and helicopters for what can be called geo-optical reconnaissance."

BAFFIN ISLAND TO BRAZIL

"We also use some geochemical exploration methods. The geophysics division continues to use the induced polarization method for defining shallow sulfidized areas.

"At the physical exploration stage, we have started using operations research in evaluating drill hole spacings, and statistical methods in evaluating assay data."

What a far cry this is from the prospector, his pick, and shovel.

Last year, minerals exploration turned up rich iron ore on Baffin Island in the Arctic Ocean, gold in Canada's Northwest Territory, molybdenum in Wyoming, and zinc in Brazil.

The rise in the price of silver has stimulated exploration for that metal, particularly around the old western camps, Mr. Guild says, with some new finds apparently being made.

He also notes the increasing role that international organizations are playing in mineral development. The World Bank has helped finance Gabon maganese and Mauritanian iron, although not at the exploratory stage.

A more direct role is played by the United Nations Special Fund, which is administered by Paul G. Hoffman as managing director. The Fund engages in preinvestment surveys, feasibility studies, and technical training in minerals and metallurgy.

The Fund presently has underway 27 projects from Argentina to Upper Volta at a cost of $40.3 million. The objective is to aid economic development through the building of local mining and refining industries.

In Africa, for example, mineral resources hold that continent's great promise of industrialization and increased export earnings.

Mining investments abroad, however, have taken on an incredible complexity.

Last November, in Liberia, an iron ore project known as the Lamco Joint Venture was dedicated, but only after a decade of financial, engineering, and construction activity involving United States, German, Swedish, and Liberian participants and the expenditure of $220 million.

The hazards of oversea investment were dramatized in the change of regime in Cuba and the subsequent elimination of that island as an important source of nickel and cobalt for the United States.

In a symposium this week, L. C. Raymond, senior mining engineer at Ford, Bacon & Davis, Inc., will comment on the risks of oversea investment. In a paper, he suggests:

"These risk factors can be greatly cushioned by recourse to law and order, possibly a special arbitration group connected with the World Court."

Despite the risks, foreign ores continue to be sought when the grade is high and when the economics of extraction and shipment are attractive. But the influx can create competitive problems for the domestic industry.

MEETING COMPETITION

In the case of iron ore, however, domestic producers are meeting the competition with high-iron-content pellets. In the case of lead and zinc, domestic producers have been successful in obtaining quotas to limit imports.

The combination of lead and zinc quotas and higher demand for these metals have led to higher prices, which in turn could stimulate greater domestic mine production.

Politics and mining are inevitably mixed, with mining interests affected by Government stockpile accumulations or disposals and by the proposed wilderness bill, which would exclude minerals prospecting from designated recreational areas. Mining subsidies are often proposed.

On a State level, the possibility of massive investments in Minnesota taconite, a low-iron rock, hinges on the approval by Minnesota voters this fall of a referendum on so-called fair tax treatment for the taconite mining industry.

The U.S. mining industry sometimes raises a protectionist cry on the ground that this country must become self-sufficient in minerals as a defense in the cold war.

Although this country leads the world in mineral output and consumption, the point is raised that its share of the world's total is dwindling rapidly. More attention to domestic resources is urged.

The counterargument is that the United States could not become completely self-sufficient if it wanted to. Although this country is liberally endowed with most resources, some important ones, such as tin, are either not available at all or not available in large quantity or in economically extractable grades.

In addition, friendly nations with minerals to sell must be supported through liberal and mutually profitable trade policies, this argument holds.

Consequently, foreign policy might bear on the future of the minerals industries as much as advanced control systems for the preparation of ore.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1964]

SNOW NOR COLD HALTS MINING, BUT THOSE SKI GALS MIGHT

PARK CITY, UTAH, February 15.—Neither snow, nor cold, nor sleet, nor ice is slowing ore production here in the operating mines of Utah's oldest silver camp, "but those ski gals are liable to bring work to a shuddering stop anytime soon." That's the considered opinion of mining men lining the bar in the Bucket, Tommy Matthew's popular spa in Park City.

To foster employment in what was once Utah's busiest silver-lead-zinc district, the United Park City Mines Co. recently utilized a $1.2 million Area Redevelopment Administration loan to construct a 2½ mile long gondola lift, a chair lift and two J-bar tows atop the snowy Wasatch peaks into which its mine shafts burrow.

THE WHISTLING STOPS

As a result, when the snows deepened just before Christmas, skiers including quite a

few women began stemming and schussing past the shaft house and offices of the old Silver King Mine Co. "Eyes popped for a while, but now the whistling has stoppped and mining is back to normal," says Art Gray, an underground superintendent.

S. K. Droubay, mining engineer who manages both the resort and mining operations of United Park City, believes he is the only mining man extant who scans the skies in hopes of heavier snowstorms.

"We have about 100 men working underground in Park City and snow, or lack of it, don't bother them at all," he says. "But plenty of snow means plenty of work for another 100 employees of our recreation division—and most of them running the lifts and gondolas are ex-miners."

Elsewhere in the mountainous West, mining engineers look at snow and below-zero temperatures less favorably, although modern machinery and proper lubricants keep open-pit mines, as well as underground operations, running smoothly despite bitter weather. Near Ely, Nev., a perennial "icebox of the Nation" where temperatures of 15 below zero are not uncommon, Kennecott Copper Corp. crews keep pretty close to the goal of 24,000 tons of ore and 80,000 tons of waste that must be moved from the Ruth open pit daily.

ONE BIG BLIZZARD

According to Canadian-born M. J. O'Shaughnessy, heavy-set, round-faced, cheerful chief of Kennecott's Nevada operations, "Snow hasn't been too bad except for one big blizzard in January."

Traffic problems engendered when 500 men drive to the mine and another 500 drive to the reduction plant 20 miles away at McGill set off major headaches for all mine families. Keeping ore from freezing in railroad hopper cars and proper lubrication of the mine's 9-cubic-yard shovels and 65-ton trucks are Mr. O'Shaughnessy's operating problems, "but you meet them by preparing in advance," he says.

At Hailey, Idaho, not far from Sun Valley, Gavin Young, project manager at the Federal Resources Co.'s Silver Star-Queen Mine echoes Mr. O'Shaughnessy's motto, sadly adding, "You can have plenty of trouble with winter weather if you're not ready. That's why we spent our time mining snow a few weeks back."

Mr. Young explains that his men were building a new mill, but couldn't get the roof on before the first big storm hit.

"You could ski down the ridge where the room should have been. In fact, some of the men did," Mr. Young says ruefully. The roof is on now, machinery is being installed and the mill will be operational in March. "But that was the first time I ever mined snow out of the inside of a building."

Far to the north, in Idaho's frigid Coeur d'Alene country, 62-year-old Lee Messerly, general mining superintendent for Federal Resources, is trying to prepare the Conjecture-Star Mine for springtime operation.

"It gets a bit rough," he reports, "since we've got almost 20 miles of road to Bayview to keep open ourselves, and the snow is 4 or 5 feet deep."

His eight-man crew manages without a telephone, "but we are real comfortable, with electric blower stoves giving us all the heat we need." Mr. Messerly and his men are "kind of used to snow; after all, it started coming down in October." They watch deer and elk rather than television and do some fishing in nearby Lake Ponderosa when the weather eases off."

EASIER THAN ANDES

In Utah's old Tintic mining district, 40-year-old Gale Hansen, a "geologist who went wrong," is the mining engineer in charge of a Kennecott effort to establish a new, productive silver-lead-zinc operation. Heading up a 46-man crew, Mr. Hansen has headquarters 6 miles from Eureka in a wind-swept cluster of mine buildings 6,000 feet above sea level.

"This is pretty easy compared with three winters I spent in the Andes," Mr. Hansen says, "We have all the conveniences, television, stores in Eureka." But he commutes 75 miles to Salt Lake City each weekend to be with his wife and children, and adds "trying to make a mine is never easy."

Mr. Hansen's development work includes sinking a 1,500-foot-deep shaft, constructing shops, compressor houses, assay office, hoists and related structures.

"If you plan it, you can do it, and keep pretty much on schedule," he believes. "Partly it's because of new materials. Nowadays you can use plastics and heaters and pour concrete even though we've got a foot of snow and zero weather."

Proper lubrication keeps bulldozers and snow-removal gear operating, proper clothing makes outdoor work far easier than a decade or so ago. "Why, some of my people like the winter weather so much they drive ever to Alta for some skiing on their day off, almost 70 miles," Mr. Hansen says with a grin.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend Public Law 874 to provide payments to local school districts based upon two additional categories of public school pupils who have a relationship to Federal programs and activities. The bill would also amend existing law to provide the Commissioner of Education with authority to phase out payments in connection with termination of existing programs over a 3-year period, instead of the present 1-year period.

If enacted, the bill would recognize the Federal connection for school district payment purposes of first, children of school age on whose behalf parents are currently receiving payments under the aid for dependent children welfare program and, second, children in families receiving unemployment compensation benefits in those areas which have been designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial unemployment.

It is estimated that there are currently some 2-million school age children in families receiving aid for dependent children payments. The bill provides that if the number of children in a school district is 3 percent or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during the year that the district could receive for each child a payment equal to 25 percent of the payment made under Public Law 874 for a child whose parent both lives and works on Federal property. The cost of this portion of the amendment would thus be under $140 million a year. The second category for which payment would be made relates to areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial unemployment. In January there were 39 such areas throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a listing of these areas and the number of families receiving unemployment compensation benefits be printed.

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

Areas of substantial unemployment as of mid-January 1964

1. Fresno, Calif.	7,200
2. San Diego, Calif.	16,100
3. San Jose, Calif.	12,500
4. Stockton, Calif.	6,500
5. Waterbury, Conn.	3,500
6. Miami, Fla.	7,500
7. South Bend, Ind.[1]	6,100
8. Brockton, Mass.	4,500
9. Fall River, Mass.	8,100
10. Lawrence, Haverville, Mass.	5,800
11. Lowell, Mass.	4,800
12. New Bedford, Mass.	6,600
13. Springfield, Chicopee, Holyoke, Mass.[1]	9,400
14. Worcester, Mass.	7,800
15. Duluth-Superior, Minn.	3,200
16. Atlantic City, N.J.	7,100
17. Jersey City, N.J.	16,200
18. Newark, N.J.	36,100
19. Buffalo, N.Y.	23,800
20. Utica-Rome, N.Y.	7,500
21. Hamilton-Middleton, Ohio	3,600
22. Altoona, Pa.	3,200
23. Erie, Pa.	5,100
24. Johnstown, Pa.	6,500
25. Philadelphia, Pa.	79,800
26. Pittsburgh, Pa.	48,700
27. Scranton, Pa.	8,300
28. Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, Pa.	13,600
29. Mayaguez, P.R.	1,000
30. Ponce, P.R.	1,500
31. San Juan, P.R.	3,900
32. Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.	20,400
33. Chattanooga, Tenn.	4,000
34. Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.	3,400
35. Seattle, Wash.[1]	28,300
36. Tacoma, Wash.[1]	6,500
37. Charleston, W. Va.	3,000
38. Huntington, W. Va.	4,400
39. Wheeling, W. Va.	3,600

[1] All the foregoing areas with these exceptions have had substantial unemployment for a period of at least 9 months.

NOTE.—Total number of benefit payments, 449,100.

Average number of children per unemployment compensation benefit families estimated at 2.6.

Number of children on whose account school district payments by virtue of unemployment compensation benefit relationship is 1,167,660.

Estimated cost based on 25 percent of local contribution rate (average payment made by Federal Government to school districts under category A of Public Law 874 for children whose parents are both employed on and who live on Federal property) $78,815,050.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senators will note that the geographical distribution ranges from Fresno, Calif., and Seattle on the west coast through the Midwest—Minnesota and Indiana are on the list—to the east coast and Southern States of Florida, Tennessee and Texas.

It is estimated that the school district would receive payments based upon 2.6 times the number of unemployment compensation benefits. The rate of payment in this category would also be set at 25 percent of the payment made for a child whose parent both lives and works on Federal property.

I am currently in the process of deriving cost figures for this portion of the program, but, in my judgment, the total cost of the program initially would not exceed $200 million annually, or less than is being appropriated for category A and B payments under Public Law 874.

The important point, however, is that this money would be funneled directly into those areas by these twin standards having a great need for additional school funds. Every large metropolitan center would receive help from the Federal Government to educate these youngsters for whom the Federal Government through the twin programs of aid to dependent children and unemployment compensation benefits has already assumed a responsibility.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not wedded to the precise language of the bill. It would be my hope that hearings upon it could perfect the detail and the language.

I suggest to Senators that the bill has certain advantages in its approach. These include:

First, the decision as to which school district the aid shall go, and the amount, is automatically determined by objective verifiable factors associated with depressed areas whether rural or urban——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may have an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Second, the certification to the school district from local welfare offices and unemployment compensation offices of the numbers of children in each category could be accomplished with a minimum of clerical expense, and in addition, such a program should not increase Federal employment perceptibly;

Third, under the procedure no question of Federal control of local education is raised;

Fourth, all metropolitan areas and many additional school districts, particularly in areas such as Appalachia, could qualify for assistance, thus adding significantly to the political support for the program;

Fifth, since this is not a general aid bill but rather a pin-pointed assistance to economically distressed school districts bill, I would hope that it could escape the church-state and racial issue controversies; and

Sixth, it possesses a philosophy or logic for the aid given—the children in the two new categories are already related to Federal programs.

The Federal Government is contributing to their housing, clothing, and food through the AFDC and the unemployment compensation programs. These children and their families are not in economic brackets whereby the local tax base is enhanced by their presence. By adopting these amendments we would be recognizing that the Federal Government has a responsibility, in part, to help to educate the children so that in the future, through education, perhaps these cycles of poverty could be broken. School districts which have large numbers of children from very low income families have costs which are greater in many instances than high income suburban school districts—yet far too often they do not have the revenues to finance the types of program which are needed if the native talent and ability of the child is to be developed. The additional $200 million or more annually that this program might cost, perhaps, is justified if it serves to reduce the ranks of the future unemployed.

One thing we can be sure of, unless we strive to find ways to meet the problem of poverty, we will serve only to perpetuate it. Education may not be the only key to the door of opportunity, but without education that door will remain locked.

The bill has two main sections. The final section of the bill is designed to guard against the disruption of an ongoing program in the event of a cancellation of the military or defense activity. At the present time the phaseout of Federal assistance would take place within a year. I am suggesting that the Commissioner be given authority to stretch out the termination of this impacted area program for 3 years when he finds this to be appropriate. I can foresee that the elimination of a defense activity in an area can cause just as great or greater problems for a school system as the establishment of such a program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill as introduced be printed at this point in my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for additional cosponsors until the close of business, February 28.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2528) to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activity, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236) is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "SECTION 1." and (2) by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) It is further declared that in recognition of the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote full employment throughout the Nation and to encourage education necessary to such employment, it is also the purpose of this Act to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents."

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"CHILDREN OF NEEDY FAMILIES AND CHILDREN RESIDING IN AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT WITH UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

"Authorization

"SEC. 4A. (a) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children who were in average daily attendance at the schools of such agency, and for whom such agency provided free public education, during such fiscal year, and who, while in attendance at such schools—

"(1) were dependent children for the purposes of title IV of the Social Security Act, or

"(2) resided in an area, which during a major portion of such year was designated by the Secretary of Labor as an area of substantial unemployment, with one or more parents neither of whom was regularly employed and at least one of whom was drawing State unemployment compensation.

For the purposes of this section a child may not be counted under both clauses 1 and 2 of this subsection for the same period.

"DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT

"(b) The amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to (1) 25 per centum of the local contribution rate (determined under section 3(d)) multiplied by (2) the number of children determined under subsection (a).

"MINIMUM REQUIREMENT

"(c) No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (a) unless the number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and to whom such subsection applies—

"(1) is ten or more; and

"(2) amounts to 3 per centum or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and for whom such agency provided free public education.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, the Commissioner may waive the 3 per centum condition of entitlement whenever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such condition inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this section.

"DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF CHILDREN

"(d) The determination whether a local educational agency has met the percentage requirement for eligibility under this section for any fiscal year shall be made on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner prior to the close of such year, except that an underestimate made by the Commissioner pursuant to this subsection shall not operate to deprive an agency of its entitlement to any payments under this section to which it would be entitled had the estimate been accurate."

SEC. 3. Sections 3(f) and 4(d) of such Act are each amended (1) by inserting after "such agency is otherwise entitled under this section for such year" the following: "and the two succeeding fiscal years", and (2) by striking out "current expenditures for such year" and inserting in lieu thereof "current expenditures for such years".

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such Act is amended (1) in subsection (a) by striking out "or 4" and inserting in lieu thereof "4, or 4A", and (2) in subsection (c) by striking out "and 4(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "4(a), and 4A".

SEC. 5. Section 9 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(11) The term 'State unemployment compensation' means unemployment compensation paid to an individual under State law or title XV of the Social Security Act."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964.

WHEAT AND COTTON PROGRAM

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I feel shy speaking on an agricultural subject, because I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I did wish to bring out what has happened in the committee, inasmuch as we shall be debating the particular issue within the next few days, and also to present to the Senate some questions as to the merit of the bill that was reported.

It is my understanding that the bill finally reported by the committee over the objection of the chairman was a bill which was not even considered, so far as hearings were concerned, but was pushed through as a compromise, with wheat and cotton lumped together.

The proposals for both wheat and cotton have one basic ingredient in common, and that is that the farmers who will receive support under them will receive payment for their crops, part of it in the marketplace and part of it from the Federal Government. In general, this is considered as the payment issue, involving the question of whether the Government itself should provide a part of the income for the farmers who are producing the crops.

There are a number of different viewpoints on this question. I recently received a document from the American Farm Bureau Federation, dated February 1964, entitled "Questions and Answers on 'The Payments Issue'."

I must say, in all candor, that this is about as clear an exposition of the basic issues we shall be asked to debate—either this week or next week—as I have yet seen on this particular agricultural problem.

For example:

Question No. 1. What kind of payments are we talking about?

Answer. Any kind of Government payment that is made for the purpose of supplying a part of the income farmers receive for the sale of their products.

This is true whether we do it in the form of support, in the form of loans, or in the form of certificates—which is what is being proposed at this point, certificate payments for wheat supports. We are doing it whether it applies only to cotton and wheat, as in this particular bill, or whether it also applies to the dairy production supports which have been asked for by the Senator from Minnesota.

It seems to me that finally we must come to a decision on—and a basic decision—as to whether we are to go along with producers in the agricultural industry themselves, who feel that they can do better by getting free from governmental control, or whether we are going to keep them encased in a system whereby we provide incentives for their prices and still say that they must reduce production even with that incentive. These two things conflict on every occasion and on every other program with every other commodity in this country.

We should not forget that support payments were designed to promote increased production. Yet, in the agricultural field, for some reason wholly bewildering to me and to many others, we provide the support payments and then say there is no reason why production will be cut down. It makes no sense.

Inasmuch as I believe this particular series of questions and answers is productive and will be useful in the debate soon to follow, I ask unanimous consent to have the document printed in the RECORD.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE PAYMENTS ISSUE

Should farmers get their income in the marketplace or partly from the market and partly from some sort of Government payment? In other words, the issue is whether Government checks should be used to pay a part of the price farmers receive for their products. This is the hottest farm policy issue before Congress during this election year of 1964.

The following questions and answers have been prepared to facilitate understanding of this issue:

Question. What kind of payments are we talking about?

Answer. Any kind of Government payment that is made for the purpose of supplying a part of the income farmers receive for the sale of their products.

Question. What commodities would be affected by current payment proposals?

Answer. Legislation now before Congress proposes various types of payments for dairy products, wheat, and cotton. If the payments approach is adopted for these major commodities, it can be expected to spread to the rest of agriculture.

Question. What is proposed for dairy products?

Answer. Senator MCCARTHY of Minnesota has proposed a plan under which producers reducing production of manufacturing milk would receive Government payments of not to exceed 50 cents per hundredweight on their marketings.

Question. What is proposed for cotton?

Answer. There are two types of payment proposals on cotton. Under the Cooley bill, which has passed the House, payments would be made to handlers (in effect, to the mills) to compensate in full or in part, for the subsidies already being paid on cotton exports. An additional payment would be made to each cotton grower on the first 15 bales of his production although this might be disguised by a program of buying such cotton at the support level and offering it for resale at a lower price.

Under the Talmadge-Humphrey bill cotton would be supported at the world price level, and payments would be used to provide additional support for cotton produced within a domestic allotment. All such payments would go directly to producers. Producers would receive one rate of payment for the first 15 bales of production, within domestic allotments, a lower rate for the next 15 bales of such production, and a still lower rate for production in excess of 30 bales.

Question. What is proposed for wheat?

Answer. The major payment proposals for wheat are the so-called voluntary certificate plan and the Humphrey bill. Pending certificate proposals are based on the plan which growers voted down in the May 1963 wheat referendum. Cooperating growers would receive certificates entitling them to payments on certificate wheat. The total number of certificates to be issued would be based on domestic human consumption and a portion of wheat exports. Some versions provide for one level of payments on the domestic portion of the certificate wheat and a lower rate on the export portion. The cost of the proposed payments would be partly, or completely, offset by a processing tax (bread tax). The cost could be completely offset if participation were low since the tax collected on wheat sold by noncooperators could cover the cost of the payments on export wheat. If participation were high it would be necessary to use Treasury funds for payments on the export portion of the certificate wheat. Under the Humphrey bill cooperating producers would receive a payment of not more than 65 cents per bushel on 50 percent of the normal yield of their planted acres (which is assumed to be the domestic portion of the crop), and 25 cents per bushel on the other 50 percent (which is assumed to be export wheat). This plan is similar to the certificate plan in many respects. The principal difference is that under the Humphrey bill all payments would be financed by the Federal Treasury as there is no provision for a processing tax.

Question. Aren't some of these proposals similar to the present feed grain program in some respects?

Answer. Yes. Under the 1963 and 1964 feed grain programs cooperating producers qualify for both commodity loans and price support payments. For example, in 1963 cooperating corn producers were eligible for price support loans at a national average rate of $1.07 per bushel, and a price support payment of 18 cents per bushel on the normal yield of their planted acres.

Question. Are there objections to a payment plan such as the one now in effect on corn?

Answer. Yes. Payments are wrong in principle because they are destructive of the market system. Under the feed grain program the producer makes his production plans on the assumption that corn is worth $1.25 per bushel. But, since he is getting part of the support price (18 cents in 1963) from the Government, he bases his livestock production plans on the assumption that corn is worth only $1.07 per bushel. A situation of this type encourages an overproduction of both corn and livestock. The feed grain program is supposed to reduce production but the 1963 feed grain crop was the largest on record.

Question. Is there any common denominator in these various plans?

Answer. Yes. While the various plans differ in form and detail they all propose to make producers dependent upon Government payments for a part of the price of their product.

Question. Is this a new issue?

Answer. No; the issue raised by current payment proposals is the same as that raised by the Brannan plan, which Congress rejected in 1949. Regardless of differences in form and detail, the current payment proposals are all "Brannan-type plans."

Question. What's the difference between Brannan-type payments and the payments

that are made under the ACP and Conservation Reserve programs?

Answer. Payments for retiring land or following conservation practices are not destructive of the market system. They do not come between the producer and the consumer of farm products by establishing one price level for the producer and a lower price level for those who buy his product as all Brannan-type programs would do. They do not divide farmers into classes and establish separate prices for commodities produced by each class as the Cooley and Talmadge bills would do. They do not force the individual farmer to sell products of identical quality for different prices as the certificate plans would do.

Question. Would payments make it possible to support prices without production controls?

Answer. No, except in the case of a deficit commodity such as wool. Payments would stimulate excessive production of most commodities and this additional production would depress prices below the level that would prevail on a free market. With payments stimulating production the prices prevailing in the market would not be true "market prices"—they would be "Government-wrecked prices." Proponents recognize that payment programs would require controls to limit Government costs. In a number of current proposals the purpose of the payments is to buy compliance with a Government supply-management program.

Question. Would Congress provide the money for a large-scale payments program?

Answer. No one can answer this question with absolute certainty. A payment program covering all of agriculture would cost billions of dallors. Farmers are a constantly declining percentage of our total population. There may well be a limit to the willingness of the Congress (a majority of whose members are primarily responsible to nonfarm people) to vote the vast sums that would be required for a full-scale payments program year after year. Farmers might well have to enter into political deals with other groups such as organized labor in order to round up votes for payment appropriations.

Question. What would happen if Congress should provide less than the full amount needed for a payment program?

Answer. The payments promised producers would have to be reduced. The easiest way to do this would be to limit the amount that may be made to any one producer. The proposal in the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill to establish a graduated scale of payment rates for producers who receive domestic allotments of more than 15 bales illustrates one method of limiting payments to individuals. Other proposals would simply set a limit on the total amount that may be paid to any one producer.

Question. Are there limitations on payments under the Wool Act?

Answer. Not yet; however, a limitation of $1,000 has been proposed. The 11 Western States, plus Texas and South Dakota, have 95 percent of the growers that would be affected by such a limitation. The other 37 States have the remaining 5 percent of the affected growers. Thus, the politics of numbers favors the adoption of a limitation so that the payments to smaller producers can be increased.

Question. How would a limitation on payments to individuals affect producers?

Answer. It would set a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture. Since payments would stimulate production and depress market prices, it would become unprofitable to produce more than the amount eligible for the payments.

Question. How would a payment program affect efficiency?

Answer. Producers would be encouraged to continue high-cost inefficient production in order to get the payments. On the other hand, the restrictive effect of controls and limitations on payments would fall primarily on the producers with efficient-size units.

Question. How would a payment program affect consumers?

Answer. Any program that encourages inefficiency means high-cost food and fiber when total costs (market prices, plus payments) are taken into account.

Question. Who is for the payment approach?

Answer. The payment approach is advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture and groups that favor a Government-managed agriculture. In the past 3 years a number of supply management programs have been rejected either by the Congress or by producer referendums. So, the supply managers are now pinning their hopes on the idea that payments can be used to buy support for Government supply management programs.

Question. Where do labor unions stand on the payments issue?

Answer. Labor unions are generally in favor of payments. Union leaders are no doubt interested in cheap food, but their real objectives are to keep as many people as possible on the farm (and out of the job market) and to break down the farmers' traditional independence. If farm income were dependent on annual congressional appropriations farm groups might well be forced to support union-backed "welfare" legislation in order to get union support for farm appropriations.

Question. Where do businessmen stand on this issue?

Answer. Some businessmen who buy and sell farm products think that the payment approach would "get the Government out" of their business. Some who sell to farmers think that payments would give farmers more spending money. Dealers in farm products should ask themselves whether they can really "get the Government out of their business" by destroying the market system. Those who sell to farmers should ask themselves whether farmers will be better customers under a system that emphasizes individual opportunity, permits farmers to adjust to changing conditions and encourages the development of adequate units; or a system that fosters inefficiency and sets a ceiling on opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, during the tax bill debate, last week, I made the comment on the floor of the Senate that once it was enacted, the accompanying sanctimonious outbursts for Federal fiscal responsibility would soon turn into polite whispers and then quietly disappear into oblivion. I further stated—and one does not have to be a prognosticator to do this—that once a respectable period of time went by after its enactment, the race for more and greater Federal spending would get underway with lightning speed. The bill has not been signed into law yet—but already the Federal subsidy idealists are on their way again. The mad dash to the Federal Treasury by special interest groups has started, and as usual the American taxpayers—especially those who work conscienciously to meet their needs and wants—will end up being trampled on like so many jack rabbits in a stampede. Well, if it is really beyond our power to help protect the American taxpayer from these spurious Treasury raids—undeniably some of us in Congress are desperately trying—then we can at least alert the responsible citizen, so that he can protect himself wherever possible from the onslaught of Federal fiscal irresponsibility.

According to a notice on the front page of the American Transit Association's recent weekly newspaper, there will be a meeting this week of a group known as the Urban Mass Transportation Steering Committee here in Washington, D.C. I urge my brethren in the House of Representatives to take special notice of this group—whatever it might call itself—because the object of this meeting will undoubtedly include the development of a program to pressure House Members to vote for the mass transit subsidy bill now pending in the House Rules Committee. As a matter of fact, this notice bluntly implies just that.

The new program that the group will push for seems innocent enough, as embodied in the budget submitted to Congress. Only $75 million is asked for in fiscal 1965 to get the transit subsidy program going. After all, $75 million from a $100 billion budget is nothing but the proverbial drop in the bucket. The newly formed Urban Mass Transportation Steering Committee will no doubt try to convince the Members of the House of Representatives that this new program is nothing more than that.

Let me briefly show for the RECORD what this seemingly innocent plea will amount to if the transit subsidy bill is enacted.

First, as passed by the Senate, the bill contemplates $375 million in direct subsidies, a $375 million revenue bond guarantee program and a loan program, all to be used by local and State public bodies for building mass transportation facilities. The program would be administered by a special office in the Housing and Home Finance Agency which was set up less than 2 years ago. HHFA would decide which cities would be eligible to receive Federal aid under the overall program.

If I may digress here briefly—this proposed subsidy program is being advocated by these special interests groups because, they say, the Federal Government subsidizes the construction of highways which in turn, is causing more traffic congestion, air pollution, "miles and miles of unsightly concrete and asphalt," to use their words, in the Nation's cities. But they are quick to add that highways are necessary—as if this were a revelation. So it follows, they say, that the Federal Government has the obligation to subsidize local mass transit. What logic.

Mr. President, it is more than just about time to set those so-called facts right. The Nation's highway program is being paid for by the users of the highways through gas, rubber, and excise taxes. These taxes go into a special Federal trust fund—and for the benefit of the transit subsidy proponents it is known appropriately as the highway trust fund—and these user charges pay for the construction of a national, coast-to-coast highway system on a pay-as-you-go basis. Furthermore, this highway system unites all cities in the Nation without regard to their size; funds are apportioned accordingly. And this national system—I want to emphasize the words national system—serves not only the automobile users but the "baker and candlestick maker," the trucking industry and business in general by the delivery of products over the highways between the cities as well as within them. In addition, the Nation's fire and police departments and school buses—as well as ambulances on emergency calls—use these highways. Who else but the Federal Government could act as the catalyst for collecting the charges imposed on the users of the highways and coordinate the development of a national system of highways? The argument by the transit subsidy proponents concerning the Federal aid highway is specious.

On the other hand, the transit subsidy proposal, if enacted, will not be paid for by the users, and funds for carrying it out will come from the general treasury which contains taxes collected from everyone in all parts of the country. Only the users of transit would directly benefit from this subsidy program.

How many cities would be eligible for direct subsidy under this proposal? As constituted, no one would really know until the HHFA Administrator decided, of course. But here are some hopeful guidelines as to the program's possible cost. The Census Bureau statistical breakdown shows that there are 212 standard metropolitan areas. These are areas having 50,000 or more inhabitants. According to a study paid for by the Federal Government, the total projected needs for only 40 of these 212 areas for developing new transit facilities amounts to some $10 billion over the next 16 years. So, if the Federal Government puts up two-thirds of the net project cost of each facility involved, this could amount to two-thirds of the total cost—or as high as $6 billion as the Administrator of HHFA pointed out in testimony. But the point of my statement is that the real figure would be considerably higher than 6 billion or even 10 billion if the program were to go into effect, because then more and more cities would fight for their rightful share. It is a well-known fact that the price tags for new Federal programs are almost always underestimated. This program is no exception. The irony of the whole thing is that the proposal is strictly a big city attempt to get the American taxpayer to foot the bill for its transit facilities; facilities which it can pay for if it wants to. San Francisco—as well as other cities around the country—has proven that.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my statement a report given at a conference on urban passenger transportation held recently by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which shows that the Nation's urban areas have the wealth to pay for—and subsidize if need be—their own transit construction programs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, so the American Transit Association, with a membership of 250 transit systems—out of a total of about 1,200—is trying to get the transit subsidy bill enacted. But the American Transit Association has a selfish financial interest in getting good old Uncle Sam to pay their transit bill. This meeting in Washington is of interest to those who stand to gain by the passage of a program that will cost the American taxpayer well over $10 billion, if it is enacted.

Mr. President, now that the matter of Federal fiscal responsibility has subsided, the gold rush is on again—not the old-fashioned type of course, but the one that leads to the Federal Treasury. Maybe it is time for the Nation's taxpayers to form a committee of its own that will successfully head off the stampede before it reaches them—at least as it relates to this proposal.

Mr. President, as I have stated, assembled in Washington this week is the so-called urban mass transportation steering committee, meeting primarily for the purpose of stimulating favorable consideration of the great urban mass transportation bill which was passed by the Senate last year and is now pending in the House.

In my judgment, if the bill eventually becomes law it will entail an expense of at least $10 billion on the part of the Federal Government before the program is finally put into effect. There has been considerable talk about reduction of governmental expenses so as to warrant the tax reduction which was made.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Ohio estimates that it will cost $10 billion before the program is finally put into effect. Would he not agree that over the years that expenditure will continue indefinitely and will grow as the years pass by, certainly so long as the Federal Government offers this kind of superincentive, this kind of grant, this vast amount of subsidy to a mass transportation system? There is every reason why the local communities are sure to rely on the Federal Goverment to provide the money rather than paying for it through its own fare-box operation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur completely in what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. This will be a permanent program, in my judgment. It will mean that forever, hereafter, the Federal Government will be buying buses, terminal facilities, and equipment, to finance governmentally local operated mass transportation systems.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Ohio also agree that this kind of program will result in wasteful expenditures, inasmuch as there will not be the same kind of incentive to eliminate the uneconomic runs of the bus system, for example, that there will not be the same incentive for keeping costs down that there would be if operators faced the alternative to efficient operation of higher fares or higher local property taxes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in the statement by the Senator from Wisconsin. Strong proof is available as to what happens in the efforts to fiscally manage a local mass transportation system when it is being subsidized. New York has not been able to solve its problem—neither has Boston or Philadelphia. There are other communities in the Nation, including my own city of Cleveland, which have made it an objective to operate the system on a self-sustaining basis—and it has done so.

My judgment is rather unalterable that the moment the Federal Government begins to subsidize these systems, all concern about prudent management will be thrown to the winds. The deficits will mean nothing because the Federal Government will pick them up. I repeat, I concur with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to remind the Senator from Ohio that during the process of debate on the mass transit bill, I brought up the point of whether we should eliminate the provision which now permits all Federal aid to be cut off from an entire area if the administrator or the transit agency does not like the rate structure which is put in, even though it may have been approved by the local or State public utilities commission.

Can the Senator tell me whether this provision is still in the House bill that is about to be debated, or whether we have an opportunity at least of getting out of this autocratic power?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot answer that, because I do not know. The Senator gives me information of which I have not been aware. Has it come to the floor of the House yet?

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe it is still in committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is in committee, but the committee does not feel that we should enter into this expenditure. The pressure is on to get the committee to release it. I hope that the good judgment which has been manifested by the committee members will not now be thrown aside, because it is needed, more than ever in face of the fact that we have reduced prospective revenues to the Government by $11 billion through the tax reduction.

Mr. DOMINICK. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One word further, Mr. President.

The sponsors of the bill are arguing that the U.S. Government should finance the building of interstate highways. They say, "If we are financing the building of interstate highways, logically we should finance the mass transportation systems of the various communities throughout the country." There is a flagrant weakness in this argument of the proponents of the mass transportation bill. We forget completely that the Federal Government has imposed a special gasoline tax, an excise tax on tires and accessories for the purpose of creating the trust fund to build highways.

There was no contemplation of imposing a special tax to finance this eternal program which is being urged. The taxpayers generally will have to provide the money. When hearings were held on the measure before the Commerce Commission, a Mr. Maloney, of Boston, in charge of the Boston transit system, testified that he was highly elated by the results being obtained in a pilot test that was being made. The Federal Government spent $4 million in Boston. The State of Massachusetts put up some money, and the local people put up some money also. It was decided that if fares were cut by one-third and train service increased by 75 percent, people would give up their automobiles and ride the trains.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator believe that it is possible to beguile car owners into not using their automobiles by any such subterfuge?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not think so at that time, and my judgment has been corroborated by what happened on the Boston & Maine Railroad.

Mr. SIMPSON. It happened also in Chicago. The reverse is exactly the fact.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Mr. Maloney was in charge of the project. Ten million dollars was made available. Fares were reduced by 33⅓ percent, and the frequency of train service was increased by 75 percent.

About 3 weeks ago the program was abandoned. Automobilists would not give up the convenience of their automobiles. They did not ride the trains.

There was also a rather fascinating sidelight to all this. The transportation expert of Northwestern University testified last March that even if automobilists were paid to ride the trains, unless they were picked up in front of their homes and brought to their offices, they would not ride the trains.

Mr. McNAMARA rose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I had not intended to participate in the debate. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying, however.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator and I will be together on the St. Lawrence Seaway issue.

Mr. President, I have some statistics, which I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE PLIGHT OF METROPOLITAN AREAS—TOO MANY GOVERNMENTS, TOO FEW FINANCIAL POWERS?

(By Ralph E. Rechel, consultant, Economics and Organization of Transportation, Washington, D.C.)

These sheets present data on trends in the numbers of jurisdictions (I), on the taxes collected from metropolitan area residents by all levels of government (II), and on the dependence of local governments on transfers of money from State and Federal levels (III). These figures provide rough measures of the jurisdiction problem and of the past financial trends.

I. TRENDS IN THE NUMBER OF JURISDICTIONS INVOLVED IN METROPOLITAN REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

The first portion of the 1962 Census of Governments to be tabulated and published covers government organization. This census report shows that between 1952 and 1962:

The number of counties decreased by 10, primarily caused by the elimination of counties in Connecticut.

The number of municipalities increased by 1,190 due to new incorporations.

The populations in many of the newly incorporated areas (effectively severed from a more unified type of administration) are large: 23 new cities had over 100,000 people when incorporated; 423 new cities had over 10,000 people.

The number of townships decreased by 58 due to the above incorporations.

The number of special districts (not including school districts) increased by 4,283.

The number of school districts, the government unit least related to finance of transportation facilities, decreased by 6,000 due to consolidations.

Central cities of 50,000 or more population and their contiguous urban county, or counties, are designated as standard metropolitan statistical areas (hereafter SMA) in Federal statistics, including the census of governments. The census shows that between 1957 and 1962 the number of SMA's increased from 174 to 212. Within the 212 SMA's there were increases of 298 (8 percent) in the number of municipalities and of 1,675 (45 percent) in the number of special districts in the 5 years between 1957 and 1962. There was a decrease of one county.

Since the urban passenger transportation problem is located primarily in the SMA's, it is clear that the number of jurisdictions which must cooperate in, or organize for, planning, financing, and operating areawide transportation services are increasing. This will inevitably make cooperation and organization in the metropolitan areas more difficult.

In 1962 the 212 SMA's contained 310 counties, 4,142 municipalities, 2,575 townships, and 5,411 special districts. While many of the latter will not affect transportation directly, there were 310 multiple-purpose districts and 773 highway districts. Housing and urban renewal accounted for another 1,099 districts. While there is no data on the number of special districts having the power to tax property within SMA's, over half of all special districts (not including school districts) in the United States possess such power. Presumably half or more of the districts within SMA's have taxing powers.

II. WHO PAYS THE TAXES IN THE UNITED STATES?

The following table shows the proportion of revenues of local, State, and Federal Governments which are collected from people residing in SMA's. Since the revenue portions of the 1962 Census of Governments have not been published, the data are from the 1957 Census of Governments and the 1957 report of collections by Internal Revenue Service. The methods of estimating State and Federal tax colelctions in SMA's are contained in an appendix note.

Estimate of the collection of all taxes inside and outside of metropolitan areas, fiscal year 1957

Level of government	Total public revenue [1]	Revenues from outside SMA's (thousands)	Revenues from inside SMA's [5]	Percent of total revenues from SMA's
1. Federal tax collections	[2] $82,387,233	$25,722,408	$56,664,825	68.8
2. State collections and charges	[3] 20,728,217	66,867,736	14,041,481	67.7
3. Local collections and charges	[4] 18,407,000	5,339,000	13,068,000	71.0
4. Total	121,522,450	37,748,144	83,774,306	68.9
5. 1960 population	178,464	66,079	112,385	63.0

[1] For 48 States and the District of Columbia.
[2] Internal Revenue Service only, thus excluding customs duties and charges or sales revenues of various Federal agencies.
[3] Include taxes, interest, charges for services, and liquor store income.
[4] Same items as in footnote 3 for county, municipal, and township governments, and all types of special districts including school districts.
[5] Includes only the 174 SMA's in the 1957 census. There are 212 in the 1962 census which is not yet published.

The answer to the title question is, of course, "People who live in metropolitan areas." Since the methods of estimation tend to undervalue the State and Federal collections in SMA's, and there are now 212 SMA's rather than the 173 used in 1957, it is conservative to assume that at least 75 percent of all Federal, State, and local taxes are paid by residents of metropolitan areas.

Since these areas are the primary producers of wealth and taxes in the country, the question may well be asked, "Why do they have to come to Washington for money?" A principal reason is that these major groups of taxpayers are not able to effectively control or channel the collection and spending of the public funds which they provide. This lack of control is largely caused by the multitude of political jurisdictions acting within the SMA's, and the many limits on the powers to act of the individual units of local government. Legally, towns, cities, counties, and special districts are much better equipped to spend money handed to them from the outside than to raise and spend their own money, or to cooperate with equivalent jurisdictions in spending jointly the locally raised funds. The local government's power tends to be negative in effect rather than creative.

It is clear that SMA's do not get "free" money from Washington, since they already supply most of Washington's money.

III. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS RECEIVE LARGE PORTIONS OF THE FUNDS THEY SPEND FROM STATE AND FEDERAL SOURCES

The dependence of local governments (cities, townships, counties) on transfers of funds from the State and Federal Govern-

ments increased steadily until 1950. Since that time local revenues have increased at a slightly more rapid rate than the transfers from outside.

Year	Transfers from State and Federal sources (millions of dollars)[1]	State-Federal transfers as percent of total local government revenue
1902	$56	6.6
1922	321	8.3
1932	811	14.3
1940	1,932	27.8
1948	3,501	30.8
1950	4,428	31.6
1957	7,539	29.7

[1] Of these amounts, the direct Federal grants are less than 10 percent of the Federal-State total in all years.

The 1957 figure consists of $350 million granted directly to local governments by the Federal Government and $7,189 million transferred to them by State governments. An additional $3,523 million was granted to the States by the Federal Government. Much of this was spent in urban areas for education, public welfare, highways, etc., so that, in terms of the physical location of expenditures rather than the government unit doing the spending, the total transfers to local governments were substantially greater than the above table indicates. The ratio is probably 35 to 40 percent.

All of the above data include all local governments, both in and out of SMA's. State and Federal grants constituted 25.1 percent of the general revenues of local governments in SMA's in 1957, or 4.6 percentage points less than the ratio for all local governments. This may indicate that revenues are increasing more rapidly in the SMA's than outside. No historical trend is available.

These figures, while indicating a favorable change in trends, emphasize the relative financial weaknesses of local government as presently operated. If metropolitan regional needs of great magnitude are to be effectively dealt with by local governments, much strengthening will be necessary.

APPENDIX NOTE—METHOD OF ESTIMATING FEDERAL AND STATE TAX DISTRIBUTIONS TO SMA'S

The taxes and charges collected by the local governments in the SMA's were reported directly by SMA and by State in the census of governments. State tax and charge revenues were reported by the Census but without any geographic breakdown within the State. The Federal revenues were taken from the annual collection report of Internal Revenue Service for 1957 where the moneys are identified by the State in which the collection took place. The total of State and Federal revenues for each State were distributed between residents of SMA's and all other residents on the basis of the 1960 Census of Population. While this is a convenient method for a brief analysis such as this, the use of population has a number of disadvantages.

States: Detailed studies of the distribution by county of State revenue collections have indicated that urban taxpayers contribute about 5 to 8 percent more per capita than do rural taxpayers. Thus the State revenues from the SMA's are understated by perhaps 5 percent or more.

Federal: Although the IRS collections are reported by State many problems arise in relating such collections to the people who actually paid the taxes as consumers. Corporate income taxes, paid originally by the entire population, are concentrated as collections in a few of the States with large populations in the SMA's. On the other hand the manufacturer's excises on alcohol and tobacco products are collected in predominantly rural States although paid largely by the urban population (the latter constitutes over 70 percent of the total). For purposes of this analysis it is assumed that these defects roughly cancel out; that is, do not shift enough income among States with differing ratios of SMA population to seriously affect the suggested distributions.

Federal taxes are much more strongly alined with income than are State taxes. Therefore the Federal taxes collected in SMA's are more seriously understated by using distributions based on rural-urban population ratios than are State taxes. Average annual cash income differences between urban and rural populations range from 15 to 25 percent. It is not possible to judge the probable understatement of SMA Federal tax production without additional analysis.

While a thorough analysis of the origins of taxes and charges paid to governments would cause many changes in details, it is unlikely that the 75-percent ratio estimated for SMA's in the text would be changed more than 5 percentage points.

MASS TRANSIT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETS FEBRUARY 18

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Urban Mass Transportation Steering Committee will hold a meeting here on Tuesday, February 18, in the Housing Center on L Street. This Committee is the one set up to assist toward the enactment of the Federal mass transportation bill. All parties interested in attending the meeting are invited to do so. Further details can be obtained from ATA Headquarters in New York.

UNITED STATES TERMINATES ASSISTANCE TO ALLIES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the administration, after interminable study and a few quarterback sneaks, has reached a consensus, labored, and brought forth a brilliant coup d'etat against communism in the Western Hemisphere. This deft blow was delivered Tuesday by terminating U.S. military assistance programs to two of our stanchest European allies.

The administration has moved off dead center, but from where I sit, the villains of the piece have escaped unscathed while we have placed ourselves at the throats of our friends.

The action, in the name of anticommunism, has indicated our willingness to slap down our allies and cleave the Western alliances provided, of course, that the administration's critics are mollified and Castro is not goaded into threats of a "thermonuclear holocaust." But, of paramount importance, Mr. President, the administration has announced to the world the extent to which its alternatives of action have been reduced in meeting the challenges of the cold war.

Communist Cuba is the root of the strife to the south. The State Department, with an assist from the press, handed the Pearl of the Antilles and its 7 million inhabitants to communism on a silver platter. Now, a half decade later, comes the terrifying realization that Khrushchev and Castro have boxed the United States into a corner.

In just 5 years Khrushchev, without firing a shot or sacrificing a Russian soldier anywhere in the Caribbean, has caused us to make a mockery of our alliances, obviate our sacred trusts, and turn against the nations with which we must identify ourselves to survive. Khrushchev has bluffed, coerced, subverted, and bought a position of Soviet preeminence in the Western Hemisphere and so frightened the timid souls who execute our foreign policy that not a finger is raised against him.

In the administration's eyes our alternatives are deteriorating so rapidly that the only action we can now take against Communist aggression is against our friends and allies. We cannot chase the bear or pull the beard. We can only strike at our friends—for they will not strike back.

Mr. President, the Congress enacted the law under which the administration is directed to end aid to countries violating our facetious embargo on Cuban trade. I have no quarrel with that law. I voted for it when the foreign aid bill was passed. But, I feel it important that this question be raised: Must this legislation now become an "out" for the administration to use in circumventing a decision on the source of the violence that pervades the Western Hemisphere?

On January 31 I placed in the RECORD a speech in which I said, in regard to French recognition of Communist China:

> The tragedy of the French action is that it is a byproduct of what might be termed America's policy of "the great vacillation." U.S. policymakers had not caused us to stand firm in Europe and in our own hemisphere, and we had not guided with decisiveness the thrust of the free world against the menace of international communism.

I would hazard the opinion again, Mr. President, that had the United States conducted its foreign affairs in a manner compatible with its position and its responsibilities, and had we developed the hand-tailored opportunities in April of 1961 and October of 1962 to expel communism from Cuba, we would not today find our alternatives of action limited to striking against our allies or doing nothing at all.

I am not defending the British and French policy of trading with Castro. It is a demonstrably false policy. The British position that a fat Communist is more amenable than a lean one recalls the profundity of Neville Chamberlain when he brought peace to Europe in the 1930's only to find England in the middle of a savage war months later and his name synonymous with appeasement.

As David Wills of Three Star Extra put it last Friday:

> The British argue that a well-fed Communist, a fat and confident Communist, loses his revolutionary zeal and ceases to be a Communist. Hence, they conclude the best way to defeat the Communists is to trade with them—to feed them and to fatten them. Now the British surround their argument with an atmosphere of superior wisdom presumably gathered over the centuries while we were indifferent and inexperienced in foreign affairs. But this assumption is not supported by the facts. Before the Second World War, successive British governments were just as determined to ignore Hitler's written threats as they now are to belittle the Communist menace. Despite all warnings Chamberlain pursued appeasement until disaster was inevitable. The unequaled bravery displayed by the British when their backs were to the wall was matched only by the blindness with which they maneuvered themselves into this desperate condition. The record suggests that the British may be as wrong now in trading with Russia as they were in appeasing Hitler

* * * just as wrong in fact as we were in selling scrap iron to Japan in the thirties.

Those are strong and prophetic words. Moreover, it can be said another way, that Britain is as wrong in trading with Communist Cuba as we are in peddling our wheat to the Soviet Union for rerouting to Cuba.

Tuesday's action, although not of great importance from a dollars and cents basis, can be expected to have symbolic impact on relations with our allies.

Two English newspapers, the Daily Telegraph and the Guardian, made the most indicative remarks. The Daily Telegraph said the move "amounted to a rather undignified end to one of the historic postwar arrangements between the two countries." Both the newspapers noted the absurdity of one member of an allied triumvirate terminating its aid to the other members for an "offense" of which all three are equally culpable. The Guardian, aware of the shiver of trepidation that runs through the State Department whenever Castro's name is mentioned, correctly opinated that "the Americans merely contrive to hurt their friends without hurting Castro."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is a coincidence that a few days ago there came to my office a letter from a citizen of Columbus, Ohio, whose name I shall not identify, reciting facts giving strong corroboration to the correctness of the views which the Senator from Wyoming has just expressed.

I read from the letter:

FEBRUARY 18, 1964.

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAUSCHE: In January 1964, I spent some time in Mexico, not as a tourist, but as a member of the wedding party of a physician friend of mine. In fact, I was the best man at this wedding, which not only had a civil ceremony on one day but a religious ceremony the next. Because of this I spent considerable time in the homes of professional and business Mexicans, many of whom I have known from previous visits to Mexico. This trip was limited to visiting of friends in Mexico City and spending a few days in Taxco.

I am giving you this outline so that you will realize that what I am writing you about is not hearsay picked up by a random tourist.

The Mexican citizens with whom I came in contact are very much perturbed and bewildered at the United States so-called foreign policy. They cannot understand what has happened to our State Department. They cannot understand why a country like the United States has suddenly taken the attitude as they phrased it (of hiding under the bed whenever some small country politician said boo). This got to be very embarrassing to both my wife, our daughter, and myself because it was brought up at each place we were. They are especially concerned about the Cuban situation, as they are now being infiltrated to such a state that the Cuban agents openly work among the students at the university. They made the statement many times that they were not concerned about the older Mexican people, regardless of class, but that it was the students who were being indoctrinated and who are now beginning to raise trouble for them.

Everyone with whom I talked emphasized the fact that while Mexico was strongly pro-United States, they could not be expected to continue in that manner unless the United States did an about face and did something to regain the vast amount of lost prestige. Needless to say this is very humiliating to one, when one's very good friends bring up these problems. In fact, it has been more than humiliating to me here in the United States to see how we have deteriorated in our handling of these situations.

I spent considerable time with various physicians, many of whom teach at the great University of Mexico Medical School. They are having their problems with socialized medicine and told me that many of their top men were leaving Mexico to practice in other countries because of this situation.

Trusting this information from an interested citizen may be of some help to you in getting us (out from under the bed) I am,

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

The people of the world want to honor us. By our weakness in asserting our rights, we are making impossible the fulfillment of the will of the people of the world.

The difficulties in which we find ourselves in countless places around the world should be a matter of grave concern to every citizen of our country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the contributions made to this discussion by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. The letter which he read thoroughly accords with my views as to what is happening. Castro's Communist base in Cuba is now causing trouble all over the world, and will continue to cause increased trouble.

EARTHQUAKE AT AZORES ISLANDS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, once again tragedy has struck the Azores Islands. An earthquake hit the island of São Jorge on Tuesday, causing widespread damage and forcing at least 20,000 persons from their homes.

In 1958, when a similar calamity struck the Azores, President Kennedy, then Senator from Massachusetts, cosponsored special emergency legislation to provide nonquota immigrant visas so that some of these displaced Portugese citizens could enter the United States.

The tragedy of this week is just as great and it calls for similar compassionate action on the part of our country.

As soon as the reports are in on the extent of the damage and the number of persons rendered homeless by the catastrophe, I intend to introduce similar emergency legislation to relax the immigration quota.

I hope it will find the support of Congress.

INTIMIDATION OF SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Intimidating Senator DIRKSEN," written by William S. White and published in the Evening Star of yesterday, February 19, 1964. Mr. White, who as we all know is one of the most astute and able correspondents and columnists in the Washington newspaper field, has written a remarkably fine article.

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

INTIMIDATING SENATOR DIRKSEN

(By William S. White)

The United States has, in the old phrase, now seized the issue of civil rights. A long and bitter struggle over that bill, as already passed by the House of Representatives, now opens.

Now opens, too, the most powerful and open pressure upon a single Senator—EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois—ever applied in the memory of old Washington hands.

Senator DIRKSEN, the Republican leader of the Senate, has long been an advocate of civil rights in general. He has, however, been opposed to any unqualified grant of power to the Federal Government to compel privately owned businesses to serve Negro customers against their will. He does not like or support such discrimination. But he honestly questions whether Federal compulsion would not be an unconstitutional intrusion on the right of private property.

All the same, the proposed ban on this form of discrimination is the heart of this whole bill, as the Negro organizations now see it. To oppose it is to be treated as "against civil rights."

The Negro organizations frankly intend to drive Senator DIRKSEN from his present position of resistance on principle by the most extraordinary demonstrations against a single public officeholder ever seen in the United States since those directed a century ago against individual Senators not willing to vote a verdict of impeachment against President Andrew Johnson in the Reconstruction aftermath of the Civil War.

PERSONAL DEMONSTRATIONS

James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, has publicly declared that there will be extensive demonstrations in Illinois against the Senator personally. He has added that people will march en masse to the post offices there to file handwritten letters protesting Senator DIRKSEN's attitude.

The Senator, himself—whose courage and high sense of responsibility have rightly become familiar to a Senate which once had reason not quite so highly to regard him—has retorted:

"All the picketing they may do in my home State and all the picketing they may do here is nothing more than a form of unjustified duress to secure a judgment against my convictions." If the day should come when such pressure could force him to change honestly held convictions, he has added, on that day he would leave the Senate.

Without going at the moment into the merits and demerits of the public accommodations section of the civil rights bill, some observations are now essential.

MOBISM

This sort of naked attempted intimidation of a U.S. Senator is not a part of anybody's civil rights. It is, instead, a profound civil wrong. This is not the way of fair men in a free society. This is moral and intellectual mobism. And those who condone it, either out of a confusion of motives or a lack of courage, will live to regret a shameful surrender to hysteria and demagoguery.

What happens to Senator DIRKSEN personally in itself is important. For he has behaved with civility and honor in a high post in a forum whose whole tradition is the assumption that great public issues are

to be settled in the minds of men and not by crude menace, in whatever form it might take.

But what happens to Senator DIRKSEN as a symbol is even more important. If pressure groups, however earnestly motivated, can picket a Senator in the exercise of his duty and conscience, as though he were some industrial plant refusing a wage increase, where does the picketing stop?

Can a judge be terrorized to turn from an unpopular to a popular decision in a case at law? Can a jury be swayed in the very courtroom by the chants of pickets under the courthouse windows, or thrust from its convictions by the physical pressures of marching men shouldering and elbowing it as it goes out to lunch?

Can a somber and infinitely complicated national issue be decided by the simple process of selecting a single man of responsibility and pouring out upon him, day and night, the angry demands of one set of partisans in the dispute? Is this legislation? Or is this the thin and terrible end of a wedge that might one day be driven into the whole fabric of orderly responsibility in this Nation?

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 849, S. 2456.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2456) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:" and insert "That the sum of $71,799,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1965 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of $71,799,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1965 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:

VESSELS

For procurement of—
(1) one high-endurance cutter;
(2) six medium-endurance cutters;
(3) one coastal tender;
(4) three inland tenders;
(5) three small harbor tugs;
(6) nine small patrol cutters; and
(7) one river tender.

AIRCRAFT

For procurement of seventeen helicopters.

CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of Coast Guard installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Atlantic Coast: Offshore light platforms at Shoals and Chesapeake Bay entrance.

Missouri River: Moorings for river tender.

Air Station, Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Replace runway.

Air Detachment, Annette Island, Alaska: Family housing units and support facilities.

Detroit, Michigan: Operational facilities for helicopter detachment.

Aircraft Repair and Supply Base, Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities.

Air Detachment, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Maintenance and operational facilities.

Moorings, Mayport, Florida: Administrative, operational and maintenance facilities.

San Juan, Puerto Rico: Family housing units and support facilities.

Depot, Guam: Replace operational, administrative, and supply facilities.

Wilmington, North Carolina: Moorings for large cutter.

Base, Ketchikan, Alaska: Improve maintenance facilities.

Base, Woods Hole, Massachusetts: Improve operational and maintenance facilities.

Academy, New London, Connecticut: Field house.

Loran Station, Sitkinak, Alaska: Replace runway.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 9640.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 9640) to authorize authorizations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move to strike from H.R. 9640 all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the language of S. 2456 as it is proposed to be amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 9640) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HART, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2456 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement concerning the bill, together with an excerpt from the report.

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

STATEMENT

The purpose of this bill is to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. The committee authorized a sum of $71,799,000 to be appropriated to the U.S. Coast Guard for the fiscal year 1965.

AMENDMENT TO THE BILL

The committee amendment modified the bill in two respects. As introduced, the bill included no dollar figures for specific items authorized or for a total authorization and the bill would have permitted the Coast Guard to carry authorizations forward without fiscal year limitation for purposes of future appropriations.

When the act requiring this authorization (Public Law 88-45) was enacted, the Senate Commerce Committee report stated that one purpose of the legislation was to bring the congressional procedures affecting the Coast Guard into harmony with those relating to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It is also acknowledged that the operations of the Coast Guard involve significantly smaller appropriations and special consideration may be required to assure the necessary flexibility.

For the past several years the practice has been to enact two authorization bills annually for the Armed Forces, one primarily for procurement and research and a second for construction of military installations. The practice has been to include specific dollar figures, with limited authority for adjusted increases, on items of military construction and to provide specific dollar figures on total procurement of aircraft, missiles, and vessels. The funds are authorized with fiscal year limitations. The committee amendment to the bill, therefore, has the dual effect of placing an overall dollar limitation on the authorization and limiting the authorization to the single fiscal year 1965. The latter, of course, has no effect on the question of whether funds appropriated may be held until expended, which is a concern of the Committee on Appropriations.

The committee did not attempt at this time to establish any permanent practice in respect to future Coast Guard authorizations, but it is hoped that the legislation introduced next year will follow more closely the practices developed under the authorizations for the Armed Forces.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

This bill represents the first legislative proposal submitted by the U.S. Coast Guard to obtain authorization for appropriations pursuant to Public Law 88-45. That act, passed and approved by the President in June 1963, provides that no funds may be appropriated to the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels or aircraft or the construction of shore or offshore establishments unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by law. Public Law 88-45 gives the Coast Guard the same opportunity as is given the Armed Forces of the United States to present a construction and procurement program to Congress.

The committee received the bill on January 22 of this year. Hearings were held January 29 and the bill was ordered reported February 7. In responding promptly to this request for authorization, the committee recognizes that the responsibilities of the Coast Guard have increased by severalfold in recent years and obsolete and inadequate facilities and vessels have continued to pyramid.

ANALYSIS

Vessel replacement program

The Coast Guard construction and procurement authorizations included in this bill are parts of a comprehensive program documented in Coast Guard reports relating to the replacement and augmentation of vessels, aircraft, and shore establishments.

In respect to the authorization of vessels, the basic plan provides for a construction schedule which will, by 1975, make available to the Coast Guard an adequate fleet of serviceable and modern ships. The basic program for this year would permit the replacement of 15 vessels and the construction of 9 new augmenting vessels.

The vessel replacement program includes the construction of one 350-foot, 270-ton, high-endurance vessel; five medium-endurance vessels of 210 feet in length; one coastal tender of 157 feet; three inland tenders, two tugs, and three patrol boats of 100 feet or less.

The Coast Guard has 36 ships now classed as high-endurance vessels. These are the Coast Guard's largest and most versatile vessels. They are used in long-range search and rescue and in ocean station duty primarily. Six of these vessels are over 25 years old and all of the 36 will be at least 25 years old by 1971. The committee approved authorization for the construction of one vessel for replacement. The Coast Guard noted that a second vessel is to be reconditioned during 1965 with funds outside the authorization bill.

The Coast Guard uses the medium-endurance vessel primarily for search and rescue work immediately offshore along our coast. The Coast Guard has 30 vessels in this category that are or will be overage by 1970. The program for fiscal year 1965 authorizes the replacement of five vessels of this class with cutters of 210 feet overall in length with a maximum speed of 18.7 knots.

The Coast Guard has 26 vessels of the coastal buoy-tender class. Eleven of these ships will be obsolete by the end of 1964. At the present time two are under construction from funds previously made available. The authorization for fiscal 1965 permits the replacement of one additional vessel of this class with a tender of 157 feet overall with a maximum speed of 14 knots.

The Coast Guard uses inland buoy tenders to service navigation aids in harbors, lakes, and rivers. It employs small harbor tugs for operations in ports. The 1965 program authorizes the replacement of three obsolete inland tenders and five small harbor tugs.

Vessel augmentation program

In addition to the replacement of certain obsolete Coast Guard vessels the comprehensive vessel plan recommends the addition of a total of 31 vessels by 1975. The 1965 program includes nine of these ships. These include one medium-endurance cutter, seven patrol boats, and one river tender.

The medium-endurance cutter will be assigned primarily to fisheries patrol. In describing the need for this additional vessel, Adm. Edwin J. Rollin, Commandant of the Coast Guard, stated:

"Other missions absorb all our presently available capability for this type of work and in face of the influx of foreign vessels into traditional American fishing grounds it has become more and more urgent to put vessels on patrol in the fishing areas to enforce laws, carry out surveillance in connection with fishing activities, and provide protection for American interests on the fishing grounds."

The seven patrol boats to be constructed will be used for search and rescue purposes and close-in law enforcement work. It is anticipated that the new vessels will be stationed at Etons Neck, N.Y.; Fort Pierce and Fort Myers, Fla.; Port Hueneme, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; Petersburg, Alaska, and American Samoa. The addition of these steel-hull, small patrol crafts will complete the total requirement for this type of vessel set out in the approved plan of Coast Guard vessel requirements.

The new river tender is programed for use out of St. Joseph, Mo. The servicing of aids to navigation in the upper Missouri River was initially accomplished by the Corps of Engineers on a reimbursable basis. The new tender will permit the Coast Guard to assume this function.

Aircraft replacement program

The Coast Guard's request for authorization to purchase aircraft is based on a 5-year aviation plan. The plan requires both a schedule for replacement and a program for augmentation of the present capabilities. For the 5-year plan, 1962 through 1966, 41 replacements and 65 additional aircraft were recommended.

The replacement program will be completed by the procurement of nine helicopters as proposed by this year's authorization and five during the 1966 fiscal year. The helicopters are a new turbine-powered amphibious type which was first put in service in 1963.

Aircraft augmentation program

Sixty-three of the sixty-five additional aircraft called for by the aviation plan will be helicopters. The Coast Guard has already received appropriations for 17 of the 63. The 1965 program provides for eight additional helicopters. The new helicopters will be assigned as follows: Three to a new station in Detroit, two to Kodiak, Alaska, one to New Orleans, and two to Corpus Christi.

Construction program

This bill would authorize the Coast Guard to proceed with the construction of 15 shore and offshore establishments. These include the replacement of overage lightships at Diamond Shoals and Chesapeake Bay entrance with two offshore light platforms; the construction of mooring facilities for the Missouri River tender; the replacement of the runway at the air station at Elizabeth City, N.C.; the construction of 24 family housing units at Annette Island, Alaska; the establishment of an air detachment at Grosse Pointe, Mich.; the construction of a paint and dope shop at Elizabeth City, N.C.; the improvement of operational and maintenance facilities in San Juan, P.R.; the construction of moorings at Mayport, Fla.; the construction of family housing units at Fort Buchanan, San Juan, P.R.; the replacement of storm damaged facilities at Guam; the replacement of existing mooring facilities at Wilmington, N.C.; the improvement of facilities at Ketchikan, Alaska, and Woods Hole, Mass.; the construction of a fieldhouse at the Academy, New London, Conn.; and the improvement of the runway at Sitkinak, Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the U.S. Coast Guard provides the citizens of this Nation with heroic, unwritten 24-hour service as it patrols our coastal waters and strives to keep our fishermen and pleasure boatowners safe. As the Coast Guard works to do this, so must it be ever on the alert to protect our territorial waters against the growing encroaching of foreign fishing vessels.

In the State of Alaska the Coast Guard must patrol thousands of miles of jagged coastline. The job is not easy, but when vessels of other nations venture illegally and unwisely into our waters, it is the duty of the Coast Guard to protect our waters.

Obviously, and I have said this many times, the Coast Guard cannot be expected to do its job unless it is given the tools which are modern.

We read daily of the growth of the fishing fleets of the Soviet Union, of Japan, of Cuba, and other nations. These fleets are modern. So it is appropriate that we authorize a sum which will procure for the Coast Guard vessels and aircraft of the same or better caliber. And it is urgent that we construct shore and offshore establishments equipped to cope with the demands of this age.

The bill reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce by my able friend and colleague, Senator BARTLETT, makes authorization for the following:

Vessels:	
1 high-endurance cutter	$14,000,000
6 medium-endurance cutters	22,500,000
1 coastal tender	2,500,000
3 inland tenders	2,100,000
3 small harbor tugs	795,000
9 small patrol cutters	3,375,000
1 river tender	500,000
Total	45,770,000
Aircraft: 17 helicopters	9,350,000
Construction: Construction of shore and offshore establishments	16,679,000
Total	71,799,000

The total cost for these vessels, aircraft, and shore and offshore establishments is $71,799,000. The investment is small but the return is great.

For example, the seven patrol boats to be constructed will be used for search and rescue purposes and close-in law enforcement work. That work will be done in New York, Florida, California, Washington, Petersburg, Alaska, and American Samoa. And it can be expanded.

The construction program proposed authorizes the Coast Guard to proceed with work in 15 areas, including Annette Island, Ketchikan, and Sitkinak, Alaska.

The historical development of the work of the Coast Guard dates from 1790 when the old Revenue Cutter Service, the Life-saving Service, and Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation were amalgamated.

And the function of the Coast Guard today includes the saving and protecting of life and property, maritime law enforcement, the providing of navigational aids to maritime commerce and to trans-oceanic air commerce, the promoting of the efficiency and safety of the American merchant marine, and the readiness for military operations.

The motto of this fine service group is "Semper Paratus," which means "always ready."

That the Coast Guard has brilliantly lived up to its motto even as it has been inadequately equipped cannot be denied. That the Coast Guard will surpass its previous record when it is properly outfitted is inevitable.

I endorse the legislation which will make this possible.

I discussed the plight of the Coast Guard in protecting our coastal waters when I spoke before persons attending the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute held in Miami, Fla., on November 11, 1963.

In that speech I said:

The need for both the penalties and the extension is further demonstrated by actions of the Russian fishing fleet. Soviet vessels have repeatedly, under cover of morning fog, penetrated inside our 3-mile limit. Russian whaling vessels have taken whales well within it and have been observed doing it. When detected by plane, they have often not moved, and only with the approach of our Coast Guard vessels have they moved out. Hitherto they have had nothing to fear. The Coast Guard vessel merely escorts them outside of the 3-mile limit. Actually, if S. 1988 becomes law, we shall need faster vessels because as of now they are not fast enough to catch the Russian ships. I have repeatedly requested the administration to station faster vessels—a destroyer or two—in Alaskan waters to overtake and apprehend such violators. Up to now, we are limited to escorting them outside our waters and then making a protest to the Russian Foreign Office.

The Coast Guard is known by and closer to the people of Alaska than to the people in any other State. We cherish it. Its record of performance has been superb. We must give it the tools it needs to carry on in the face of expanding needs.

U.S. POLICIES ON VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am glad that the majority leader is in the Chamber. I hoped he would be, so that I could say a word of comment about his statement of yesterday, which is of such great interest to all of us here and to the world, concerning our posture in Vietnam. I believe it is essential that other Senators have a word to say about this very vexing subject in order to develop what in this country we always so proudly consider to be a consensus of the judgment of the people upon it.

While I sympathize deeply with the motives and the feeling which dictated the statement of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—widely interpreted as lending some aid and support to the position of President de Gaulle in respect to Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and the general situation in southeast Asia, and as bearing importantly on the debate with respect to the continuance of the American presence there—it would be most unhappy and most harmful, in my judgment, if an impression should get abroad that we have lost confidence in the fundamental reason why we are in South Vietnam or in our determination to help the Vietnamese carry on that struggle for freedom, as long as it is humanly possible to carry it on, and that we are looking for some way out; or that the American people require assurances that we are trying to find a way out because they are unhappy about what is taking place in Vietnam and reluctant to continue our assistance.

I do not for a moment believe that any such impression was sought to be created. I speak because I wish to express myself in an affirmative way, not in any negative sense, with respect to the policy which we are pursuing there. Also by expressing what I conceive to be the sentiment of the country, we shall speedily ascertain in editorial comment and in other ways in which our great democracy has a way of expressing itself, what is the sentiment of the country, and thereby generate a good debate on the subject.

A headline in the New York Times today reads: "MANSFIELD Supports Paris Effort in Asia." Senator MANSFIELD will himself in due course, I am sure, say whether that headline is justified or not. Nonetheless, it will, as I say, arouse comment. Therefore I should like to make my contribution to what I consider should be the consensus on this subject.

In the first place, I believe that the American people support the presence of the United States in Vietnam. I believe they recognize the fact that our presence there is important enough to warrant the risks which we are running. I believe that in the great understanding our people have of these grave and difficult problems, they will accept those risks—yes, even accept the casualties—if they believe there is the remotest chance in that way to keep the Communist grip from encompassing Vietnam.

Also, I believe it has been widely considered in this country—perhaps unjustly, but certainly widely considered—that if we adopted the attitude of General de Gaulle in that area, it would represent a diminution in American effort, some lessening in our support, perhaps even a decision to pull out and let the Government of South Vietnam do whatever it pleases.

It seems to me that General de Gaulle's position with respect to this situation is made possible, as General de Gaulle's positions have been made possible in so many other areas of the world, only by the fact that the United States is present and is taking the "rap." If we were not there helping to hold the line against the inundation of South Vietnam by Communists, there would be no room for the lofty preachment by General de Gaulle that somehow the whole area should be negotiated into a neutralized area. It is doubtful whether Prince Norodom Sihanouk and his administration in Cambodia would indulge in the luxury of inviting neutralization, with some hope of success, if the United States were not helping, at tremendous cost and sacrifice both of treasury and of blood, to buttress the whole area of South Vietnam.

Many of us have been terribly dismayed by the shaky position in Laos and the real uncertainty whether, within the proximate future, Communists, notwithstanding any agreement about neutralization and an armistice in terms of conflict, would not then overrun the country.

Let us remember, too, that, what we are dealing with is a Communist giant, nothing else. That Communist giant is the great, overwhelming figure that stands over everything that is happening in Asia today; and Ho Chi Minh, of North Vietnam, is nothing but a creature of Communist China.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the comments which the distinguished Senator from New York has just made. I am sorry I have not been able to follow the full content of his speech, because—as always—I know he makes a distinct contribution.

But I would say that while Communist China is a menacing shadow over all of southeast Asia—and perhaps we could say over south Asia, as well, in view of the aggressive tactics of Communist China some months ago against India—it is my belief that so far as Hanoi—North Vietnam—is concerned, based on the ancient enmity of the Vietnamese people toward China, the relationship between Hanoi and the Soviet Union may well be closer and may prove to be a mitigating factor.

I would point out that so far as General de Gaulle is concerned, to the best of my knowledge he did not indicate that Communist China should be brought into consideration in connection with all of old Indochina, but that his remarks diverged in two directions. One was recognition of Peiping, which I think was a tragic mistake, as I said yesterday; and in that respect I join in the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and others in deploring that act. Aside from what the French did on their own responsibility in that respect, and in connection with a government which is acting within those bounds, I was sorry to note that the Government of Formosa broke relations with General de Gaulle, although I understand that, in effect, that was forced by Paris, in an attempt to get away from continued French recognition of Formosa and to make possible French recognition of Peiping. That is an unfortunate situation; and I think the Nationalists by their action took President de Gaulle out of a hole in which he had inadvertently placed himself.

So far as the other divergent view—Indochina—is concerned, I think General de Gaulle, who is a man of great historic perspective, and quite often offers ideas which at least are worth consideration—whether they prove to be right or wrong, only time will tell—is aware of a deepening difficulty in that area; and certainly France, based on 80 years of experience in Laos, Cambodia, and the two Vietnams, is in a position to speak with some degree of authority.

It is true that the United States has 15,500 troops there at the present time, as "advisers." We are faced with a number of choices. We can go ahead and can increase our military commitment and can increase our resource expenditures and can carry the war to North Vietnam, and maybe into Communist China, itself, and be prepared to pay the consequences. I do not think that is the motive behind American thinking. I hope it is not.

Or we can withdraw. I think that would be just as bad a mistake, because then South Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia would be placed at the mercy of elements connected with the Communist movement.

There may be a third alternative, and it may be the suggestion advanced by De Gaulle—which may be a good one or may be a bad one; at the moment, no one can tell. But if any stability is to be brought

to South Vietnam, it is not going to be done on the basis of coup after coup after coup.

Personally, I deplore what happened to the late President Ngo Diem Dinh, who, in spite of all his faults, I thought was a good man, and who did maintain a degree of civilian control over that government. If he had his way, I think he might in time have achieved a degree of stability which would have redounded to the benefit of his country.

But if we go back to the Geneva Agreement of 1954, to which we were not signatories, we recall that that agreement partitioned Vietnam at the 17th parallel, and also contained a provision that within 2 years thereafter there would be elections, in both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, as to what the future of the country would be.

I do not endorse the election proposal in that Geneva Agreement; but, after all, we did agree—at least, by association—to a line of demarcation of the 17th parallel.

I believe that the stability of South Vietnam must be maintained; and if, for example, there is some way, based on De Gaulle's suggestion, and apart from any consideration of Peiping and recognition of Communist China, that this stability could be given a chance to enhance itself, and if Vietnam could become a more stable nation, then I think the idea, if not the proposal, is at least worth considering.

I repeat that it may be a good idea; it may be a bad idea; it may have some value; it may be worthless. But we have to have something to contrast with the choice between going all the way in or all the way out; and one of the ideas advanced in that area is such a factor as an international patrol which would guarantee a true neutrality and a true territorial integrity which would stop the flow of arms along the Ho Chi Minh trail—or by sea, which is the way they seem to be coming in at the present time—that stability perhaps to be maintained by American troops who are there, and/or perhaps by others of international agencies, so that there would be a type of neutrality based on guarantees—not on words, proposals, or promises.

So I think these statements should be made—even though they have taken a little longer than I anticipated when I asked the distinguished Senator from New York to yield—in order to indicate that a proposal coming from a quarter with which we have had differences, but with which we are still, on the whole, friendly, should not be treated casually, should not be tossed out the window; but if such an idea has merit, it should be given some consideration; and if, after study, we find that it has no merit, then it should be tossed aside.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, no one respects the majority leader more than I do. I have said that many times, and I am sure he knows that.

I rose today only to make clear what I think needs to be made clear even if that does involve a difference with the majority leader.

What I thought needed to be made clear was that the struggle which we are helping to wage in South Vietnam is understandable to the American people, and that they are determined to wage it, and that they will not stop waging it until they see a much better solution than De Gaulle's idea that he will "take care of it", and just "leave it to him." After all, he "took care of it" at Dien Bien Phu, too.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; he did not, because he was not in power at the time.

Mr. JAVITS. I am speaking about France.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But on the basis of what the distinguished Senator from New York has said, I hope he will keep in mind the other two alternatives—because he is making a distinct contribution, and we have remained silent too long on this subject.

It is all very well for the people to talk about Panama and Cyprus and the difficulties there; but perhaps the most difficult problem at the present time is the one in southeast Asia. On that basis and on the basis of the intelligence the Senator from New York always displays, I think his suggestions will be a service to the country, which is displaying great interest in this most difficult and vexatious problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the majority leader.

I point out that the minute we begin to talk about neutralization and neutralism, the backbone and the spirit could go out of the action which is being taken in this struggle. No one would intend that or desire it to happen, but such things do happen.

Therefore, I thought it important to emphasize—and to speak these words in the same forum—the determination of the American people, as I view it, to carry on the struggle in Vietnam until there is a far more viable solution.

Mr. President, let us remember that our forces are in South Korea, and have been there for 14 years; that South Korea has not been neutralized; but that, nonetheless, the confrontation between ourselves and the Communist Chinese in South Korea has been a very restraining influence upon the Communist Chinese, and will continue to be for a very long time to come.

Let us remember also in respect of Communist China that her incursion against India, her deals with Pakistan, the taking of Tibet, and her assaults, which for the moment have ceased, on Taiwan, certainly are not reassuring in terms of the intentions of Communist China, which I believe are very clear—to dominate the whole of the Asian Continent.

With all due respect to the Senator from Montana, I believe he assumes far too much when he assumes that the relations between Ho Chi Minh and Moscow are better than the relations between Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung. I believe there are many proverbs, both Eastern and Western, to the effect that the tiger at the door is much more important than the tiger in the forest.

It is inconceivable to me, and to most Americans, that Ho Chi Minh could be carrying on this guerrilla war throughout South Vietnam and Cambodia and into Laos without the friendship, support, and alliance of the Communist Chinese, who are on his doorstep, and without whom he could not survive for 20 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will go back over his history, he will recall that the enmity between Vietnam, and the Chinese to the north goes back well over 1,000 years. Much of Vietnam, and almost all of southeast Asia, were either tributary to or vassal kingdoms of the Chinese emperors.

There is an inherent fear on the part of all Vietnamese because of the nearness of China; and there is, I believe, testimony to the effect that even in recent weeks there have been exchanges of missions between Moscow and Hanoi by means of which North Vietnamese groups went to Moscow for the purpose of seeking assistance from the Soviet Union.

The Senator will recall that when the activities in Laos were being carried on by the Pathet Lao, it was not the Communist Chinese who were sending down the supplies by sea from Vladivostok and elsewhere on the Siberian coast, but it was the Soviet Union which was sending down those supplies to Haiphong, the port for Hanoi, and from there sent overland into Laos and were taken over by the Pathet Lao.

There have been no indications, I admit, that in recent months there have been any Soviet airlifts or Soviet sea trips from Vladivostok or any other ports to Hanoi. But I still think that basically the friendship is toward Moscow, and basically the enmity on the part of the Vietnamese, North and South, is still directed toward Peiping.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would not wish to be distracted from the main scene by what is a sideshow. We all know that the Poles and the Finns hate the Russians, too. Nevertheless, those people do the bidding of the Russians because they have no other choice. Be that as it may, the end point is as follows: If North Vietnam should be able to overrun South Vietnam, and thus destroy the whole position in south and southeast Asia, she would be doing an inestimable service to Communist China. That is all I am speaking about.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who has indicated that North Vietnam would seek to overrun South Vietnam? Who has brought out any indication that General Giap, an able soldier, has ever used his troops on that basis to penetrate into North Vietnam? It may be that elements of the North Vietnamese Army have penetrated into South Vietnam. I do not know.

But south of Saigon, in the Mekong Delta, there are a number of Communist Vietcong elements which do not seem to be decreasing in number, and which have been most effective in fighting the Vietnamese Army in that particular area. Of course, circumstances—geography and terrain—are on their side, as was the case in the Red River Delta outside of Hanoi when the French

were in control and tried to subjugate that area. They were unsuccessful.

The point is as follows: To the best of my knowledge, only irregular elements have been coming into South Vietnam. Perhaps certain elements of the North Vietnamese Army have also come in. Again, I do not know for certain the facts in this matter.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York has certainly not charged that which he knows nothing about as to the regular elements of the North Vietnamese Army. But it is very clear—and upon this point the Senator from New York has received ample confirmation—that the lines of supply and the base of support for what is going on in South Vietnam are in North Vietnam.

When things really became hot, as they did at one time in the northern provinces, the Communist elements moved over into North Vietman for rest, reequipment, and supply. Without that base, the whole operation of the Communists in South Vietnam would be untenable. We well know Communist technique in these wars of so-called national liberation which are fought in precisely that way. We also know that if the Communists should take over in South Vietnam, it would be as effective, from the point of view of the free world, in that there would be another Communist state which would play freely with North Vietnam and Communist China. That is the only point I am making.

I do not desire to be diverted from my main point. I believe the American people support what is being done in South Vietnam. I do not believe that the American people are in any mood to back away from it. If they are, they should not be, because though we are suffering casualties and running grave risks, the alternatives are far more dire. Let us remember that even a great nation must suffer casualties currently in order to avoid even greater casualties later. The present position in south and southeast Asia—representing still a rampart against the absolutely uncontrolled expansion of Communist China, which preaches to all its people that its ultimate aim is the destruction not only of the free world, but specifically the United States of America and its people—it seems to me is only insurance against a future which seems so foreboding in terms of the intentions at the moment which Communist China declared and reiterated for so very long.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Not yet. I shall yield in a moment. My only purpose in speaking is that on the one hand we are told that we should have a completely open mind about this area, that we should consider President de Gaulle's suggestions—and I assume those of anyone else—and also that we should be searching for new methods, new techniques, and new ways of dealing with the problem. I believe it is also important to reiterate our fortitude and determination to stay in South Vietnam and do the job, though it is costly and difficult. We should reiterate our determination to try to find a viable, freely elected government for South Vietnam, pursuing very much the same policy that we have pursued, notwithstanding reverses, in South Korea, and for the very same reasons. I merely reiterate that. I believe it is extremely important. I do not think there should be any sapping or lessening of the morale of the American people, nor do I believe that the Pentagon should be doubtful of the fortitude of the American people, or that there must be a promise that we will not pull out or they will not stick it out. That was the mistake made after World War II that was so costly to us in terms of the rise of the Communist power in Europe. It resulted in nothing but losses; and we are still licking our wounds today. We do not wish to repeat that experience in southeast Asia.

It is not necessary to have a repetition of the debate about morale, as we did with General MacArthur. It is not necessary for a determination that we must wipe out the northern base for this operation in South Vietnam. Sufficient unto the day is the work thereof.

All that must be reiterated now is that we know what we are doing. We will continue to do it. It is worth doing. No one in the Pentagon or in the Senate need have the "jitters" about it. It is high time that some people understand that the American people are adults. They understand that in order to make an omelet, some eggs must be broken.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Not yet. A little later.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I should first like to finish my thought.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has used a word which I believe needs correction.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator would permit me to finish, I should be glad to withdraw the word "jitters."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to speak in the affirmative. I love the majority leader too much to be critical. I mean that in every way. I wish to speak only in the affirmative. I think there must be cojoined with whatever he has said and whatever Secretary McNamara has said about the fact that we will bring people back from Vietnam a reiteration of the American determination to do what we are doing, even though it involves losses, to persist in doing what we are doing, to undertake our commitment and to carry it through, because it is worthwhile, and because the alternatives are greater losses, both in national terms and in terms of killed and wounded and the expenditure of treasure.

That is all that needs to be said about it. If we have both understandings, certainly the United States should always keep an open mind. I am sure the majority leader, and others, as well as I, am for our experts in the State Department and others using their ingenuity to see if they cannot come forward with a better line of policy. I have heard people raise some questions, but I think we are convinced that what we are doing is necessary and that no pullout is necessary in order to placate a feeling by some American people that we are doing the wrong thing. On the contrary, it is the right thing, and I think we must continue to do it in the national interest and in the interest of the American people.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I understand the Senator made a comparison of the United States long sojourn of 14 years in South Korea with the situation in South Vietnam. Has the Senator noted the marked difference in the attitude of the South Koreans from that of the South Vietnamese? The South Koreans were opposed to the Communists. They fought bravely and incurred many losses. The United States went in there to help those who wanted to help themselves. There seems to be a lack of will on the part of the South Vietnamese to wage a fight against the Communists. It contrasts with the will to fight of the Koreans. That is the basis of our difficulty in Vietnam. The Vietnamese show no great enthusiasm for being saved. That is why our performance there has not been as successful as it should have been. Will the Senator comment on that point?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. On the first point, I would prefer not to say that the South Vietnamese have not been willing to fight. On occasion they have shown a great intrepidity and have sustained great losses, both civilian and military. It seems to me the problem has been one of government stability and the question of whether the government has had the interests of the people at heart, which has been a blow to morale. Nevertheless, I would not try to draw a precise comparison between the South Koreans and the South Vietnamese.

I was only pointing out that we have had military programs in a dangerous spot for a long period of time, and, notwithstanding the dangers and losses, the policy has paid off, because the Communist forces have been restrained in that area of the world for a very considerable time. I was only making the analogy that we cannot look at these problems in terms of short swings. We must take the longer swings into consideration. That was the only comparison I was making.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator think that if our action in South Vietnam is not more successful than it appears to have been, we should go in there with greater strength, more manpower, and more equipment and win the war for the South Vietnamese?

Mr. JAVITS. I think I have made my views on that point very clear—that we ought to continue doing what we are doing. I am not sitting in the Pentagon and judging the strategic and tactical necessities. If I could write a one-line directive, I think it would be that we should do what we are doing. We should continue with our "instruction" in that area, and support it with highly technical assistance, and also incur the danger which is involved, which is a

help to the morale of the Vietnamese, and do our utmost to bring about a freely elected government there.

I cannot say to the Senator that I would send in a new group of instructors, or take out an old group, or increase the number from 15,500 to 16,500, or reduce it to 14,500. I do not know. That is why I have said we should continue to do what we have been doing; that the effort is worthwhile, and that the American people are backing it up, or should be; and that we should determine to cojoin our ideas, as was done in the debate engaged in yesterday, in looking at De Gaulle's neutralist ideas, and thinking of other ways to deal with the problems.

I had feared that unless our ideas were cojoined, the result might be to lead people to feel that the United States was looking for a way out.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I agree with the Senator that there should be an open mind, but I do not think anyone can state with any degree of assurance that our policy and performance in Vietnam to date have been successful. We have been in there for a long time and we have lost substantially, both in American lives, and in southeast Asia over four billion dollars in money. We are now spending at the rate of a million dollars a day. Will the Senator admit that if this situation continues much further without success, we should have an alternative? Does the Senator think that if we continue in this way we should go into that area with larger forces and see if we can win the war, instead of having a stalemate, which would go on and on with loss of American lives and substance?

Mr. JAVITS. As to the increase in forces, I think I have answered that point by saying I would continue to do what we have been doing. At least we have outlined an objective and have learned what is required to carry out that objective.

With respect to the success or lack of it, I certainly am no apologist for the administration. However, South Vietnam has not been taken over by the Communists. If that took place, it would be a disastrous rout for us. That has not happened. I do not want it to happen.

I would certainly rather have that situation than the alternative. I am sure that the Senator from Montana, as well as I, and the rest of us, would want to guard against it. That is the purpose of my making this statement. When one gives tongue to an idea, one can interest others in it, and perhaps arrive at a consensus, just as we should look at all problems with fairness, with open eyes, and try to decide on our own. But that is no "flap" for pulling out of Vietnam because certain people have determined that we should not pursue what we have been doing. That is all I have been trying to say today.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator, and also the majority leader, for their kind contributions.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator from New York has rendered a signal service to the country by a logical analysis of the situation in South Vietnam. What really concerns the top military personnel in the Pentagon is the fact that measures are not being taken which would enable them to win the war with Vietnam. I think that concerns our officials. I commend the Senator from New York.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The discussion which has taken place this afternoon has broken a long silence on affairs in Vietnam. The distinguished Senator from New York has performed a service.

I know he agrees with me when I say the answer is not an increase in forces or resources, to carry the war into North Vietnam or, for that matter, possibly into Communist China itself. I know he agrees with me that the answer is not a withdrawal of the American forces in South Vietnam at the present time. But if he agrees with me in those two respects, I believe we should keep an open mind to consider other possibilities. While we may disagree with a man of the stature of General de Gaulle from time to time—and I do, most certainly—nevertheless, I have a great respect for him because I believe he is doing for his country that which France, by and large, wishes him to do. When he does these things, he sometimes comes into disagreement with his allies; but that is his responsibility, just as what we do is our responsibility.

The mere fact that he advanced the idea covering the old associated states of French Indochina does not necessarily mean that our reaction should be to treat it in a casual way or to pay no attention to it.

I believe an open mind is a good thing. I believe discussions concerning a most difficult part of the world in which we are heavily involved are worthwhile. I believe that so far as Vietnam is concerned, it is just as important as Cuba, even though one is 10,000 miles away and the other is only 90 miles from our shores.

I point out that late news stories are to the effect that no more dependents would go to Guantanamo, and that those who are there would be brought home when their regular tours of duty were over, if not before. Perhaps we have too many dependents in South Vietnam. Perhaps a conflict of interest exists because of this fact. But I point out, if my understanding is correct, that what we have sent to South Vietnam are probably the best we have in the way of fighting men, that they are the elite of the various services, and that they all volunteered for that hazardous duty. But there is no reason why discussion should not occur. There is no reason why debate and differences on the floor of the Senate should not be stated because ways and means will have to be found not only in South Vietnam, but elsewhere throughout the world, to face the changes which occur and to try to do our best as the leader of the free world, as the Nation charged with the primary responsibility, in my opinion, in too many areas of the world, to find different answers and to face different changes in different times.

Mr. JAVITS. As to my answers in agreement or disagreement with respect to the basic posture of the Senator from Montana, I have already expressed my views in my address, and I shall let those answers stand as answers to those questions.

As to General de Gaulle, I too, have great respect for him. He was a great hero during the war. He is a great hero to his people. I deeply believe, however, that General de Gaulle could not be doing what he is doing for France unless we were around to do what we are doing for the free world, and that so long as this is a rather free ride, we had better be wary of how we operate in taking these grand suggestions.

That is the only thing I stressed in my speech—that we had better not be distracted from persevering in the basic policy in relation to the free world, and that our people, in my judgment, should support it.

That was the reason for my speaking today. I agree with the Senator from Montana that the airing of this issue is valuable.

I believe that he and I made somewhat similar speeches in regard to Berlin. The Senator from Montana first authored the suggestion with respect to some possible change or consideration of a change in the status of Berlin. He took up the issue in much the same way I am doing today, in order, if possible, to reach a consensus. I believe the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] participated in this debate, along with many other Senators. The result was a better consciousness in the United States of its policy and determination as to how to pursue it to the best effect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There was a change which resulted in the wall being created between East and West Berlin, instead of a unified Berlin, a Berlin to be the future capital of a unified Germany.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not wish to raise that problem again, but it was my view that the result might have been extremely dangerous to the continued presence in Berlin of the allies. At the time, the Russians could easily have taken over Berlin and made of it the capital of East Germany. In any case, the decision could have gone either way, in my judgment, but I believe that our debate upon the subject or consideration of the subject is helpful to the country, as I hope this one will be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Speaking of Berlin, this is one area in the world where the U.S. Government is in effect begging the Soviet authorities and the Soviet troops to remain, because we do not wish to displace them by East Germans.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that is a subject which I shall be glad to discuss at some other time; but right now I believe we had better keep our eyes fastened on the Vietnamese ball, which is serious enough.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is always a pleasure and a privilege to have the opportunity to debate and discuss issues, both foreign and domestic, with the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator for those remarks. I am pleased at his reference to me. He knows full well that I deeply feel the same way about him.

INTER-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to comment for just a few moments on what I believe to be a significant new development in the Alliance for Progress. As my friends in the Senate know, I have had a long and intense interest in the problems and opportunities in the countries closest to us. I recently returned from Europe, where I believe we made considerable progress in harnessing new resources from private sources for Latin American development through the organization I had the honor to cosponsor known as ADELA.

There is no question in my mind that what the Alliance for Progress has been lacking is multilateralism. It has been too much an American show. This is why I have been so interested in getting more European participation in the program.

Now, the Latin American countries and the United States have taken another step forward in the inevitable process of making this a true alliance, rather than merely another foreign aid program. The 20 member nations have established a small, 7-nation committee, to be headed by a distinguished Latin American chairman, Carlos Senz de Santamaria, Finance Minister of Colombia, which can convert this program from a relationship of rich uncle and poor relatives to one of free and equal partners. The new group is designed to involve our Latin American friends in the appraisal of each other's progress and performance under the criteria of the Charter of Punta del Este, instead of having this job performed by the United States. That way, it is more likely that judgments will be accepted in good grace rather than resented as dictation.

The new group is also charged with making recommendations, based on the joint appraisals and analyses, on the resources each Latin American country should generate for its development, and on the distribution of funds that become available from abroad.

The European Economic Community, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and nongovernmental organizations are invited to join the CIAP's meetings. This is, of course, in addition to the Inter-American Development Bank and other hemispheric organizations with an obvious and direct interest in the progress of the Alliance.

I believe this is a most healthy development. Only by involving all member countries in the policymaking and coordinating work on a permanent basis will this become a true Alliance. Only by doing everything to draw other industrialized countries, especially those of Western Europe and Japan, into the Latin American development programs shall we succeed in generating the resources needed for the gigantic task we have set ourselves in this hemisphere. I hope that this new organization will so operate in carrying out its responsibility that this Government, in making available U.S. funds, will be able to rely heavily on their recommendations.

Finally, only through such deep and constant involvement with us and the West European countries will our Latin American friends come to fully realize the need to provide greater opportunities for private enterprise to do its share in the development process.

The new multilateral group is indeed a welcome step forward. It will provide a forum not only for the 20 Alliance members to weld themselves into a genuine team of builders. It will also be a useful means to attract others outside the hemisphere, and to galvanize private enterprise where contributions are indispensable for developing Latin America.

I hope that we will give the new group all the support it needs. I am confident that Ted Moscoso, who will represent us in it, and for whose ability and dedication I have the highest respect, is the best man we could have picked to give it that support.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Times of February 2, entitled "New Life in the Alliance."

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

NEW LIFE FOR THE ALLIANCE

The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress has been elected and will soon be starting work. All of Latin America will watch to see whether the Alliance will, in truth as well as in theory, become a hemispheric program run by all the nations and not just by the United States.

A distinguished Latin American—Carlos Sanz de Santamaria—has been elected chairman. He is a good choice because of his caliber, his familiarity with the United States and Brazil, where he served as Ambassador, and his popularity. Mr. Santamaria evidently received some assurances that he would be able to exercise genuine authority before he accepted the post.

Much of the criticism leveled against the Alliance for Progress by Latin America has been that it is simply an instrument of U.S. politics. Unhappily, the program has been treated as such by Congress and on occasions by the State Department. When Washington wanted to punish the Dominican military junta which staged a coup last September, the Kennedy administration unilaterally stopped Alliance aid and withdrew all Alliance personnel from the Dominican Republic. The same thing seems to be happening now in the case of Panama.

The idea for the new committee, known as ICAP, was first put forward by two South American statesmen, the Brazilian Kubitschek and the Colombian Lleras Camargo. At the second annual review of the Alliance in São Paulo in November, the size and composition of the committee were agreed upon.

Since then President Johnson has overhauled his Latin-American staff at the State Department and White House, putting diplomatic, economic and Alliance affairs under Thomas Mann, who has a difficult and delicate task. He must satisfy Congress, which cut foreign aid funds so brutally; he must arrange to give the United States its due role, which has to be a very big one; and he must satisfy the Latin Americans that the Alliance for Progress really is an alliance of all active members of the Organization of American States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe the minority leader wishes to be recognized at this point, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW—READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, I wish to state that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] will read Washington's Farewell Address shortly after the Senate convenes tomorrow.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, some weeks ago I received a letter, eloquent in its simplicity, signed by the members of homeroom 15 of the Condon Junior High School in Detroit, Mich. The students wrote to tell me the reasons as they see them for action by Congress on civil rights legislation.

Sometimes the straightforward statements of young people viewing the world they live in are far more impressive and persuasive than speeches made here on this floor, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful letter from students at the Condon Junior High School in Detroit be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR HART: We are very sorry about the former President's death. He was so concerned with the civil rights bill; and would have like to have seen it pass. We

feel that the civil rights bill should be past in the remembering of President Kennedy.

So the Condon Junior High School put down some facts why the bill should pass.

1. In war all races fight side by side.
2. We feel all people should be allowed in any public place.
3. All races should be able to vote in any part of the United States.
4. Students ought to be allowed in any school.
5. A person should not be turned down in a job because of race.
6. A person should live where he wants to live.
7. All persons should be allowed to use public transportation.
8. All persons should get the same pay for the same work.
9. People should be protected from bombing, shooting and other forms of hurt by racial hatred.
10. People ought to be allowed to worship in any church they want.
11. Any race ought to be allowed to walk down the street without being criticized because of their race. We hope the bill will pass.

Sincerely yours,

Condon Junior High Homeroom 15: William Winiarski, Charlie Chisholm, Stephanie Stevenson, Charlene Tomlinson, Samuel Thompson, Brenda Flemons, David Hill, Nathaniel Black, Ernestine Griffin, Ronnie Berry, Sammie Jo Anding, Larry Clemons, Yvonne Lawrence, Kenneth Robinson, Ernestine Elam, Clarence Perkins, Doris Goldsmith, Lyonel Davis, Lucille Diane Shaw, James Sims, LaVerne Cheatham, Freddie M. Taylor, Jacqueline Howell, Marvin Lee, Nell Rose Brooks, Jean Kildy, Douglas Mitchell, Gail Puckett, Allen Peery, Carolyn Moore, Aaron Rials, Jr., Marlene Pearl Robertson, Gregory Fountain, Lancine D. Martin, Franklin D. Carter, Sherrie A. Johnson.

SCIENTISTS MELNICK AT BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE MAKE PROGRESS IN WAR ON CANCER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the battle against the deadly ravages of cancer goes on daily in scientific laboratories all over the country. Our ablest researchers are making every effort to discover the causes of this malignant disease which takes so many human lives every hour of the day.

Scientists have turned their attention to the virus for possible clues in their search for eventual control of cancer. One of the leading figures in this field, a scientist with an international reputation, who played an important role in the development of the polio vaccine, is associated with Baylor University in Houston, Tex. He is Dr. Joseph L. Melnick, chairman of the Department of Virology of Baylor's College of Medicine.

This week Dr. Melnick presented to a symposium in New York City the results of recent studies which hold out hope of an important breakthrough in the role of viruses in cancer. Dr. Melnick was assisted in these researches by his wife, Dr. Hatilda Benyesh-Melnick, who has achieved an independent reputation for her own studies. They are one of the few scientific couples who work side by side in the same laboratory. They are an excellent example of the tireless men and women who spend their lives in selfless dedication to humanity. Texas is proud to have them on the staff of one of its finest universities.

Excellent articles describing recent developments in their researches, as announced this week, have been printed in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, February 4. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1964]

PARTICLES SIMILAR TO VIRUSES ARE FOUND IN THE BLOOD OF LEUKEMIA PATIENTS

(By Robert K. Plumb)

The discovery of particles that look like viruses in the blood of children who have leukemia was reported here yesterday at a symposium on virology.

The medical scientist who made the report, Dr. Joseph L. Melnick, of the Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, declined to say flatly that his team had proved for the first time the presence of viruses in association with human cancer.

Leukemia is a form of cancer. Particles that look like viruses have been previously found in the blood of leukemia patients but have never been positively identified as viruses.

During recent years, it has become widely believed that viruses and cancer are associated. The list of viruses capable of producing cancer in animals grows almost daily.

It is known that viruses that commonly infect man can produce cancer in laboratory animals. The list includes the adenovirus, popova, and pox virus groups. But the role of viruses in human cancer remains undefined.

A difficulty is that the causative viruses may disappear after cancer develops and become "masked" or "hidden." There has been no laboratory technique for demonstrating the presence of these hidden viruses.

Associated with Dr. Melnick in new studies at Baylor were his wife, Dr. Matilda Benyesh-Melnick, Dr. Kendall Smith, and Dr. Donald Fernbach. As a model for their research they took a well-studied situation in which virus-caused leukemia occurred in fowl.

The particles the group found have been studied by an electron microscope so that physicians with an ordinary light microscope can make blood counts.

The strange particles appear to belong to a class of viruses known as the myxoviruses. About a hundred children with leukemia and children without leukemia have been studied at Baylor. The particles were found in 0 to 90 percent of the leukemic children and in fewer than 10 percent of the children without leukemia.

The group took tissue from leukemia patients and grew it to determine whether cells from the tissue would develop changes characteristic of viral infection.

In the case of leukemia and a disease called infectious mononucleosis, cultures grown out of bone marrow of children transformed spontaneously into a cell-type characteristic of leukemia.

In addition, the same kind of particle present in the blood of the patients was found in the culture fluids. The group took this to be a demonstration of their virus-like character.

Strangely, the same particles, and their ability to appear in transformed bone marrow cultures, were found in children with infectious mononucleosis.

Dr. Melnick and his associates believe they have demonstrated some similarity between leukemia and infectious mononucleosis. They have adopted as a working hypothesis the idea that, in infectious mononucleosis, antibodies are produced that in time stop the disease process. In leukemia, they believe, no antibody production occurs, and the disease progresses until the patient dies.

If a virus is shown to be the cause of leukemia, the agent might be used to produce a vaccine against leukemia, just as vaccines are used to protect against other virus diseases.

The virus symposium, held here at the Barbizon Plaza Hotel, is one of a series on virology held every 2 years by the Gustav Stern Foundation.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 4, 1964]

SCIENTISTS DISCOVER VIRUSLIKE PARTICLES IN BLOOD THAT MAY BE CAUSE OF LEUKEMIA

NEW YORK.—Scientists may have uncovered another important clue indicating viruses as a cause of the childhood type of blood cancer, leukemia.

A Houston research team, using a new technique of viewing and counting viruses, said they found large quantities of viruslike particles in the blood of about 80 percent of leukemic children studied. Similar viruslike particles were found in the blood of only about 10 percent of normal children checked in the study. The viruslike particles also were found in test tubes containing bone marrow cells from leukemic children. Bone marrow is involved in the manufacture of blood cells.

The researchers said they aren't yet positive that the particles are actually viruses. But as a result of their research and similar research findings at the National Cancer Institute in Bethesda, Md., a project will be launched by several other groups to inoculate newborn baboons and monkeys with the particles. This will be a test to discover if the particles could cause leukemia or some similar disease in the animals.

Scientists in the past few years have grown increasingly suspicious that leukemia, as well as some other cancers, might be caused by viruses. This suspicion centers mainly on the acute, childhood type of leukemia, which is usually fatal within a few months; another type, chronic leukemia, usually occurs in adults and can last for years.

Most of the evidence in the recent studies shows that the submicroscopic germs can cause leukemia in animals such as fowl and mice.

PREVENTION, TREATMENT POSSIBILITIES

So far, researchers have been unable to find evidence of a virus in human leukemia or other cancer cells. Such a discovery, however, would open up the possibility of finding a preventive or treatment of some type. Vaccines, for example, are made of killed or weakened viruses that, when injected, stimulate the body to build up an immunity to the particular disease caused by the viruses.

The finding in Houston was reported here by Dr. Joseph L. Melnick of Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston. The report, made before a meeting of virologists sponsored by the Gustav Stern Foundation, covered research by Dr. Melnick, his wife, Dr. Matilda Benyesh-Melnick, and Drs. Kendall Smith and Donald Fernbach.

Using a new technique to count viruses, the group looked at blood plasma taken from 24 children with leukemia. Examining the blood under a powerful electron microscope, they conuted large quantities of viruslike particles in blood from 19 of the children. They then looked at blood from 40 normal children and were able to find quantities of the virus particle in the blood of only 4 children.

In a related experiment, they grew bone marrow cells, taken from leukemic children, in the test tube. The bone marrow cells were chosen because the bone marrow is involved in leukemia, a disease in which a large quantity of cancerous white blood cells is produced.

In the test tube, the bone marrow cells produced cells similar to that seen in leukemia. When the researchers examined the fluid in which the bone marrow cells were grown, they found the viruslike particles. Under an electron microscope the viruslike particles appear physically similar to viruses known to cause leukemia in fowl, Dr. Melnick explained.

COOPERATIVE STUDY PLANNED

Dr. Melnick said the group couldn't say for certain that the particles they see are viruses. He also noted that whether the viruslike particles could cause disease would have to await further research. In an interview later, however, Dr. Melnick said that research at the National Cancer Institute, part of the U.S. Public Health Service, was turning up similar findings. As a result, the cooperative study among several groups would get underway with newborn baboons and monkeys to find out if the particles have disease-causing capacity. If it turns out that the animals after receiving the particles develop leukemia or some similar condition, it would mean "we're on the right track," he explained.

In the Houston study, Dr. Melnick said the group unexpectedly discovered that the blood from persons suffering infectious mononucleosis, sometimes called "kissing disease," also contained large quantities of the viruslike particles similar to those seen in the blood of leukemic children. The significance isn't certain, but Dr. Melnick noted that infectious mononucleosis, also, is a disease involving alteration of the blood. The germ that causes the disease has never been discovered.

The researcher said one tentative theory might be that both leukemia and infectious mononucleosis are caused by the same family of viruses.

Dr. Melnick's report was made primarily to describe the value of the new virus counting method. He noted there are apparently many virus diseases in which there are no known chemical or biological methods of detecting the viruses. These hidden virus diseases, he said, appear to include leukemia and infectious mononucleosis. The method of physically counting viruses holds promise in detecting possible disease-causing viruses for further experiments. "If such methods prove successful, the term 'hidden viruses' might no longer apply to human leukemia and infectious mononucleosis," he said.

NATO AND CRISIS

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, for a number of years now the North Atlantic Alliance has been divided within itself. That division has been noted by virtually all competent commentators on the European scene. It has been the subject of speeches and international debates between heads of government, defense and foreign ministers, civil servants, and parliamentarians. No person who considers himself informed on world events can be unaware of it.

This division arises essentially over the question of military strategy. But it is compounded by conflicting economic policies and alinements, by differing political goals, and so forth. These factors are all mutually interacting, with the result that a difference in any one of them may have adverse ramifications for NATO. Since the divisions within NATO are presently serious, and since they often involve views and interests of the members which, strictly speaking, may not be NATO's concern but nevertheless affect the relations between NATO members, many commentators have referred to a crisis within NATO. This term may be too strong, if a crisis is thought of as a flash-point threatening to disintegrate NATO at one stroke, but may not be too strong if one contemplates the serious breach that has developed within NATO over the past few years.

II. THE MILITARY ASPECT

The differences within NATO over military strategy are actually a product of the revolution in weaponry, and the changing military environment which that revolution has produced. American strategic thinking has undergone something resembling a total reversal over the past 3 years, although certain of its elements have remained consistent for roughly a decade. This changing thinking has clashed with European conceptions, most specifically with the politicomilitary aims of President de Gaulle. Indeed, although rival French and American strategic concepts have been highlighted since 1961, it is probably safe to say that this rivalry began with General de Gaulle's advent to power in 1958, although France actually inaugurated her drive for a nuclear capability even earlier.

At its inception, NATO's strategy was essentially simple. It was based on America's monopoly of the atomic bomb and the means to deliver it. Assuming a Soviet attack in Europe, it called for conventional forces to fight a holding action, while the finishing blow to the Soviet's home base was struck by American strategic airpower. When it proved difficult to raise the ground forces originally envisioned, NATO's force goals were trimmed, and the concept of the tripwire was elaborated. Under it, NATO's ground forces were to act as little more than a screen to determine the weight and character of a Soviet attack. If such an attack proved genuine, nuclear retaliation was to be immediate. Mr. Dulles applied the concept of retaliation to any attack on the recipient of an American guarantee. There could be no question of meeting such an attack with conventional forces. Instead, we would retaliate massively with our nuclear weapons. It is obvious that American strategy in this period, then, whether applied to Europe or other areas of the world, relied on our nuclear primacy.

This strategy of retaliation was admirably suited to protect Europe against a large-scale Soviet ground attack, so long as the United States maintained sole possession of nuclear power. In addition, it dovetailed neatly with Europe's order of priorities, for it permitted economic reconstruction behind America's nuclear shield. But when the Soviet Union began to develop its own nuclear and thermonuclear capability, the strategy began to be questioned. For one thing, it was realized that tactical nuclear weapons would not necessarily make up for the difference in manpower between Soviet and NATO forces. Assuming that the Soviet Union also developed tactical nuclear weapons, any Soviet attack would inflict huge casualties on NATO's forces, even if sustaining heavy casualties itself. NATO's slim reserves would be quickly depleted. Hence the tripwire theory diminished in acceptability as it seemed that the retaliatory strategy might require more, rather than fewer, ground troops.

The result was a shift in emphasis from the defensive to the deterrent value of nuclear weapons, accompanied by an undercurrent which began to question the credibility of any tactical nuclear response—Osgood, Robert E. "NATO: Problems of Security and Collaboration." American Political Science Review, March 1960, pp. 119–120. All of this was prior to the advent of missiles. The appearance of IRBM's may not have altered the essential strategic picture, but certainly that of ICBM's—the Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles—did. The new factor in the equation was the tremendously increased risk of massive destruction to the continental United States. There had always been the risk of considerable devastation to this country once the Soviet Union acquired a nuclear capability, and built up a bomber force with the capacity to deliver a nuclear attack. But the development of ICBM's meant that large-scale destruction within the United States was a virtual certainty in the event of nuclear attack. According to some estimates, that devastation might mean the death of half our population and the destruction of three-fourths of our cities—Gallois, Pierre M. "U.S. Strategy and the Defense of Europe." Orbis, Summer 1963, p. 228. If America had not been completely out of reach before, it was now in the front lines.

This consideration began to play an increasing role in American strategic thinking. During the latter part of the 1950's a number of writers and political opponents of the Eisenhower administration began to criticize our dependance on nuclear retaliation, asserting that we thereby committed ourselves to a course of action where even minor intrusions might eventuate in all-out nuclear war. They argued that nuclear retaliation was not necessarily appropriate as a response to the great variety of provocations which the Communists might employ. Furthermore, the Soviet Union might not regard such retaliation as credible, and hence would continue to nibble at our flanks. What the United States needed was the ability to meet something less than all-out nuclear attack with something less than an all-out response. Otherwise we might risk an unnecessary nuclear exchange, with all of its destructive consequences.

When the Kennedy administration assumed power in January of 1961 it put into effect this strategy of options and flexible response. It exhorted our NATO allies to increase their contributions to NATO's conventional forces, not only to enforce a pause in Europe during which the United States might consider its options, but also to help ease the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. Europe had heard these exhortations before, ever since the inception of NATO in fact, but had done little to satisfy them. Now, however, European suspicions were aroused. They wondered whether the United States was not asking them to bear the brunt of a conventional war without guaranteeing to come to their

assistance. Once the nuclear guarantee was suspect, it was just one step to the demand for an independent nuclear deterrent. The course that General de Gaulle has followed appeals to those within the NATO countries who hold this view.

The idea of independent deterrence is looked upon with disfavor in the United States for two basic reasons. In the first place, if the United States is to pursue a strategy of flexible response, it must retain as tight control of Western nuclear capabilities as possible. We want to be able to select that form of response that we believe is most appropriate to a given situation, and not have Europe force our hand. As it has so often been put, we want an American finger on the nuclear trigger. In the second place, the United States quite genuinely fears the spread of nuclear weapons. Not only would it diminish our control of events within the Western Alliance, but it would multiply the difficulties of peacekeeping all around the world. In more concrete terms, the wider the spread of nuclear weapons around the world, the greater the chances for the outbreak of nuclear war. At the present moment the nuclear powers include, besides ourselves, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and now presumably France. In a few years mainland China may join that group. A number of other countries have the potentiality of making nuclear weapons, Sweden for example, or Germany. Both Israel and Egypt have been reported as developing nuclear capabilities. It can readily be seen how much of a temptation nuclear weapons would pose for those seeking a quick solution to protracted or bitter rivalries. Hence U.S. concern in this regard is undoubtedly genuine.

But a considerable segment of the population and leadership of our NATO allies is skeptical of this concern. They believe it masks a simple unwillingness on the part of the United States to share effective control of the deterrent. Since their own fate is bound up with whatever decisions America might choose to make concerning the deterrent, they believe they should be given a much greater measure of control over decisions involving its deployment and use. This demand took shape a number of years ago, and was advanced by various NATO governments prior to the change of administration in 1961. Yet under the spur of the French example, these demands have become more insistent in recent years.

The thesis of those Europeans opposed to American NATO strategy is roughly as follows: Europe can no longer rely on America's commitment to come to its defense. In a crisis the United States may well decide that it is not going to suffer catastrophic destruction in order to preserve Western European freedom and independence. Furthermore, since Europe is tightly packed, with little room to spare, its chances of surviving a nuclear blow are far less than those of the United States. As a consequence Europe must develop its own nuclear force, of sufficient strength not only to retaliate against a Soviet nuclear strike, but to prevent it from happening in the first place. This means that any European—or French—deterrent must be sufficiently credible to the Soviet Union as actually to deter. Secretary McNamara is on record as questioning the credibility of any such deterrent—Speech of Secretary McNamara, Ann Arbor, Mich., June 16, 1962. Department of Defense, Office of Public Affairs, No. 908–62.

Indeed. if a major antagonist should believe that there was a substantial likelihood of its being used independently, it was his view that such a force might actually invite a preemptive strike. Using such a small nuclear force against cities of a major nuclear power would be tantamount to suicide, and its employment against significant military targets would have a negligible effect on the outcome of any conflict. In thus voicing administration views, Secretary McNamara threw down the gauntlet to De Gaulle.

This divergence in strategy between the United States and Gaullist France is at the heart of the difficulties now plaguing NATO. At times this quarrel has taken on overtones of bitterness, with neither side wishing to yield any concessions to the other. The United States has been particularly incensed by the French questioning of our good faith, and by French intimations that they want to have the power to trigger nuclear war if necessary in order to commit America to massive intervention on their behalf. Paraphrasing a recent sentence of Louis Halle, the French President, employing his own deterrent would have virtually the same power as the American President to detonate our deterrent—Halle, Louis J., "The Wrangle Over Strategy," the New Republic, January 18, 1964, page 20.

President de Gaulle's policies are the most dramatic manifestation of an increased concern of NATO's European members for a greater voice in alliance decisions involving nuclear weapons. Several American proposals have sought to relieve this concern, but since we have been reluctant to permit many fingers on the nuclear trigger, these proposals have not evoked an enthusiastic response. During 1958 and 1959, we deployed Thor and Jupiter missiles in Britain, Italy, and Turkey, but not on the territory of any other member of the alliance. Next, we offered to sell ballistic missiles to Europe, while keeping custody of the warheads, but this idea found little acceptance. Then, in December 1960, at the NATO foreign ministers' meeting in Paris, Secretary of State Herter proposed consideration of the establishment of a medium-range sea-based ballistic missile force. Under the plan, the United States would commit 5 Polaris submarines, each carrying 18 missiles, to NATO before the end of 1963. In return, our NATO allies were to buy 100 more missiles from the United States. A plan for joint control of this force would then be worked out.

After the Kennedy administration assumed office, Secretary Rusk renewed this commitment. In May of 1962, five Polaris submarines were earmarked for NATO. But the project went no further, for in the summer of 1962 the administration decided that a surface fleet was a preferable method for any multilateral experiment. As presently conceived, such a force would consist of 25 surface ships, each carrying 8 Polaris missiles. This would make a force of 200 missiles in all. The crews of these ships would be mixed, representing at least three nations, with the United States one of these in every case. The estimated total cost of such a force would be $4 to $6 billion, spread out over an 8- to 10-year period, with the greater part to be borne by the United States and West Germany. The ships and supporting bases for this force would require a 10,000-man force. It would be under the overall command of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. Close liaison would be maintained by NATO, the U.S. Strategic Air Command, and Britain's Bomber Command, and European officers would participate in target planning at SAC Headquarters—Congressional Quarterly, week ending July 5, 1963, page 1083.

At about the time that the United States was coming to the decision to press for a multilateral surface force as the means of satisfying pressures within NATO, it was also in the process of deciding to abandon Skybolt. Since Britain had pinned her defenses to this standoff missile, which was fired from an aircraft, the United States appeared to have pulled the rug from under Britain's independent deterrent. Britain's reaction was one of great consternation and anger, and Anglo-American relations were severely strained, at least for a short time. The upshot of this controversy was the Nassau agreement of December 1962, under which the United States was to make Polaris missiles available to Britain, while Britain would supply the nuclear warheads and the submarines to carry the missile systems. Although this British force and equivalent American forces were to be included in a projected NATO nuclear force, Britain was to retain control of this nuclear deterrent in the event supreme national interests required it.

Since the Nassau agreement spoke of assigning Polaris submarines to a NATO force, it implied that a mutual deterrent force would include undersea as well as surface vessels. With our more recent emphasis on a surface fleet, it is not clear whether the current conception still includes both types of vessels, although that is probably the case—at least one knowledgeable commentator, Alastair Buchan, has stated unequivocally that the multilateral force would include undersea and surface ships. See his "The Control of Western Strategy." Royal United Service Institution Journal. November 1963, page 305.

If we are to be precise, we must distinguish the multilateral from the multinational force. A multilateral force implies an integrated arm, including crews of mixed nationalities on missile carrying ships, such ships to be under a common command. A multinational force, on the other hand, would group the countries which have either nuclear weapons of their own or important nuclear delivery vehicles into a special relationship in NATO, for purposes of planning. While joint action is implied, it would be joint action by allies, but by

separate and independent national forces. The United States has championed the multilateral idea, although it has been suggested that France and even Britain, which presented the multinational idea at Nassau—ibidem—might prefer the multinational approach.

The dispute with Britain arising from the cancellation of Skybolt could not help having an impact on NATO as a whole. For one thing, it gave added force to the position of De Gaulle, who could point to the dangers of pinning one's defense on the United States. For another, it undermined the British claim to a special relationship with the United States, a claim deriving in part from Britain's possession of a nuclear capability.

The United States made the same offer to France that it had made to Britain at Nassau; but President de Gaulle rejected it, on the ground that France had neither the warheads nor the submarines to carry Polaris. He restated France's intentions of pressing on with her program for an independent deterrent, a force de frappe. He may well have been strengthened in his resolve by the Skybolt affair, despite his prior resentment at Anglo-American nuclear collaboration and French exclusion therefrom. Such resentment, while understandable, overlooks the fact that Britain attained her nuclear capability without special assistance from the United States, having built up a backlog of knowledge during the joint wartime effort to develop the atomic bomb. But if De Gaulle enjoyed British discomfiture, his official posture was correct. All in all, the Skybolt incident hardly reflected credit on U.S. leadership of the alliance, and indeed may have led to a temporary decline in allied confidence in such leadership.

Confidence has not been fully restored by the multilateral surface force plan. Most of NATO's members feel the plan is impractical; and strong criticism of it has been voiced in the European press and in some official circles. British naval officers are said to be particularly skeptical. However, the United States can truthfully point out, in reply, that despite its repeated invitations, the European members of NATO have never advanced any precise and careful plans for sharing nuclear control.

So far as conventional military forces are concerned, the problem remains what it always has been—the reluctance of NATO's members to meet their commitments. Britain has been talking of cutting down, and even withdrawing, her Army of the Rhine. French troops assigned to NATO fall short of programed strength. Part of the problem is economic, but a greater part of it may well lie in the rather widespread European belief that any war with the Soviet Union would be bound to be a nuclear holocaust; and that if this is so, there is not much point in building up conventional forces.

One country which has not not followed this philosophy is West Germany, which, along with the United States, furnishes most of the ground troops for NATO's crucial central front. This puts the Germans in a position to demand nuclear equality, a demand which the United States well realizes might shatter the alliance. It was in at least partial anticipation of such a demand—to forestall the controversy that nuclear arms for Germany would be sure to provoke, while at the same time honoring legitimate German interests—that the United States put forward the multilateral deterrent force plan. Germany may protest that she has no intention of asking for nuclear arms; but the Gaullist drive for an independent nuclear force could weaken her resolve. Certainly this is a strong argument in the American arsenal against French nuclear aspirations.

A final military problem is posed by the generally cool attitude of France toward NATO. In 1959, France withdrew her Mediterranean fleet from NATO control; and in June of 1963, she took similar action with her North Atlantic fleet. In 1958 and 1959, France refused to integrate her tactical air forces with the rest of NATO. In 1960, she agreed to unify such forces in the forward area only—that is, in a zone on either side of the Franco-German frontier. It was only after this French action that a unified air defense system running from Turkey to Norway was established by NATO.

One might conclude, then, that for the past 3 years the strategic problems within NATO have become intensified, and no satisfactory solution for these problems has yet been found. It has been suggested that one of the reasons for this intensified conflict was the increased lack of consultation between the United States and its NATO allies in the actual formulation of that strategy—Buchan, Alastair, "Partners and Allies," Foreign Affairs, July 1963, page 632. Thus, the doctrine of "controlled nuclear response" arose out of American discussions, and was presented to the Europeans as a fait accompli. This only served to nurture European suspicions—Buchan, Alastair, "Partners and Allies," Foreign Affairs, July 1963, page 632.

III. POLITICAL ABRASIONS

Since its inception, a number of political disputes have arisen within NATO. The one issue that most consistently entangled the United States was colonialism, with the United States favoring independence for particular dependent areas when such independence was opposed by the metropolitan power, which also happened to be a NATO member. Thus, we clashed with France, over Algeria; and with Belgium, over the Congo. For the past 3 years such a clash has infected relations between this country and Portugal. In 1961, the United States voted with the Soviet Union in the United Nations Security Council for a resolution calling for an inquiry into conditions in Angola. Then we voted for a General Assembly resolution calling upon Portugal to institute reforms in Angola. Portugal also deplored our failure to take stronger action against the Indian seizure of Goa, a Portuguese territory on India's coast. The dilemma for U.S. policy was summed up by Arthur Krock as follows:

> The perplexity of the U.S. Government created by the latest Afro-Asian activity in the U.N. against the Portuguese in Angola grows out of policies which require the Kennedy administration to try simultaneously to ride two horses galloping in opposite directions. Our fundamental military alliance in NATO, and its strength depend greatly on the unity which this Government is ever urging. Our fundamental diplomatic policy is to demonstrate by votes in the U.N. and otherwise that the United States unreservedly supports movements for the independence of people everywhere. (New York Times, June 8, 1961.)

The United States has never fully extricated itself from this predicament.

Portuguese sovereignty over the Azores, where the United States has had bases since World War II, put them in a position to exercise considerable leverage when the United States sought an extension of these base rights. Because of our desire to have the agreement extended without a prohibitive increase in the Portuguese asking price, either political or financial, even though the bases are less important than formerly, we backtracked somewhat from our previous stand on Angola, abstaining from a vote on a Security Council resolution calling upon Portugal to grant independence to her African colonies. This action, as might have been expected, satisfied neither the Portuguese nor the Africans. When our lease on the Azores bases expired at the end of 1962 the Portuguese let us stay on, pending a new settlement. We are still there on this somewhat unsatisfactory ad hoc basis. There seems little doubt that the Portuguese inclination to drag matters out is directly related to their dissatisfaction over U.S. policy regarding their African possessions.

Just as the importance of Portugal within NATO was pointed up during 1962–63, so was that of her Iberian neighbor, Spain. Spain is not a member of NATO; but the United States maintains there bases which play an important part in NATO strategy. The defense pact under which the United States exercised its rights to these bases expired in September 1963. It was renewed for a 5-year period, but not until after concern had been expressed over possible Spanish exploitation of her position to gain admission to NATO, or at least to effect a closer association with the alliance. Formal Spanish application for admission would have elicited formal Scandinavian opposition, and perhaps split the alliance. That such an application was not made is due, at least in part, to the buildup of Polaris and other missile forces, and the subsequent decline in importance of Spanish air bases. But Spain did not come off too badly in the base negotiations. In a joint statement of Secretary Rusk and the Spanish Foreign Minister the United States affirmed its recognition of the importance of Spain to the security, well-being, and development of the Atlantic and Mediterranean areas. There is to be a joint consultative committee on defense, with headquarters in Madrid. A threat to either country is a matter of common concern, and both countries recognize that the security of each of them is necessary to the common security. If this agreement does not admit Spain to NATO directly, it nevertheless appears

to amount, as the French paper Le Monde pointed out, to a military pact which is not formally called one—Le Monde, September 28, 1963. As such, it can have a definite bearing on NATO policy at some future date.

At the present moment the political problem most threatening to NATO is the quarrel between the Greeks and Turks on Cyprus. The particulars of that quarrel need not concern us here. The United States was asked by Britain, along with West Germany, France, and Italy, to supply troops for a NATO peacekeeping force on Cyprus. We were reluctant to become involved, but agreed provisionally to go along. But the plan is now dead because the Cyprus Government refused to accept it. Apparently the Cyprus Government did not like the idea of any NATO force, because Turkey is a NATO member, and under the 1960 Constitution of Cyprus, Turkey, Greece, and Britain as guarantors of Cyprus' independence, each may intervene in Cypriot affairs.

At any rate, Cyprus and Britain addressed an urgent appeal to the U.N., and the problem is now in the hands of the Security Council. It has been reported that a plan advanced by U Thant, the Secretary General, has found favor, and stands a good chance of acceptance. This plan calls for an international force to maintain the peace in Cyprus, and the appointment of a neutral mediator who would seek a long-range political settlement. From the Cypriot point of view the essential thing is, at the very least, a declaration of respect for Cyprus' sovereignty. At the maximum they would like a repudiation of those provisions giving Greece, Turkey, and Britain the right to intervene.

The United States, and indeed all other members of NATO, must proceed with caution in this dispute, lest it get out of hand and blow apart NATO's eastern flank. If nothing else, the dispute is instructive in pointing out that NATO is anything but a monolithic structure. Unfortunately it also highlights Britain's conventional weakness, for her troops have been stretched so thin by a succession of crises that she was forced to turn to her fellow NATO members for assistance lest she further deplete her already undermanned forces in Germany. Despite the decline in British conventional strength furthermore, there is little likelihood of the present Conservative or of a possible future Labor government instituting conscription.

If the Cyprus quarrel is presently the most severe within NATO that should not obscure the fact that Franco-United States disagreements characterize the political as well as the military sphere. On January 22, 1963, a treaty of cooperation was signed between France and Germany, which was ratified in May by the German Bundestag and in June by the French National Assembly. This treaty signalized the French desire to play an independent political, as well as military, role. On the German side this treaty was largely the doing of former Chancellor Adenauer, who reportedly was unhappy with what he believed to be a more flexible attitude of the Kennedy administration toward Berlin. It is also conceivable that the Chancellor had been won over to the view that Europe must have its own nuclear deterrent, and believed that joining forces with De Gaulle might help bring this about. But whatever Adenauer's motivation, it seems fairly clear that the Bundestag was not too happy with the arrangement, for it ratified the treaty with a preamble reaffirming German commitments to the United States, to NATO, to the unification of Germany, and to the unification of Western Europe through the integration of Britain and other countries wishing to join. Other German leaders, such as the present Chancellor, Erhard, Foreign Minister Schroeder, and President Lubke were all known to be uneasy at this tack in German policy. For while under other circumstances a Franco-German rapprochement might give cause for satisfaction, under present circumstances, with De Gaulle mistrustful of American leadership and determined to pursue his own policy, it gave cause for anxiety. For one thing, these leaders believed, Germany should not be drawn into any Franco-American quarrel. For another, it seemed obvious that the French connection could provide no real substitute for the American guarantees that are vital to West German security.

In any event it does not appear likely that the Franco-German Treaty will be a touchstone of Bonn's policy, now that Dr. Adenauer has left the scene. This is apparently the case not only because Germany wants American nuclear protection, but also because the German interest in reunification seems rather unlikely to be advanced by a Gaullist orientation to her policy. This does not mean the end to French foreign policy initiatives, some of which we are going to deem inimical to our interests. The recognition of Communist China and the suggestion for the neutralization of Vietnam are two current illustrations. As long as France desires to play a more active role on the world stage we may expect such periodic eruptions, with concomitant strains on NATO.

IV. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Throughout its existence NATO has been necessarily concerned with economic problems which might adversely affect the defense effort. First and foremost was the simple fact of the economic burden the NATO defense effort imposed on its members. Then followed the related problems of rising prices, possible inflation, imbalance of payments, difficulties in the procurement and distribution of raw materials, and so forth. While there was a certain amount of grumbling over the economic requirements of NATO, and indeed the reluctance to meet force goals can be attributed partially to this factor, the difficulties enumerated did not cause any major breach within NATO.

But NATO could not escape repercussions arising from the attempt to unite Europe economically. In particular, it is undeniable that French rejection of Britain's bid for entry into the Common Market a year ago—although technically the negotiations concerned the establishment of conditions for entry—imposed a severe strain on Franco-British relations and thus indirectly on NATO, to which each of the Six belong. Although the Common Market did not break up, and indeed the other members opposed the French action, the drive for European integration did lose momentum. Furthermore the French decision meant the perpetuation of Western Europe's division into two economic camps, with leading NATO members in each.

Other pronouncements of President de Gaulle relative to the economic affairs of the Common Market have caused some uneasiness among the other members, particularly a statement of last July 29 in which he said that at the forthcoming round of tariff negotiations between the United States and Europe the Common Market must either stand on its own feet or it must disappear. This was coupled with a statement that Europe must assure its own food supplies, which was taken to mean that France must have an assured market for her agricultural produce within the Common Market.

But generally speaking, agricultural policy within the Common Market is not, at this writing, a major source of stress within NATO. Rather, difficulties arose between the United States and the Common Market, and it was these which for a time threatened to engender unwonted bitterness.

These difficulties, embodied in the so-called chicken war, had their origin in the EEC's implementation of the first phases of its common agricultural policy. As part of this process, the Market raised its ad valorem duties on American poultry from 15 percent to 45 percent. The United States estimated that this would cause damages to American poultry exports amounting to $46 million. The EEC assessed the damages at far less, and argued that in any event community poultry producers were fast adopting U.S. mass production methods, and that as a result we were going to lose much of our European market fairly soon, anyway. With the Common Market standing adamant, the United States took steps to retaliate, by withdrawing trade concessions on a number of commodities to make up for the estimated losses to our poultry industry. Eventually the Common Market accepted mediation of the dispute by a special GATT panel, as we had earlier proposed. That panel fixed the damage to the United States at $26 million, rather than $46 million. This was a great deal closer to the market estimate of $19 million than to our own figure. This past January the United States withdrew trade concessions to EEC countries equal to the value of this particular loss. Thus while the matter has been smoothed over, there has been a certain decline in confidence in this country over the direction the EEC might be taking. Obviously, this could complicate our relations within NATO.

One reason for U.S. vehemence against the increase in poultry tariffs lay in the difficult U.S. balance-of-payments position. The United States has continued to insist that its European allies pay a greater share of both the defense and

foreign aid load as a means of reducing our unfavorable balance-of-payments position and the consequent gold outflow. Our allies have generally stepped up their expenditures in these areas, particularly with respect to foreign aid, but in our view their efforts have not been commensurate with what their booming economies can support. This question has been a continuing source of friction within NATO, that was highlighted during the Kennedy administration, and may be again in the future.

V. SOME PARTING THOUGHTS

NATO is beset with problems, so much so that some people predict its dissolution. Yet it has never been free of problems from the moment the rearmament of Germany was decided upon. In the past few years differences over strategy and over the control—in the sense of the right of review—to be exercised by our European allies with respect to nuclear weapons, have perhaps been exacerbated. This is due primarily to the clash fostered by the French belief in the need for their own deterrent system, and the American feeling that we must maintain as close control as possible over the decision to employ nuclear weapons if our strategy of flexible response is to be viable. This strategic argument is complicated by political and economic problems which in themselves are considerable sources of internal NATO division. The plan America is advocating to accommodate allied insistence on sharing control of nuclear strategy, that is the multilateral seaborne force, appears to have a less than 50–50 chance of adoption by NATO. Even if it is eventually accepted, France will probably continue to construct her own nuclear force and go her own independent way. If it is not adopted, NATO will continue to be plagued by the necessity of finding some feasible method of sharing nuclear control. In either case, the waters of NATO will probably be roiled for some time to come.

VI. A CALL FOR A NATO SUMMIT CONFERENCE

I have discussed, briefly some of the history of NATO, and, more particularly some of the problems which beset the alliance at present. These problems are very real, and they must be met. It is most appropriate, therefore, that we seek means through which solutions to them might be found.

If we desire to lead the West from wisdom as well as from strength, now is the time. This means, as I see it, a NATO summit conference, a conference which we should call. That conference should be held as quickly as it can be organized and the necessary staff work done.

We cannot afford to let NATO drift. Nor should we permit the call for such a conference to originate in another quarter—let us say the French quarter. If it does, wounded pride might dictate our rejection, and wounded pride seldom makes for wise decisions. Most of all, we should not wait until particular quarrels and irritations boil up into one grand crisis. If that happens, any conference we call would meet hastily, under extreme pressure, with ill-prepared positions. Its chances for success would hence be very slim.

No, we should not respond after the situation has gotten out of hand, as has all too often been the case in the years since World War II ended. We should seize the initiative. A call for a NATO summit conference would proclaim our concern with the state of the alliance, our realization that our policies, however well conceived in terms of our own interest, do not necessarily satisfy the interests of the alliance as a whole. Or, if we believe they honestly do, a NATO summit conference would give us a platform, which we would have to use most thoroughly and carefully, to explain to our allies why we think this way.

I would like to see the United States resume its leadership of the West, a leadership which can be respected and admired, rather than simply borne with. A NATO summit conference would be the first step in that direction.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a couple of comments and then a question or two?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. First of all, I have been listening with great interest to the Senator's analytical summary of the problems we have in NATO. There is no doubt that those problems exist. There is no doubt that they have increased in the last 2 or 3 years. I had the opportunity, a couple of years ago, of visiting a good many of the NATO bases. It became apparent, in the process of visiting the military bases, that many of the nationals in them, including the Turks and Greeks, who have been historic enemies, were working very well together in a combined effort to try to offset the Communist pressure we were having on all flanks. But it also became clear to me that the political pressures were not solved.

During this process, I got to Spain. It was a great surprise to me to learn that, although Spain is not one of the NATO countries, nevertheless her armed forces were maneuvering in conjunction with the NATO forces. Her military maneuvers were apparently under Spain's own auspices and obviously, under her own command, but she had the definite intention of cooperating with the NATO forces to help us, if called upon. I thought it was very interesting.

I was also interested in the comments of the Senator from Vermont on agricultural problems with the European Economic Community, with particular reference to the chicken problem. I believe the Senator stated that our Government has said we would lose $46 million if the treaty were used, and GATT said we would lose $26 million. I was interested because recently we entered into a voluntary agreement with the Australians and New Zealanders so far as livestock importations into this country are concerned. The State Department has gone ahead and entered into these negotiations for the agreement, under which the Australians and the New Zealanders will be permitted to bring into this country a little over 10 percent of the total amount of livestock produced for consumers in this country. This is an increase of some 85 percent over what we were importing in 1960.

It builds into our economy a leverage for the Australians and New Zealanders and their livestock which at the present moment is costing our own national economy $2 billion. Not $26 million but $2 billion.

Mr. PROUTY. I believe the Senator from Colorado should emphasize that point once more. So let me help him by asking the question: Did the Senator say $2 billion?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes; I said $2 billion. This is the direct loss which the economy will suffer in terms of the agreement entered into.

It strikes me that somewhere along the line we must not only try to do something to expand our exports, but also we must be realistic enough to recognize that if all the other countries come into our country and use our country as a primary market for their production, our own domestic production will be at least reduced and may be eliminated—at least curtailed to such an extent that the unemployment level in this country, which we are trying to lower, will be seriously affected. This, I believe, the State Department and those in favor of the idea have not really come to grips with yet.

On trade with Communist countries, which is another subject, I wish to ask a question. Section 2 of the NATO Agreement permits us to call a conference on an overall trade agreement, including the agreed on policies on trade with Communist countries. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not have the charter before me, but I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have been trying to urge a policy under which we could have some kind of conference, such as the Senator from Vermont has just called for, on trade with Communist countries. It seems to me that the type of conference among the NATO countries at the high level of which the Senator from Vermont is speaking would be a magnificent forum to make a start. At the moment, we are going in every direction at once.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure that would be a conference that would be germane, and one about which the American people and the American Government should be much concerned. We see what has happened in connection with shipments to Cuba and other Communist countries by our Western Allies. It is a matter which disturbs most of us in this country. A conference would afford an opportunity to stress our point of view and try to persuade our allies that it is in their interest, as well as ours, to reduce those shipments quite considerably.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont. He has rendered a great service with his analysis. It gives the Senate the historical

background on the situation we are facing and the problems that lie ahead.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 1153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101) is amended:

(1) by striking out the designation "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(2) by inserting "(except advance planning and engineering for which specific grants have been made)" immediately after "specifications" in paragraph (6);

(3) by striking out "and the Virgin Islands" in paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof "the Virgin Islands, and Guam";

(4) by inserting "of the advance planning and engineering costs or" immediately after "portion" in paragraph (10);

(5) by inserting "the United States Air Force," immediately after "Navy," in paragraph (11); and

(6) by striking out the subsection heading "Airport Classifications" and all of subsection (b).

SEC. 2. Section 3(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1102(b)) is amended:

(1) by striking out the phrase "War and Navy Departments" wherever it appears in the subsection heading and text and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Defense"; and

(2) by striking out "such Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department".

SEC. 3. Section 4(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1103(a)) is amended by inserting "and for advance planning and engineering therefor" immediately after "airport development".

SEC. 4. Section 5(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(4) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in the several States, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $199,500,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $66,500,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, and shall continue to be so available until expended.

"(5) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $4,500,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $1,500,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, and shall continue to be so available until expended. Of each such amount, 40 per centum shall be available for Hawaii, 40 per centum shall be available for Puerto Rico, and 20 per centum shall be available for the Virgin Islands.

"(6) For the purpose of developing, in the several States, airports the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion at airports having high density of traffic serving other segments of aviation, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act for such purpose, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $21,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $7,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, and shall continue to be so available until expended."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 6(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or 5(d)(1)" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ", 5(d)(1), or 5(d)(4)"; and

(2) by inserting "for advance planning and engineering or" immediately after "grants" in the second sentence.

(b) Section 6(b)(1) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and 5(d)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 5(d)(1), and 5(d)(4)"; and

(2) by striking out "section 5(d)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 5(d)(3) and 5(d)(6)".

(c) Section 6(b)(2) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "for advance planning and engineering grants or" immediately after "available" in the first sentence;

(2) by inserting "advance planning and engineering or" immediately before "projects" in the second sentence; and

(3) by striking out "and the Virgin Islands" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "the Virgin Islands, and Guam".

(d) Section 6(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(c)) is amended by inserting "advance planning and engineering and" immediately before "projects".

SEC. 6. Section 7 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1106) is amended—

(1) by inserting in the section heading "ADVANCE PLANNING AND ENGINEERING AND" immediately before "PROJECTS";

(2) by inserting "advance planning and engineering and" immediately before "projects" where it first appears in the text; and

(2) by inserting "advance planning and engineering costs or" immediately after "United States share".

SEC. 7. Immediately after section 7 of such Act, insert the following new section:

"ADVANCE PLANNING AND ENGINEERING GRANTS

"SEC. 8. For the purpose of developing airport layout plans and plans designed to lead to a project application, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to sponsors, based upon approved advance planning and engineering proposals, for not more than 66⅔ per centum of the estimated cost thereof. For the purposes of this section, 'airport layout plan' means a plan for an airport showing boundaries and proposed additions to all areas owned or controlled by the sponsor for airport purposes, the location and nature of existing and proposed airport facilities and structures, and the location on the airport of existing and proposed nonaviation areas and improvements thereon."

SEC. 8. (a) The section heading of section 9 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108) is amended by inserting "ADVANCE PLANNING AND ENGINEERING PROPOSALS AND" immediately before "PROJECTS".

(c) Section 9(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(a)) is amended by inserting "an advance planning and engineering proposal or" immediately after "Administrator" where it first appears in the first sentence.

(c) Section 9(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "submission of a project" and inserting in lieu thereof "submission of an advance planning and engineering proposal or a project"; and

(2) by inserting "advance planning and engineering proposal or" immediately before "project" the second time it appears.

(d) Section 9(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "submission of a project" and inserting in lieu thereof "submission of an advance planning and engineering proposal or a project"; and

(2) by inserting "Guam," immediately after "the Virgin Islands,".

(e) The first sentence of section 9(d)(1) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows: "All such projects and advance planning and engineering proposals shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if he is satisfied that the project or advance planning and engineering proposal is not inconsistent with plans (existing at the time of approval of the project or advance planning and engineering proposal) of public agencies for the development of the area in which the airport is located and will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of this Act, that sufficient funds are available for that portion of the project or planning and engineering costs which are not to be paid by the United States under this Act, that the project or planning and engineering will be completed without undue delay, that the public agency or public agencies which submitted the project application or planning and engineering proposal have legal authority to engage in the airport development as proposed, and that all project sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this Act have been or will be met."

SEC. 9. (a) Section 10(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"General Provision

"SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the United States share payable on account of any approved project under this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs."

(b) Section 10(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(a)) is amended by striking out "(1); and the maximum United States share under subsection (a)(2),".

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended by striking out the parentheses and all words within the parentheses and inserting ", not to exceed 75 per centum,".

SEC. 10. Section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1110) is amended:

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as paragraphs (5) through (9), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations including landing and take-off of aircraft;";

(2) by striking out "(5)" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(6)"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Except for the purpose of carrying out a provision of law specifically set forth in this Act or in another Act of Congress, no rule, regulation, requirement, restriction, or order heretofore or hereafter issued, established, proclaimed, or published by any officer, employee, department, agency, or establishment in, of, or under the executive branch of the Government shall apply to the construction, maintenance, operation, or administration of any airport or project with respect to which funds have been or may be obligated or expended under this Act."

SEC. 11. Section 12 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1111) is amended—

(1) by amending the first sentence to read as follows: "Upon approving an advance planning and engineering proposal or a project application, the Administrator, on behalf of the United States, shall transmit to the sponsor or sponsors of the advance planning and engineering proposal or project application an offer to pay the United States share of the planning and engineering costs or allowable project costs.";

(2) by striking out "of the project" where it appears in the third sentence; and

(3) by amending the last sentence to read as follows: "Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the costs which have been or may be incurred."

SEC. 12. Section 14 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1113) is amended—

(1) by inserting "advance planning and engineering costs or" immediately before "allowable" in the second sentence;

(2) by striking out "of the project" each place it appears in the second and third sentences;

(3) by inserting "advance planning and engineering or" immediately before "airport development" each place it appears in the second and fourth sentences;

(4) by inserting "of advance planning and engineering costs or" immediately after "United States share" in the third sentence; and

(5) by inserting "planning and engineering or" immediately after "such" where it first appears in the fourth sentence.

SEC. 13. The Federal Airport Act is amended further by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"ACCESS TO RECORDS

"SEC. 21. (a) Each recipient of grants under this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grants, the total cost of the plan or program in connection with which such grants are given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the plan or program supplied by other sources and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers and records of the recipient that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. HART, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. SCOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE IOU'S, NO. 8: WATER OVER THE DAM IN VIRGINIA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, this week a Virginia State senator, Edward O. McCue of Charlottesville, asked for an investigation of high electric and telephone rates in his State, despite record earnings by the utilities.

Senator McCue's interest is warranted.

The value of Virginia Electric & Power Co. common stock has increased in capital value more than five times during the past 11 years. Dividends have been handsome. The value of each stockholder's 1953 investment has increased more than 50 percent annually since that date. However, there have been no major adjustments in rates charged residential customers for about 10 years. And that last major adjustment, affirmed in a Virginia court in 1955, was a rate increase.

A review of the hearing which preceded that increase, and an examination of statements made subsequently by officials of Vepco and the State corporation commission—the utility regulatory body in Virginia—illustrate how the electric consumer is subsidizing the stockholder and how the regulation of IOU's has broken down.

Customers of Vepco—and they include Members of this body—are billed every other month. Vepco was in the process of changing from monthly to bimonthly billing during the 1953 rate hearing. Maximilian George Baron, an attorney for Arlington County, which was fighting the proposed rate increase, asked the company treasurer, Samuel Edward Ratcliffe—now vice president—how much the company would save by bimonthly billing. Mr. Ratcliffe replied that some 150,000 customers—about one-fourth of the total served—were already on bimonthly billing. The company planned to put about 25,000 more customers on bimonthly billing, he said, "so the only additional savings that might be gained would be with respect to this 25,000 additional customers."

"What is the amount that would be saved on that?" asked Arlington County's counsel.

"That would run approximately $60,000 a year," responded Vepco's treasurer.

The State corporation commission accepted the company's stated position. Commissioner H. Lester Hooker said, in his opinion:

> This protestant [Arlington County] also asserted that expenses should be reduced because of savings to be anticipated from bimonthly billings. * * * The savings from bimonthly billing are, as the treasurer of the company testified, of a very modest amount and almost all of the savings that are practical have been already realized.

Therefore, the predicted income reflected no savings in expenses by reason of additional bimonthly billing of Vepco customers.

Mr. President, now let us see what the company and the commission have said more recently about bimonthly billing.

Mr. E. H. Will, at that time chairman of the board of Vepco, journeyed to New York in March 1960, where he was interviewed by the Wall Street Journal. I shall read one paragraph from the Journal's March 7, 1960, article:

> The (Virginia Electric & Power) company's ratio of operating expenses to operating revenues was 41.72 percent last year, according to Mr. Will, reflecting a gradual decrease from 49.07 5 years ago. He said the company estimated a "further slight improvement" in this ratio in 1960. Contributing toward the lower ratio, Mr. Will states, was the company's method of billing its customers every other month, saving $2 million last year over the cost of monthly billing.

Mr. President, it would appear that savings from bimonthly billing are not as modest as the company and commission visualized they would be.

However, to my knowledge, neither has suggested that electric rates be reduced to reflect this saving.

Under the water-over-the-dam principle of utility regulation, the party which benefits from a miscalculation of predicted income is not required to share the benefits with the other party.

This month a Vepco customer in northern Virginia asked the State corporation commission how much the company had saved in recent years by bimonthly billing, and the extent to which these savings were reflected in the rate structure. The reply from the State corporation commission said:

> We do not have any specific information concerning the amount of money saved by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. by the use of bimonthly billing.

As I said at the outset, the interest of a Virginia State senator in this subject is warranted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a United Press article appearing in the February 18 issue of the Northern Virginia Sun, under the heading "Bill Asks Utility Rate Probe"; a series of three articles by Rice Odell which appeared last year in the Washington Daily News; a letter to the State corporation commission from the Arlington County board, dated August 21, 1963, and an analysis of earnings and rates of Vepco and the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia, which was prepared by Martin Bennett Associates, consultant to the Norfolk City Council.

I call particular attention to the unanimous conclusion of the Arlington County board based upon a study by the county public utilities commission:

> The rate of return for Vepco, instead of fluctuating about the 6-percent level which the State corporation commission said was appropriate in 1953, actually reached the 7-percent level in 1962 and, based on current information, the rate continues to climb. The stockholders have benefited greatly as their dividends per share have increased 123 percent since 1954. At the same time, the residential user of electricity who is unable to take advantage of the new promotional rates, is eligible for a maximum annual rate saving of but 60 cents.

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

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Feb. 18, 1964]

BILL ASKS UTILITY RATE PROBE—TELEPHONE, ELECTRIC PRICES HIT

RICHMOND.—Senator Edward O. McCue of Charlottesville wants to find out why telephone and electric rates in Virginia are "quite high" despite record earnings of the State's utility companies.

McCue introduced a resolution Monday that would require the State corporation commission to provide the answers by February 24 to a long string of questions "for the protection of homeowners and domestic users."

The resolution was one of 51 last minute measures introduced in the upper chamber of the Virginia General Assembly. Further legislation during the current session may be introduced only by unanimous consent of the members or on request of the Governor.

McCue remarked on the senate floor last week that he had received a "flood of letters" from homemakers in the Richmond area in response to the suggestion of Joseph Weeks, a television commentator on WRVA-TV's "News Probe," an editorial program.

Weeks told his viewers last week to squawk to Senator McCue if they thought their utility rates were too high. Consequently, McCue said he received more than 50 letters from the Richmond area complaining about utility rates.

Weeks contended McCue favored taxing the utility companies to the point where they were forced to raise their rates.

However, in his resolution McCue said:

"It has been brought to the attention of the general public that the stock of the major power companies and telephone companies has increased in value to such an extent that * * * stock splits have taken place." He singled out American Telephone & Telegraph Co. as recently splitting its stock shares 3 for 1, and proposing to have a further 2 for 1 stock split.

"These companies are making money hand over foot," he said on the senate floor. "Being a businessman, I'm not against making money. I only wish I'd have gotten in on the split with some of that A.T. & T. stock."

The resolution asked the State corporation commission to report on the following:

The rates of return allowed major telephone and electric companies in 1948 and the rate allowed today.

The average sales price of telephone and electric stock in 1948 and the price today, disregarding splits.

Rates for electricity in Virginia as compared with those charged in the neighboring States.

The average lowest price charged the homeowner for the minimum electric bill compared with the price charged major industrial users of electricity.

The last day's flood of bills and resolutions, which brought the total to 442 in the senate for the entire session, included a Republican bill that would abolish closed-door sessions from the general assembly down to the local school board.

Senator James Turk of Radford sponsored the measure to require all public meetings to be open to the public—excluding executive sessions.

These sessions could be called only on matters pertaining to "national defense, the negotiations for the sale of public property, in which the reputation of any person is at issue."

Turk also sponsored a bill to require that Commonwealth's attorneys represent the State highway department in all matters involving land acquisition and rights-of-way. As it stands now, the department appoints its attorneys, subject to approval by the attorney general.

It was revealed last week that at least 15 members of the general assembly were working for the highway department on rights-of-way.

[From the Washington Daily News]

ARE ELECTRIC BILLS TOO HIGH?

(By Rice Odell)

(One of a series)

If you think your electric bills are too high, you may be right.

A number of experts think bills in the Washington area are running an average of $1 or more per month above what should be allowed.

This does not mean that the electric companies are gouging their customers. They are charging rates set by law. However, there is growing concern that the legal rates may be too high.

Various commissions serve as watchdogs for the consumer. They are supposed to see that the rates charged are "just and reasonable," and they have the power to back up their findings.

But if the consumer thinks this is a guarantee against being overcharged, he might change his mind if he knew how the system works.

In the last few weeks, three utility commissions have taken a sudden interest in the rates being charged by the two big electric companies serving the Washington area—Potomac Electric Power Co. and Virginia Electric Power Co.

The Maryland and District public utilities commissions have both launched investigations of Pepco rates and the Arlington Public Utilities Commission seeks a probe of Vepco rates.

The District PUC, which last set rates for Pepco in 1959, now suspects that its more than 376,000 customers are being overcharged at the rate of roughly $7 million a year.

This would come out to more than $18 a year per average customer.

(This figure does not indicate how the burden is divided between residential and commercial users.)

On the other side of the river, the staff of the Arlington Public Utilities Commission has concluded that Vepco's 810,000 customers are paying almost $15 million a year more than they should. This also represents about $18 a year per average customer.

At the moment, Pepco officials are declining to make any comment on the situation. Vepco has denied any overcharge at any time.

Here's how things work:

The regulatory commission at any time it deems appropriate, holds a hearing and is then supposed to fix rates designed to be "just and reasonable." This may involve either raising or lowering the previous rates. There are several factors usually considered in deciding what is reasonable:

The company should not be allowed to reap profits which far exceed those of normal business.

On the other hand, the company should be allowed to earn enough so it can provide sound management and credit and attract, at low cost, the investment capital it needs to operate properly.

WHAT'S FAIR?

What rate of return on investment is considered fair?

The Supreme Court has said this varies with the company and the circumstances. Leaving off the extremes, the opinions of State commissions usually vary from around 5.25 to 7.25 percent.

(The conservative or liberal character of a commission is usually reflected in the percentage considered reasonable.)

In general, a 6-percent rate of return on investment has long been regarded as the norm. In fact, since 1954 the District PUC has tried to set Pepco rates which would return 5.85 percent. In Virginia in 1953, the authorities said that a proper return would be 5.87 percent.

In spite of this, studies indicate that the present profits of Pepco are more than 6.5 percent, and those of Vepco about 7 percent.

That sounds slight, but consider what it would mean in the case of Vepco to have a return of 6.87 percent, for example, rather than 5.87 percent:

The company's rate base (or capital investment) at the end of 1962 was nearly $717 million. The 1 percent difference on that amounts to almost $7.2 million.

For the company to realize that amount of profit, after Federal taxes of 52 percent are taken out, it would have to take in gross revenues of almost $15 million—and that $15 million represents overcharge to the customers beyond what is necessary to yield the approved 5.87 percent profit.

VEPCO'S EFFICIENCY BRINGS IT UNDER FIRE

(By Rice Odell)

(Second of a series)

There is evidence, too strong to be ignored, that the rates being charged by Virginia Electric & Power Co. are too high to be considered "reasonable," as that word is used in utility rate semantics.

There has been no major change in the rates since March 1, 1954—but the story of company earnings is far different. These are some illustrations:

In 1953 the average market price of Vepco common stock was a little over $25. It has recently been around $44. In addition, since 1953 there have been 2-for-1 and 3-for-2 stock splits, so that every share in 1953 has turned into 3 shares today.

Thus a single $25 share in 1953 has increased in capital value today to over $130. In addition, dividends (adjusted for the splits) have totaled $21.82.

Added to the stock value increase of $105 this gives a total gain to the stockholder of $126.82—or an annual average gain of $12.68, which is just over 50 percent each year on the 1953 market price.

CONSULTANT

This analysis comes from Laurence S. Knappen, a public utility consultant.

"You have to allow them to keep their credit good and attract capital, but that's the kind of return you expect to get in a speculative venture," he said.

Mr. Knappen, who has worked in the field for 20 years, defends his figures on grounds that the formula used is the very same which company witnesses across the country have often adopted in their efforts to get rates increased—by claiming inadequate market value of stock.

Throughout the United States electric companies have shown a pattern of increased profits due to heavier sales, greater efficiency, and new technology. Revenues rise while company costs go down.

Vepco speaks proudly of this in its 1962 annual report: "That important measure of the efficiency of our operations, ratio of expenses to revenues, continued to improve * * * and has been almost constantly downward in the past 10 years." A graph illustrates the improvement sharply.

(It is a measure of the difficulty which regulatory commissions face that it is next to impossible to change rates fast enough to keep pace with this growing efficiency.)

Vepco has answered charges of overly high rates by saying, among other things, that electricity is a great "bargain" and that its cost per unit used has gone down while the cost of living has gone way up. This argument has an attractive sound, but it misses the point. It says nothing about earnings.

From 1953 to 1962, Vepco has reported steadily increasing net operating revenues

($17.7 to $49.4 million), net income ($12.9 to $33.4 million) and earnings per share of common stock (89 cents to $2.35).

The Arlington Public Utilities Commission, using the same formula accepted by the Virginia Supreme Court in 1953, has concluded that the rate of return has risen from the approved 5.87 percent of 10 years ago to a current 6.99 percent.

Such a seemingly small difference would actually involve additional charges to the public of some $15 million a year.

The final word on rates in Virginia comes from the three-man State Corporation Commission (SCC) in Richmond. Arlington and Norfolk are among the few local governments which have been able and willing, on their own, to challenge the status quo on behalf of their residents.

In 1960, the city of Norfolk wondered about Vepco's rates and retained Martin Bennett Associates of Washington, utility consultants, to report on the situation.

The result was a finding that the 1960 rate of return ranged somewhere between 6.36 percent and 6.93 percent, depending on the method of calculation used.

"Earnings are high in our estimation," the firm said.

The staff of the SCC itself has reported to the Commission that the 1962 rate of return was 6.36 or 7.01 percent, depending on how Federal income tax payments are taken into account.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association earlier this year issued a report on "overcharges" of 38 major electric utilities in the country. Assuming 6 percent to be a fair rate of return, it estimated that from 1956 to 1960, Vepco's customers paid $83.6 million too much.

Vepco responded that the claim was "absurd on its face."

For normal residential use, at least, Vepco rates are noticeably higher than those of Pepco across the river, but that does not take into account various factors, including commercial and industrial schedules.

There is no doubt that all the figures can be looked at many ways in determining rates of profit. And there is also no doubt that they are.

For example, much depends on whether the "rate base" (or roughly capital investment) is taken from the end of the year or as an average during the year.

AVERAGES

Most State commissions use the average, which substantially lowers the base and thereby increases the rate of return. (In the last year alone, for example, Vepco's rate base or capitalization increased $56 million during the year.)

Vepco, however, has been allowed to use the yearend base since 1953, and feels this is the proper method. Were the year's average investment used, the base would be lowered by half of the $56 million added during the year—much to the consumers advantage—in figuring rates of return on that investment.

But to the consumer's pocketbook there is an even more important battle of accounting going on throughout the country. It involves different ways of treating taxes which, for the average Vepco customer, makes a difference of $13 or more in his bills each year.

The most important type of tax adjustment was discussed in outspoken fashion recently by Howard Morgan, outgoing member of the Federal Power Commission. On February 28, while testifying before a special House Interstate and Foreign Commerce subcommittee, he said:

"The electric and gas utilities of the United States are currently syphoning off hundreds of millions of dollars a year of consumers' money by means of paying taxes to the Treasury on a basis of accelerated depreciation, while reporting their tax expenses to the Commission for rate-making purposes on the basis of the full taxes they would have paid without accelerated depreciation.

"This means that the consumers are being charged huge amounts representing phantom taxes which are not paid and in the opinion of most, if not all, disinterested students of taxation, will never be paid."

The FPC which is changing its political makeup, now has under review the question of how deferred taxes, as well as investment tax credit, should be treated for rate-making purposes. The utility world, with hundreds of millions of dollars riding on the outcome, has its fingers crossed.

S. E. Ratcliffe, treasurer of Vepco, says that taxes should be reportable as if paid in full without benefit of accelerated depreciation.

He said if this method is used—and last December's $3.2 million decrease in commercial and industrial rates is taken into account, among other things—the rate of return for Vepco is now about 6.1 percent rather than the 7 percent claimed.

BEHIND VEPCO PROBE: NEW PUC MEMBER

(By Rice Odell)

(Third of a series)

Arlington County officials are troublemakers for the Virginia Electric & Power Co.

Ten years ago, when Vepco asked for a rate increase, Arlington protested vigorously, carrying the case all the way to the Virginia Supreme Court.

Arlington lost.

NEW CONCLUSION

Now the Arlington Public Utilities Commission has concluded that Vepco's current rate of return is about 7 percent rather than the acceptable 6 percent.

It has asked the Arlington County Board to request the State corporation commission make a "serious inquiry" into Vepco rates. The county board—voting 4 to 0—agreed to make the request.

It is no accident that the Arlington PUC suddenly became concerned over Vepco. In January Laurence S. Knappen, a public utility consultant just turned 65 and ready for retirement, was named vice chairman of the commission. A dogged fighter, he is not a favorite of the utility companies.

"For 20 years I've been working the consumer's side," Mr. Knappen said. "The biggest trouble is getting the public to act in time. Until somebody complains, nothing happens.

"The residential users are always the last ones to get any downward revisions of rates," he said. "They're not organized. There are all sorts of things large companies can do to drive bargains."

For example, industries can threaten to get diesel engines and generate their own power.

Mr. Knappen said that was once involved in one case he became convinced that the power company was selling electricity at a loss to a large client.

PET PHRASE

There is a pet phrase which keeps creeping up in the utility field—"regulatory climate." This is a polite way of referring to outlook of a regulatory commission. The climate is either favorable to the companies or to the consumers.

For example, in 1960 the city of Norfolk had some doubts about the rates Vepco was charging in the State and asked a Washington firm to make a study. The firm concluded that although it felt the rates were too high, but said, "We believe that the regulatory climate of the Commonwealth of Virginia would thwart any attempt to obtain a rate reduction at this time."

A number of observers are still pessimistic about the "climate." Although the three-member State Corporation Commission's findings were protested in 1953, and there has been every indication of steadily increasing earnings by Vepco, the commission has held no hearing on general rate changes for almost a decade.

What will happen to the Arlington request is quite uncertain. The News asked the newest member of the SCC, Judge Jesse W. Dillon, whether he thought that a 6.36 percent rate of return (reported for Vepco in 1962 by the SCC's own staff) was excessive.

"I don't think so," he said.

Asked about the 7.01 percent rate which the staff reported through use of a more common method of allowing for income taxes (based on accelerated depreciation), Judge Dillon said, "That may be getting close to the borderline."

He added that the Federal Power Commission has not yet ruled on how accelerated depreciation should be treated for rate-making purposes. "We'll probably not go against the FPC," he said.

If the FPC says that the accelerated depreciation is to be used, the books of the utilities will show a far higher rate of return and provide a better chance of getting rates lowered.

The regulatory climate manifests itself in many ways, Mr. Knappen said. Whichever party is pressing for a rate change may be warned by someone on or close to the Commission, "This is not the time to take aggressive action."

Often, he said, a diligent Commission staff may work hard to present evidence for a needed rate change, only to have an unsympathetic Commission itself quash the case.

HIGH PROFIT

Mr. Knappen said he knew one staff member who took a report to a commissioner which showed that a firm was earning at a rate of more than 15 percent.

"Isn't that interesting" the Commissioner said, taking the report from him and putting it back on the shelf.

The Federal Power Commission only has jurisdiction over wholesale interstate rates, so when it orders a refund from one supplier to another, there is no provision for passing any of it on to the consumer.

Mr. Knappen said he has run across a number of instances in which official transcripts of hearings were changed or doctored to suit someone's taste.

Once in a Kentucky case, he said, the treasurer of a company referred in testimony to his firm as having "sold the Treasury a bill of goods." The comment didn't appear in the official record.

In an Indiana case, someone remarked that something was missing from the transcript and the attorney for a company said to a group of people, "Well, I cooperated with the stenographer to clean up the record."

Sometimes, Mr. Knappen said, things are removed without anyone asking. It even happened to him. He said he once made a statement at a hearing embarrassing to himself. He had calculated some figures on the stand, adding that he would be glad to stand corrected. He was corrected a few minutes later.

But when the transcript appeared, Mr. Knappen's first calculations had been removed. He said stenographers possibly take it upon themselves to eliminate things they consider unnecessary, or perhaps something embarrassing, out of sympathy for the witness.

BRIBERY

Other obstacles to reaching a just conclusion in a regulatory case have included bribery and even keeping an official on the payroll of a utility company. That is to say nothing of the weight that mere friendship can carry.

There are, of course, thousands of ways in which books and figures can be shifted, to hide or pad items.

As if all these potential obstacles aren't enough, some commissions simply have too small a staff to watch over the utilities under their jurisdiction.

And, with utility costs constantly going down and earnings up, any commission is hard put to keep up with the current situation.

The timelag involved in laborious administrative procedure (and sometimes judicial as well) makes it nearly impossible. If a rate reduction is threatened, a company can usually think of many ways to delay the day when it is ordered, just as those on the consumers' side can try to postpone an increase.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY BOARD,
Arlington, Va., August 21, 1963.
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
Richmond, Va.

GENTLEMEN: At its August 10, 1963 meeting the Arlington County Board unanimously voted to accept the recommendation of its Public Utilities Commission and authorized the forwarding to the State Corporation Commission of a request that the commission, on its own motion, issue a show cause order to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. asking that company to appear and give justification for the rate of return now being earned and to show cause as to why its rates for electric service in Virginia should not be further reduced. In support of its request the board offers the following:

On March 1, 1954, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. instituted new electric rate schedules, pursuant to a decision of the State Corporation Commission in case No. 11788, which was handed down on December 30, 1953. In its decision, the commission stated (at p. 66 of 1954 SCC annual report), "In the light of all the testimony of record, it is our opinion that a proper rate of return is in the vicinity of 6 percent." (The commission actually allowed 5.87 percent.) While minor downward adjustments have been made in the Vepco rates, an examination of the earnings and rate of return, developed for each of the succeeding years on the same basis as that employed by the majority in rendering the decision, reveals a steady climb upward from 6 percent. The following table reflects increased rates of return on net investment in plant and allowances (rate base) enjoyed by the company since the change of the rates in 1953. The data are system results which include minor and relatively insignificant amounts of plant, revenues and expenses attributable to the gas portion of the business and to those portions of the electric business in North Carolina and West Virginia.

	Percent
1954	5.68
1955	5.82
1956	5.95
1957	6.18
1958	6.21
1959	6.28
1960	6.28
1961	6.48
1962	7.03

The earnings and profits for Vepco have increased substantially by virtually every standard of analysis which may be applied as is illustrated in the table below:

	Return on common stock equity [1]	Return on total capital	Equity per share of common split basis
	Percent	*Percent*	
1954	10.44	5.92	$7.02
1955	11.35	5.95	7.46
1956	11.57	6.13	8.03
1957	10.99	6.18	9.23
1958	10.97	6.25	9.86
1959	9.97	6.17	11.11
1960	10.37	6.21	11.70
1961	11.19	6.66	12.28
1962	12.09	7.28	12.97

[1] Ratio of earnings per share to equity per share.

During the years since the 1953 rate case, the stock has been split 2 for 1 in 1957 and 3 for 2 in 1963, with the price of the stock having increased very substantially as the dividend rate was increased at least once in each of the years. The trends of earnings, dividends and stock prices are shown below (all figures are adjusted for stock splits in 1957 and 1963):

	Earnings per share	Dividends per share	Price of common stock [1]
1954	$0.73	$0.4667	$10.10
1955	.85	.5166	12.96
1956	.93	.5833	14.23
1957	1.01	.6501	15.99
1958	1.08	.6834	22.33
1959	1.11	.7332	24.33
1960	1.21	.8000	29.71
1961	1.37	.8668	39.33
1962	1.57	.9332	37.69
1963 (12 months ended June)	1.58	.9332	
1963 (indicated for year)		.9866	
1963 (to Aug. 1)			44.37
1963 (current annual rate)		1.0400	

[1] Prices are averages of high and low for each period.

A comparison of the results of operations of the electric portion of the business for the period ended December 31, 1962, with those for the 12 months ended June 30, 1953, which were used in the 1953 rate case, presents, the Arlington County Board believes, a prima facie case for a prompt review of the rate structure of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. Using, as nearly as is practicable, the same basis for developing net operating income, rate base, and rate of return as was employed by the majority in the 1953 decision, it appears that the rate of return for this company has increased from the 5.87 percent allowed to about 7 percent in 1962. The comparative results are shown below.

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1953 rate case [1]	1962
RATE BASE, END OF PERIOD		
Electric plant	$329,828	$815,054
Electric portion of common utility plant	3,706	6,883
Plant acquisition adjustments	17,254	
Miscellaneous plant		1,441
Total plant investment	350,788	823,378
Reserves:		
Depreciation:		
Electric plant	$39,535	$124,297
Electric portion, common plant	251	891
Amortization of plant acquisition adjustments	11,078	
Total reserves	50,864	125,188
Plant investment less reserves	299,923	698,190
Working capital:		
Materials and supplies	9,291	11,546
Cash (40 days)	4,460	7,210
Total working capital	13,751	18,756
Rate base, end of period	313,954	716,946
NET OPERATING INCOME		
Operating revenues	76,559	170,937
Operating revenue deductions:		
Operating expenses	40,134	65,716
Depreciation	5,735	19,871
Amortization of acquisition adjustments	1,113	
Taxes:		
Federal income:		
Currently payable	7,584	[2] 22,931
Deferred	934	[3] 1,687
Other	5,457	13,876
Net operating income	15,602	46,856
Add interest during construction	728	3,310
Balance	16,330	50,166
Deduct charitable donations	85	[4] 150
Total	16,245	50,016

See footnotes at end of table.

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1953 rate case [1]	1962
NET OPERATING INCOME—con.		
Adjustment for increased rates	2,201	
Earnings during period	18,446	50,016
Rate of return (earnings per rate base)	5.87	6.99

[1] From decision, pp. 61–66 of SCC 1954 Annual Report.
[2] Includes downward adjustments for declining balance, $2,130,000; guideline lives, $761,000; and investment tax credit, $1,885,000, as reported in company reports.
[3] Includes downward adjustment of $1,045,000 for portion of current income tax provided in prior years, as reported in company reports.
[4] Estimated.

The rate of return for Vepco, instead of fluctuating about the 6-percent level which the State corporation commission said was appropriate in 1953, actually reached the 7-percent level in 1962, and based on current information the rate continues to climb. The stockholders have benefited greatly as their dividends per share have increased 123 percent since 1954. At the same time, the residential user of electricity who is unable to take advantage of the new promotional rates, is eligible for a maximum annual rate saving of but 60 cents. In view of these facts, and those contained in the body of this letter, the Arlington County Board believes that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. should be required to come before the commission and justify the rate of earnings being earned and to show cause as to why its earnings level should not be adjusted downward to the level authorized by the commission in the 1953 rate case.

The Arlington County Board respectfully requests that the commission, on its own motion, issue such a show cause order, and further requests that the commission keep the board fully informed as to any and all proceedings which may develop from this request.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS W. RICHARDS,
Chairman, Arlington County Board.

ANALYSIS OF EARNINGS AND RATES OF TWO VIRGINIA UTILITIES

I. VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

Virginia Electric and Power Co.'s present rates became effective March 1, 1954, pursuant to the corporation commission's order of December 30, 1953 (case No. 11788; 9 PUR3d 225). The Board of Supervisors of Arlington County appealed the commission's decision but it was affirmed by the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals on April 25, 1955 (87 SE2d 139; 8 PUR3d 120). Since becoming effective, the rate schedules have undergone certain minor revisions such as changes in the minimum bill.

In its order of December 30, 1953, the commission found that a rate of return of about 6 percent was proper on a rate base reflecting year-end original cost less book reserve plant balances. The revenues allowed actually produced a return of 5.87 percent on the test year rate base, which included allowances for cash working capital,[1] materials and supplies, construction work in progress, and plant acquisition adjustments. The net utility income reflected the deduction of charitable contributions, the amortization of plant acquisition adjustments, and interest charged to construction. On this basis we calculate the company's 1960 return earned at 6.36 percent.

At the time of the 1953 proceeding, the company held certificates of necessity en-

[1] The allowance was equal to 40 days' operating expenses and was not offset by tax accruals.

abling it to accelerate the amortization of certain facilities for Federal income tax purposes. Subsequent to January 1, 1954, the company had the option of utilizing one of the forms of liberalized depreciation on all additions to plant but it was not until 1960 that it used this option to reduce taxes by $420,000.

In contrast to the commission's treatment of rate base and income items in the 1953 case, we have calculated VEPCO's rates of return earned for each of the calendar years 1956 through 1960 by utilizing ratemaking principles which we have advocated in other jurisdictions. We used an average rate base for each year since the plant represented by the average investment in any year is most properly related to the income produced in the same year. The average rate base included materials and supplies, plant acquisition adjustments, and an offset for accumulated deferred taxes resulting from the rapid amortization of emergency facilities.[2] Relating reported net utility income, normalized for income taxes deferred by rapid amortization, to the rate base, we calculate the following:

	Percent
1956	6.85
1957	7.18
1958	7.14
1959	7.09
1960	6.93

If we had allowed for working capital in arriving at the average rate base, the rates of return might be slightly lower. For instance, the 1960 return would be 6.84 percent if an allowance equal to 40 days' operating expense were made. In a rate case, we would propose offsetting any cash working capital allowance with funds available to the company because of income tax accruals and/or lack of synchronization in collecting revenues and paying expenses. Although the rates of return would be affected by including in the rate base any items in construction work in progress which are actually in service, an estimate of items in service at specific dates would require analysis of the company records. Thus, the above rates of return may not be precisely those arrived at after a full-scale analysis for a rate proceeding, but they are a reasonable approximation.

Recent press reports indicate that the company's 1961 earnings have improved, rising from $1.86 per share for calendar 1960 to $1.95 per share for the 9 months ended September 30, 1961, on an annual basis. For the same period in 1960, earnings were $1.82 on an annual basis.

Over the 5-year period 1956–60, the company's net investment in total plant increased from $407 to $590 million. Over the same period the net investment in electric plant rose from $385 to $558 million. Installed electric generating capacity increased from 845 megawatts at December 31, 1955, to 1,507 megawatts at the end of 1959. The addition of modern generating equipment reduced the investment in that plant from $147 to $132 per kilowatt of installed capacity. Production expenses exclusive of fuel declined from 0.736 mill per kilowatt-hour of net generation in 1955 to 0.564 mill in 1959. The company's operating ratio[3] declined slightly from 54.1 percent in 1956 to 52.7 percent in 1960. Thus, it appears that the company has been in a period of declining costs.

To compare Norfolk's residential electric bills with those in other cities, we selected from the Federal Power Commission's typical electric bills, 1961, 11 cities in the South Atlantic Division and 1 Kentucky city.[4] The South Atlantic Division is comprised of 8 States, 7 bordering the Atlantic coast from Delaware to Florida, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. We tabulated and averaged typical bills in cities with populations ranging from 50,000 to 1 million because of our desire to include the rates of all large companies in these States. Comparing typical bills in Norfolk with the mean average for the 12 cities shows that customers of Vepco pay higher bills at the minimum and at the 25 kilowatt-hour, 100 kilowatt-hour, and 250 kilowatt-hour consumption levels.

At the 40 kilowatt-hour and 500 kilowatt-hour consumption levels, residential bills in Norfolk are slightly lower than the average bills in the 12 comparable cities. In neighboring North Carolina, residential bills are lower at virtually all levels of consumption.

The comparison of industrial bills is complicated by the number of rate schedules available to customers. Assuming that all customers would avail themselves of the favorable tariff for their demand and consumption, we considered the lowest bill for each level of demand and consumption. We attempted to select cities or areas in the South Atlantic region with industrial facilities similar to those in Norfolk. Admittedly, this is a matter of judgment. Comparing the mean average of the bills in 10 other cities with those in Norfolk, we found that typical bills were lower for Norfolk industrial customers at 6 of the 10 consumption levels for which bills were reported. Contrasting the Appalachian Power Co.'s bills with Vepco's reveals that the Norfolk rates were higher in only three of the categories reported. Bills in North Carolina cities were consistently below those in Norfolk.

Although Vepco's earnings are high in our estimation, we believe that the regulatory climate of the Commonwealth of Virginia would thwart any attempt to obtain a rate reduction at this time.

II. CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO. OF VIRGINIA

The present rates of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia were put into effect January 1, 1958, pursuant to the commission's December 31, 1957, order (case No. 13591; 21 PUR3d 239). The city of Lynchburg, et al., took an appeal from the order but the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals affirmed it on March 16, 1959 (107 SE2d 462; 28 PUR3d 368).

In that case, the commission allowed a 6.38 percent rate of return on an original cost, less book reserve, year-end rate base. In addition to including in the rate base construction work in progress, plant acquisition adjustments, materials and supplies, and an allowance for cash working capital equal to 20 days' operating expenses, the commission rejected annualization of revenues and included an attrition allowance of $466,000 as an adjustment to test year utility income. Making these same adjustments to 1960 operating data, we calculate the company's earnings to be 6.56 percent. This is confirmed by section F of the company's answer to the city's inquiry as reported in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of April 6, 1961. According to that report, the corporation commission's routine investigation revealed that the company was earning a return of approximately 6.5 percent on an annual basis during the last 6 months of 1960.

As we did for Vepco, we have based our calculations on an average rate base including materials and supplies.[5] Relating the company's reported utility income, adjusted for its share of the parent company's income tax saving, to the rate base we have calculated the following rates of return:

	Percent
1956	6.83
1957	6.29
1958	[1] 7.65
1959	7.65
1960	7.67

[1] Increased rates effective January 1.

The same infirmities discussed in connection with the analysis of Vepco's rates of return earned apply in this case although the weaknesses are probably even less significant.

The adjustment made to net income referred to above is commonly known as the "NARUC adjustment" and has been used in rate proceedings by many State commissions. Essentially, the NARUC adjustment imputes a debt ratio to the operating companies in the Bell System equivalent to the debt ratio of the consolidated sytem. The adjustment is especially important in considering the earnings of a company such as C. & P. which has no outstanding publicly held debt and therefore does not have the tax advantage of large interest deductions. Rather, these advantages accrue to and are retained by the parent company in its capacity as financing vehicle for the system.

In addition to indicating, from our point of view, that the company's earnings are excessive, this analysis also demonstrates that earnings have been relatively stable since the commission's 1957 order. However, some of the stability results from including the NARUC adjustment from parent company taxes. Without this adjustment, earnings for 1958, 1959, and 1960 would be 7.11, 7.30, and 7.19 percent of the average rate base, respectively. The effect of the 1957 rate case is also apparent in the company's operating ratio, which for the 5 most recent years has been as follows:

	Percent
1956	66.42
1957	68.02
1958	[1] 61.96
1959	60.91
1960	60.66

[1] New rates.

Any comparison of telephone rates must take into consideration not only the size of the cities but also the companies' relative costs of service and the number of telephones in each calling area. Although the company indicates that rate comparisons are of little value because of the variation in these factors among cities, it presented in section E of its answer to the city a tabulation of telephone rates in various cities scattered over the entire country. Apparently the companies were selected so that 10 would have business line rates higher than Norfolk's and 10 would have rates below those in Norfolk.

The costs of service in the company's selected cities would undoubtedly vary widely because of the variations in economic and geographic conditions over the country. The number of telephones in the service areas also varies widely with Norfolk falling some 50,000 below the median of 241,000. The nearby cities of Charlotte, Greensboro, Winston-Salem and Raleigh—all with more than 60,000 phones in their calling areas—are conspicuous by their absence from the tabulation, although Mr. Cash reveals on page 8 of his August 25 letter that the rates in all four cities are considerably less than C. & P.'s. Even with all these infirmities the company's tabulation shows that Norfolk's residential rates are fourth or fifth highest depending on whether individual line or two-party service is considered.

It is evident that C. & P.'s rates are not low. More important, the company's earnings, in our opinion, are excessive. However, as indicated by the commission's review of C. & P.'s 1960 operations, little hope exists for reducing rates at this time.

[2] Accumulated deferred taxes under section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code are treated as temporary interest-free loans by the Government.

[3] Ratio of operating expenses, including depreciation, to operating revenues.

[4] Tennessee was initially considered but deleted because of TVA's abnormally low generation costs.

[5] No plant acquisition adjustments or accumulated deferred taxes were recorded.

FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in a speech on the evening of February 5, I drew the attention of the Senate to a railroad strike in Florida and to various abuses of power by the Alfred I. du Pont estate, which controls the struck Florida East Coast Railway.

I pointed out that this Du Pont estate is among other things, a large bank holding company, but it is not registered under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. Both this Florida Du Pont estate and the Florida East Coast Railway are run by the same man, Mr. Edward Ball.

Mr. President, the past few days have brought important and dangerous developments in this Florida railroad strike. The latest of these developments are described in articles published in the New York Times of yesterday and today.

I shall read the first few paragraphs of yesterday's New York Times story, as follows:

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., February 18.—Assistant Secretary James J. Reynolds said tonight he would recommend that the Florida East Coast Railway be denied access to Cape Kennedy and adjacent Merritt Island.

Mr. Reynolds returned here from Daytona Beach, where he had been unsuccessful in getting the road's officials to resume negotiations with representatives of the 11 nonoperating unions that have been on strike for 13 months.

Mr. President, in my speech on the night of February 5, I expressed some criticisms of James Webb, Director of NASA, who had announced that NASA was going to make this spur available to Mr. Ball.

I pointed out that Director Webb's position was contrary to the recommendations of the Presidential Board of Inquiry established to investigate this dispute.

It is the old story of turning labor matters over to defense experts. That is always a mistake, for we have learned to our great regret, time and time again, that to do so does not protect the freedom either of American workers or American management.

As I said on the night of February 5, during the war we did not do that, we turned labor matters over to a War Labor Board, tripartite in nature, consisting of an equal number of public, employer, and labor representatives.

Mr. President, the strength of our democracy is found in our ability to adhere to our system of economic freedom in times of crisis. In our system we do not and we cannot substitute military procedures for peaceful methods for the settlement of labor disputes.

On the night of February 5, I warned—before any crisis had arisen—that we were headed straight into a crisis. Subsequent events have proved how right I was. We are not through with that crisis.

The free workers in this country are not going to work under the tyrannical regime that Mr. Ball is attempting to establish on the Florida East Coast Railway.

I return to the New York Times article:

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz has asked Edward Ball, chairman of the road, and G. E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives Association, to meet with Mr. Reynolds in an attempt to set up procedures for resolving the violent dispute.

Mr. Ball went to Daytona Beach, but insisted that a court reporter be present to record this discussion with Leighty.

Mr. President, imagine seeking to carry on mediation with a court reporter present. It is just not done in this professional field by any mediator. Mr. Reynolds was quite right in following a course of action which the story in the New York Times now records.

I wish to pay my high respects to Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds. So far as I am concerned, no one could be higher on the list of rated ability in the field of labor relations and labor negotiations than Mr. James Reynolds.

Mr. Reynolds said he would not permit the reporter to record the informal discussion. It was unnecessary in a conference of honorable men, he said, and would inhibit the freedom of talk.

As a result Mr. Reynolds met separately with Mr. Ball and three other executives of the company. He proposed that wages and other issues be submitted to binding arbitration.

Mr. Leighty agreed to accept binding arbitration, but there appeared to be no prospect of it in view of Mr. Ball's adamant position.

Mr. President, today's story in the New York Times gives some additional comments by Mr. Reynolds, as follows:

At a press conference he criticized Mr. Ball's attitude and said his labor relations philosophy had no place in this century.

It is a rather interesting story, and reads in part as follows:

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., February 19.—The Railway Labor Executives Association called on President Johnson today to reverse what it called the provocative opening of a Government-owned railroad spur at Cape Kennedy for the use of the struck Florida East Coast Railway.

Meanwhile, a subcommittee of the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission was expected to convene in Florida this week to seek a solution to the dispute at the Space and Missile Center.

The difficulties at Cape Kennedy grew out of picketing by the striking railroad men when the Florida East Coast started to move freight into the facility last week.

The subcommittee—David L. Cole, John T. Dunlop, and William Simkin; Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—will examine only the involvement at Cape Kennedy and the potentially disruptive effect of continued use of the partly completed spur there.

Mr. President, I digress to say that Mr. David L. Cole, John T. Dunlop, and William Simkin are recognized in the field of labor relations work as three of the most able mediators and arbitrators in this country. All of these three men performed outstanding work for us on the Railway Labor Board during my service on the board during the war.

I continue to read from the article in the New York Times.

James J. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of Labor, was unsuccessful yesterday in getting railroad officials and representatives of the 11 nonoperating unions on strike to engage in direct bargaining.

When Edward Ball, chairman of the Florida East Coast, refused a proposal for binding arbitration, Mr. Reynolds said he would recommend that the railroad be denied access to the spur for transporting materials to the space center.

In other words, his recommendation would be directly opposite to the position taken by Mr. Webb, the head of NASA, a position that Mr. Webb never should have taken in the first place, because he should have known that this involved basic policy problems of great concern to our country and to the administration.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced last week that it would permit the railroad to use the new spur.

The Presidential board of inquiry that studied the strike recommended against opening the spur to the railroad last fall. But NASA took the view that it was obligated by contract to permit the railroad to use it.

Union picket lines temporarily halted construction at the cape. Picketing was stopped by a temporary restraining order, which later expired, but the unions have agreed to hold off picketing temporarily and to give 72 hours' notice before resuming it.

Mr. Reynolds said today that continued use of the spur by the railroad during the strike could have a disruptive effect on operations and construction at the space center.

Mr. President, the labor philosophy of Mr. Ball is obviously the philosophy of such 18th century individualism that he seems to be of the opinion that in 1964 labor is a commodity and must be required to work under such conditions and for such wages as an employer proposes to give labor—take it or else—forgetting the fact that the rights of management are as limited as the rights of labor, in that neither has the power of autocracy and that both must be required to comply with the overall public interest.

That is a lesson which Mr. Ball and a few remaining antiunion tyrants in this country have never learned.

Mr. President, from my study of this situation I agree wholeheartedly with the views voiced by Assistant Secretary of Labor Reynolds.

Mr. Edward Ball has steadily refused to negotiate in any significant way throughtout this 13-month-old strike. He has made no settlement offer whatever for 13 months. He has rejected the recommendations of a Presidential Emergency Board, which the unions accepted. He has repeatedly refused all pleas to arbitrate, while the unions have agreed to do so.

He continues to make money at the expense of the American taxpayers. He is perfectly willing to take a direct and indirect subsidy benefit. Let us not forget that the great defense program which feeds this railroad in no small part amounts to a form of subsidy.

Mr. Ball, in fact, threatens to torpedo our whole voluntary system for handling railroad labor disputes under the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. President, this gentleman, Mr. Ed Ball, is primarily a banker. He runs a great chain of 31 banks in Florida. These events, I think, demonstrate very clearly that a banker of this kind has no business running a railroad.

The only reason Mr. Ed Ball is in charge of the Florida East Coast Railroad today is that the Du Pont estate, which he runs, was exempted from the

Bank Holding Company Act. Next Wednesday, I intend to offer a bill to end this unjustifiable special-privilege exemption from this act.

Why was this major bank holding company with its 31 banks excluded from coverage of the Bank Holding Company Act? During Senate hearings on that bill, back in 1955 and 1956, this very question was raised. It was raised by my good friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], among others.

And the reply given by other Senators at the hearings was this: The Alfred I. du Pont estate's money, they said, goes primarily for charity—to aid crippled children.

Mr. President, in making that reply, our colleagues were misled. Someone had misled them. From the very beginning, nearly all the Du Pont estate's large income has gone to the late Mr. du Pont's widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont.

I have here a certified copy of the annual accounting of the Du Pont estate's trustees, filed with the circuit court of Duval County, Fla., on January 27, 1964, covering the year 1963.

This accounting shows the Du Pont estate received income of $9,546,025.11 in 1963. The accounting shows that after certain expenses and after certain small annuities paid to other persons, the annuities payable to Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont by the estate last year totaled $8,591,889.28.

Over $8½ million of income to one lady is not charity. Let us not forget that she has been receiving vast sums of money for more than 20 years out of this estate under the direction of Mr. Ed Ball, her brother.

Mrs. du Pont, in fact, must have received more income last year than almost any other member of her sex in the world. I am told, for example, that the yearly allowance of Queen Elizabeth of England amounts to £475,000. That is about $1,425,000. Mrs. du Pont's income far overshadows that of the Queen of England.

No, Mr. President, the Alfred I. du Pont estate is not a charitable organization, and it never has been.

Let us not forget that when she gets this money, it is subject to her disposal; she can do with it what she wishes. As Senators will see in a moment, what is left over at the time of her death is another matter. It is true that Mrs. du Pont assigned about 12 percent—12 percent of more than $8 million—of her Du Pont estate income last year to a charitable foundation for crippled children. After deducting this 12 percent assigned to charity, she had left $7,584,862.57.

Back in 1955 and 1956, if it had not been for the representation that this estate was a charitable institution—which it is not—the Du Pont estate would have been brought under the Bank Holding Company Act. If it had been brought under the Bank Holding Company Act, it could not possibly have maintained its interest in both the Florida East Coast Railway and in its numerous banks—it would have had to divest one or the other. One of the purposes of the Bank Holding Company Act is to prevent great financial institutions, great banking combines, from having a stranglehold on any segment of the American economy, for we know that monopoly is irreconcilable with economic freedom; monopoly is irreconcilable with competitive freedom.

The public policy behind the Bank Holding Company Act of 1955 and 1956 is a policy to protect the American people, to protect American consumers, to protect American taxpayers, to protect all of us from being required to have our economic rights, our economic freedom, jeopardized by powerful financial combines. So a part of the purpose of the Bank Holding Company Act was to require great financial banking institutions to divest themselves of such operations as the Florida East Coast Railway. That is what ought to have been done. It is what, in my judgment, must be done now in the interest of the people of Florida and of the country.

I repeat, so that there will be no question about my emphasis on this point, that after Mrs. du Pont last year deducted 12 percent of her income for charitable purposes, she had left $7,584,862.57 for her personal use. It is also true that after Mrs. du Pont's death, the income now going to her will go wholly to the foundation for crippled children. But that does not make the estate a charitable foundation or institution now. During the lifetime of this lady, there can be a powerful combine, as I pointed out in my speech on the evening of February 5, exercising in no small degree a choking stranglehold on the economy of the State of Florida. I specified on the night of February 5 how Mr. Ball has said to the communities of Florida in which the estate has its properties, "I will pay this amount of taxes, and no more." His political power, his economic power, his despotism are so great that in many parts of Florida he rules with an iron economic hand. We must find out whether he is bigger than the Government.

I shall give the Senate and the House of Representatives an opportunity to cast their votes on that subject, for I shall seek to bring this financial tyranny under the control of the Bank Holding Company Act. Once it is placed under the Bank Holding Company Act, the problems of the Florida East Coast Railway will vanish, because Mr. Ball will then have to dispose of its property, as he should have been required to do years ago.

Mr. President, I do not begrudge this lady her ample income. I have been told she is a fine lady. I wish her a long life. I mention Mrs. du Pont's income now solely because the phony charity excuse was used to justify excluding the Du Pont estate from the Bank Holding Company Act. Senators were misled on the matter.

Mr. President, as I said, the man who runs the Du Pont estate is Mrs. du Pont's brother, Mr. Edward Ball, and Mr. Ball has gravely abused the vast economic power left in his hands by the Du Pont's estate exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act.

Mr. Ball has abused his power over his railroad, the Florida East Coast Railway. Mr. Ball has abused his power by refusing to pay the property taxes owed by this railroad. Mr. Ball has abused the power given by the vast landholdings he controls to defy the highway authorities in Florida. I fully documented those statements in my speech the other night.

We in Congress have let Mr. Ball keep all his vast power by exempting the Du Pont estate from the Bank Holding Company Act. That act required other bank holding companies to divest themselves of control over all nonbanking enterprises. The Du Pont estate was not required to do so.

It is an estate the chief characteristic of which is the operation of 31 banks. This gives it the most powerful financial influence in the entire State of Florida. The Du Pont estate, with its 31 banks, was not covered by the Bank Holding Company Act. I suggest it is time to do so now.

The "charity" excuse offered for the Du Pont empire was not valid. I repeat: Senators were misled; Mrs. du Pont gets the money—Mr. Ball gets the power, which he then proceeds to abuse. We should no longer make a special exception for these people. We should bring them under the Bank Holding Company Act and keep them there.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the 24th annual report of the trustees of the Alfred I. du Pont estate, entitled "Schedule 'G'—Income cash disbursements," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SCHEDULE G

Income cash disbursements

Jan. 1, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1963 inclusive:	
Trustees' fees:	
Jessie Ball du Pont	$5,000.00
Elbert Dent	5,000.00
Florida National Bank of Jacksonville	2,000.00
Total	12,000.00
Nemours estate maintenance	209,939.98
Trustees' miscellaneous expense	255.26
Ulmer, Murchison, Kent, Ashby, and Ball, retainer	1,200.00
Interest paid on bank loans	19,312.50
Florida intangible tax	353,877.69
State and county real estate taxes	10,735.47
Printing and other costs pertaining to booklet	60,614.93
Jessie Ball du Pont, preferred annuity	200,000.00
Other annuities as follows:	
Mary E. Brereton	1,200.00
Charlotte Lee Cannon	5,000.00
Katherine Lee Chatfield	5,000.00
Mrs. H. E. Crist	800.00
James Dolan	1,200.00
Catherine C. Gardner	1,800.00
Elizabeth Saxon Jakes	500.00
Margaret H. Kyle	1,200.00
L. Vandergrift Lee	5,000.00
Maurice du Pont Lee	15,000.00
Maurice du Pont Lee, Jr.	5,000.00
Richard H. Lee	5,000.00
Marga Lee Mahony	5,000.00
Anne Evans Matthewson	1,200.00
Mary G. Shaw	1,200.00
Laura Calhoun Walls	900.00
Irene Walsh	1,200.00
A. C. Denise du Pont Zapffe	30,000.00
Total	86,200.00
Residual annuity, Jessie Ball du Pont	8,391,889.28
Less 12 percent assigned to Nemours Foundation	1,007,026.71
Total	7,384,862.57
Plus income balance reserved on Dec. 31, 1962	200,000.00
Total	7,584,862.57
Less income balance reserved on Dec. 31, 1963	200,000.00
Total	7,384,862.57
Nemours Foundation 12 percent of residual income under irrevocable assignments	1,007,026.71
Total income disbursements, Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1963	9,346,025.11

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARREST OF MISS CAROLE ELAINE MERRITT IN CANTON, MISS.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have received a number of letters from citizens in Cincinnati, Ohio, discussing the plight of Miss Carole Elaine Merritt, who is held in jail in Canton, Miss., in connection with a movement of Negroes to attempt to attain certain objectives.

I know nothing about the merits of the charges that were placed against her. However, I am told that she is required to post a $500 property bond to procure her release pending trial. The pledgers, friends of hers, have offered to post $500 in cash; but seemingly, under the law, the enforcement officials have the right to reject that type of bond and insist that a $500 property bond be posted.

She has not been able to procure the $500 property bond. She has been able to procure $500 in cash—which her pledgers are willing to post.

I cannot understand why it should be insisted that the $500 in cash is not acceptable, and that a $500 real property bond has to be posted with the court.

The Constitution provides that people shall be allowed, pending criminal proceedings, to be released on the posting of adequate bail. Whether this lady is guilty of the offense with which she has been charged, I do not know, as I have said; but I am certain that if I am relating the facts; namely, that it is insisted that she post a $500 real property bond, and that the $500 in cash is not acceptable, justice is not being done.

I called the Department of Justice, and discussed this subject, and asked the Department, through its representatives, to check into the matter. I was told that it will do so. I hope the Department will be able to accomplish something in behalf of getting this lady released, so there will be accorded her the justice to which she is entitled under the U.S. Constitution.

Carole Merritt is a very superior young woman who won a scholarship to Vassar College from Cincinnati, Ohio, Vassar Club and graduated from Vassar cum laude.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS HAS LAGGED FAR BEHIND HOPES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Hadassah magazine appears an article entitled "Squalor and Wealth: Alliance for Progress Has Lagged Far Behind Hopes." The article was written by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

As I have been heard to say before, I repeat that I do not know of a keener student and scholar of Latin American problems than the Senator from Alaska. He has been the author of many writings on Latin America; and his book on Mexico is still a standard reference in the universities of this country, in connection with any course dealing with United States-Mexican problems.

The Senator from Alaska does well to point out, in the article, that our responsibility in regard to Latin America is to see to it that we do a better job of exporting to Latin America the institutions of economic freedom, for it is impossible to solve the problems of squalor until something is done about putting food into empty stomachs. Empty stomachs do not make for vigorous exponents of our wishes, when it comes to a matter of a political ideology. So if we do something to help raise their standard of living—and that was the great vision of President Kennedy at the time when he initiated the Alliance for Progress program—we have a much better chance to stem the tide of communism in Latin America.

So I compliment the Senator from Alaska for this penetrating article; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy and his kind words. Coming from him, the knowledgeable chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, his words constitute, for me, the highest tribute which could be rendered on the floor of this body.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Oregon in extending congratulations to the Senator from Alaska, because he is, and has been for decades, a recognized authority in the field of Latin-American affairs; and when he speaks or writes on that subject, his words are well worth the attention of the Senate and the entire country.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished majority leader for his kind words, even though they may not be fully deserved. I appreciate the wonderful support he has continually given in connection with these matters. He, himself, is an expert on foreign affairs, as his every utterance demonstrates, as well as on domestic matters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The words are very well deserved; otherwise they would not have been spoken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

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

SQUALOR AND WEALTH: ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS HAS LAGGED FAR BEHIND HOPES

(NOTE.—The violence in Panama last month is symptomatic of the volcanic emotions of the impoverished people of Latin America described in this exclusive article by Senator ERNEST GRUENING. The achievements and failures of the Alliance for Progress in dealing with this explosive situation are analyzed by the Senator from Alaska.)

(By ERNEST GRUENING)

Addressing Latin American diplomats and Members of Congress and their wives at a White House reception on March 13, 1961, less than 2 months after his inauguration, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy launched the Alliance for Progress. It proposed a cooperative effort for the economic and social rehabilitation of Latin America. It projected a great vision. It offered, by means of a major joint undertaking, to try to bring the Latin American nations abreast of mid-20th century potentials.

Reviewing the similarities in the histories of the republics of the Western Hemisphere—their self-establishment as self-governing nations—the late President then pointed out their great deficiencies in economic well-being. He depicted the contrast between their abundant natural resources and "the daily degradations of hunger and poverty" suffered by millions of Latin Americans. He stressed their lack of decent shelter, their ill health and inadequate protection from disease, their widespread illiteracy.

These conditions, he said, made for the infiltration of alien forces, seeking again to impose on the people of the New World the despotisms of the Old, with ideologies foreign to the freedom visioned by the great leaders of Latin American independence, Bolivar and San Martin, and by our own founders; and that the peril had never been greater than now.

President Kennedy was referring to the Communist takeover in Cuba and to the danger that similar overthrows would take place in other neighboring countries. Unquestionably the Communist infiltration and capture of Cuba, the first of its kind in the Western Hemisphere, gave both impetus and urgency to the proposal for the Alliance for Progress.

Throughout these messages, President Kennedy repeatedly stressed the need of the recipient nations enacting measures of self-help.

"Only the most determined efforts of the American nations themselves can bring success to this effort," he said in his White House address of March 11, 1961.

"Its effectiveness depends on the willingness of each recipient nation to improve its own institutions, make necessary modifications in its social patterns and mobilize its own domestic resources for a program of development," he said in his March 14 message to Congress, and then specified: "Even at the start such measures will be a condition of assistance. * * * Priorities will depend not merely on need, but on the demonstrated readiness of each government to make the institutional improvements which promise lasting social progress."

And twice again in the same message he stressed these conditions:

"When each nation demonstrates its willingness to abide by these general principles, then outside revenues will be available."

Finally the late President declared: "So that each recipient nation will live up to the principles of self-help and domestic reform outlined above, funds will not be allocated until the operating agency receives assurances that the country being aided will take those measures necessary to insure that the

particular project brings the maximum social progress."

The two basic principles stressed by President Kennedy as essential to the successful functioning of the Alianza Para El Progreso (to give it its Spanish name); namely, (1) the strengthening of democratic institutions and safeguarding of human rights, and (2) the intensification of self-help, were affirmed by a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, meeting at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962. Thus these principles and conditions received bilateral assent and sanction from both the United States and the Republics to the south of us.

How has the Alianza fared since then?

The realistic answer must be highly qualified.

But, first, let it be said that in the writer's view, the purpose of the program is noble, its objectives desirable, and its value, if achievable, unquestioned.

Unfortunately, in its execution, performance, and results have lagged far behind hopes.

To date, the United States has poured somewhat in excess of $7 billion into 28 countries to the south of us. This figure may cause surprise, since there are only 20 Latin American Republics, 18 of them Hispanic-American, while the official language of Brazil is Portuguese, and that of Haiti, French. But the United States has also given aid to the United Kingdom's colonies of British Guiana and British Honduras, to Surinam (Dutch Guinea), Trinidad, Tobago and Jamaica, also until very recently British colonies. (Personally, I consider that folly. The mother country should have furnished the aid, if it was required; but that is another matter.)

As for our Latin American aid, there is not too much to show for this vast expenditure. In two of the largest countries, Argentina and Brazil, into which nearly a billion and two billion dollars have gone respectively, the money has, in my judgment, been totally wasted.

The fault, in my view, is Uncle Sam's. We have not lived up to the specific prescription of reform and self-help required of them in President Kennedy's repeated assertions. In both countries the governments have been unstable, dependent on the whim of the military, and unable or unwilling to make—and keep—commitments of self-help.

At this point it might be desirable to indicate what some of the measures of self-help specified by President Kennedy as prerequisites to our aid are, and why.

Nearly all of the Latin American countries (there are a few exceptions) have a feudal structure at the top of which a plutocracy, composed of a relatively few families, allied with the military, controls the wealth and power. These families manage the nation's finances and resources. They own most of the land. In contrast, the vast majority live in abject misery. A typical illustration of this contrast exists in almost every Latin-American city where the luxurious palaces of the few and mighty look down on the vast and loathsome slums of the many. This contrast has never seemed to trouble the consciences of the intrenched oligarchy.

What President Kennedy was in effect asking was that the ruling powers distribute some of their vast landholdings equitably; cease their usurious lending practices—36 percent a year is not uncommon; tax themselves—which they have never done; permit the new revenues to go to social and economic betterment of the masses; and invest their own funds at home rather than stash them away in Swiss banks. So far the response in many Latin-American countries has been negligible. Maybe it was naive to expect this power elite to depart from encrusted practices, to divest itself of some of its riches and pelf so that the masses on whose backs its affluence rests can improve their living standards. But the alternative to this proposed evolutionary approach, as President Kennedy sought to make clear, was bloody revolution, which in this day probably means another Castro-Communist type of takeover.

Yet, despite noncompliance, the United States has repeatedly made lavish grants and so-called loans to Brazil, whose repeated promises for anti-inflation measures and other reforms have never been kept. Similar departure from the prescribed Alliance principles has characterized our relations with Argentina.

In other countries also—Peru, Ecuador, Guatemala, and more recently the Dominican Republic and Honduras—the duly elected regimes, chosen by as close an approximation to free and democratic elections as those countries have ever known, were overthrown by military juntas, using as the instruments of overthrow the tanks, airplanes and machineguns furnished by the United States, presumably for hemispheric defense. These military coups, bringing to power by force irresponsible elements with whom it is impossible to work out an assured economic and social program (to which they are generally hostile), nullify the efforts previously made by the United States and consign the funds already advanced to the familiar "down the drain."

Some three-quarters of a billion dollars have already been wasted on military aid to Latin America. The United States has aggravated the situation by not holding firm in nonrecognition and withholding of aid to the usurping juntas. After a brave show of nonrecognition and cancellation of aid in Peru, the policy was reversed and aid resumed 2 weeks later.

Such a vacillating and shilly-shallying policy engenders no respect for the United States or confidence in its pronouncements. If continued it will spell the end of the Alliance for Progress. However, in November 1963, the U.S. Senate, belatedly assuming some of its constitutional responsibility to be watchful of the authorization of funds, amended the Foreign Assistance Act to eliminate military aid to Latin America. Like all such provisions, it was qualified by giving the President the right to make exceptions where, in his judgment, the national interest required it.

In other countries our program appears to have fared better. It is too early to so state categorically. But in a number of the small Central American countries, and in Colombia and Venezuela and Chile, efforts are being made to carry out those nations' responsibilities under the prescriptions laid down by the author of the Alliance, President John F. Kennedy, and ratified by the conference at Punta del Este. Concomitantly schools, housing, clinics, roads, technical assistance, and other material benefits have flowed from U.S. dollars and are tangible and visible evidences of the U.S. high purpose.

The need is so great, however, and so undercut by the population explosion—greater in Latin America than elsewhere—that only a mighty cooperative effort and reform will spell the progress to which the Alliance is dedicated. For only by adherence to the mutuality of the effort can the program advance. The fault in not insisting upon adherence to the prescribed conditions lies with the U.S. administration of the program.

What is needed, in short, is selectivity. We should work with those nations—and only with those nations—that are willing to work with us for the common and highly desirable objectives of the Alliance.

To achieve these objectives through democratic processes was an integral part of President Kennedy's proposal. But let no one be deluded that this goal is easy of attainment. The history of most—though by no means all Latin American countries—is that of alternation between chaos and dictatorship. One may observe pertinently that in their mother countries, Spain and Portugal, after a thousand years of exposure to Western European civilization, there are still dictatorships (the dictatorships of Franco and Salazar) while their people enjoy none of the basic freedoms—of press, speech and assembly—that the Alianza hoped to inculcate along with economic progress.

True, the Alliance is scarcely 3 years old; it must be tried further before final judgment can be rendered on it.

But, unless that further trial rigidly adheres to the sound principles predicated for it, it will be a failure.

One basic fact that the administrators of our foreign aid program have lost sight of needs to be stressed. It is this: No country is obliged to accept our aid. Neither is the United States obligated to give aid to any country. Unless these twin axioms are to govern our actions in the administration of the foreign aid program, of which the Alliance for Progress is a part, we can face only disillusion and failure.

The purpose of the Alliance is too worthy to be allowed to fail. But it has failed in part to date, and will fail completely unless it becomes a two-way enterprise, instead of what it has been, a careless and prodigal disbursement of American funds without vigilance and determination as to their ultimate useful application.

PROGRAM IN CONNECTION WITH H.R. 6196, THE COTTON-WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, I wish to announce that after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and with other Senators who have been consulted, it is our intention, following the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address, to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6196, the cotton-wheat bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very cognizant of the Senator's problems in connection with scheduling measures for consideration, and so forth; but I think this matter should not be passed over without elucidation.

I preface my remarks by saying that I realize that the Senator from Montana has very great problems in connection with scheduling the consideration of measures; second, in no way do I challenge his desire—and it is urgently mine—to schedule the consideration of the civil rights bill and to have it disposed of, although we know its consideration will take a considerable length of time.

However, we have been carried along here, without anyone's really raising hob about the situation, and have waited for the conference report on the tax bill to be made, although normally there would have been an adjournment, and the second reading of the civil rights bill would have been in order, and it could have been placed on the calendar, and could have been brought up for consideration. A question of proportion is always involved. So, Mr. President, many of us felt—although we were most unhappy about it—that that was one of the facts of life with which we had to live, and

that it would take a few days, and then that would be done.

In the cloakrooms there has been talk to the effect that the farm bill would be brought up first, and thus would to that extent delay the Senate's consideration of the civil rights bill.

So I wish to ask this question—and I emphasize the fact that I am not doing this idly or on a nit-picking basis: Should it appear—assuming that the tax bill will finally be disposed of by Wednesday, let us say—that, come Wednesday night or Thursday, the farm bill is still being debated—and, after all, it could be filibustered, too—could the Senator from Montana, in all fairness to him and to his many responsibilities and obligations—give us some outline of his plans?

If we are to let the farm bill run its course and to hold the civil rights bill out of consideration until the farm bill has run its course, some of us would have strong objections.

I merely lay that point before the Senate, without jumping to conclusions, as a problem not only for me, but for the country. There has been a great deal of talk in the newspapers about the fact that civil rights bill will be stalled. We all understand that the newspapers like to write things in a dramatic way, but I do think it would be helpful for the Senator to state—if he feels he can—his full purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the question raised by the distinguished Senator from New York is a legitmate one. I have been in close contact with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], about our plans. He has always given me the utmost of cooperation, understanding, and tolerance. As we all know, it is the understanding as of the moment that it will be Tuseday before the House will be able to take up the conference report on the tax bill. We hope to take it up as shortly thereafter as it is possible to do so.

We do not know how long it will take to dispose of the farm bill, but it is anticipated that if it is not disposed of by Tuesday or Wednesday—and I doubt that it will be—the farm bill will be laid aside and the conference report on the tax bill will be taken up.

We hope that there will be no dilatory or delaying tactics and that as soon as the farm bill, the conference report on the tax bill and the authorization for military procurement—which I understand will not take too much time—are disposed of, we shall face the civil rights bill with our decks as clear as possible.

I assure the Senator—and I am sure he knows this—that there is no attempt to stall the civil rights bill. But the Senator has been a Member of both Houses long enough to understand some of the difficulties that confront the leadership from time to time, and to be aware of the pressures which descend upon on us on occasion, with which we find it quite difficult to cope.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further? He has been very gracious.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not desire to put any words in the Senator's mouth, but may we assume, first, that what the majority leader proposes is that the only two that will be considered are the farm bill and the military procurement bill with the conference report on the tax bill, which in any event has priority under the rules, to come in Tuesday or Wednesday, and that then the civil rights bill will be considered? Second, those of us who may feel that other measures would take too long, thus defer the civil rights bill too long, I assume would have, under the procedures which we follow, a number of opportunities, if the Senate set aside the farm bill for the conference report on the tax bill, and then came back to it. I assume that if we strongly objected to taking it up again, we could have a vote on that question. If we came to the military procurement bill, we could proceed in the the same way.

Two items should be cleared of record: First, an understanding with the majority leader as to the bills which will come before the civil rights bill; and, second, the fact that no opportunity will be foreclosed—as a number of Senators may feel that considerations of the two bills to which I have referred will take longer than we have any right to defer the civil rights bill—to an appropriate way to get at that issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My answer to the first question would be "Yes." However, if bills of minor importance, about which there should be no difficulty, are reported, I assume that the Senate would allow us to bring them up for passage or consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Second, I hope that the Senator from New York will not bind the hands of the leadership, because we do not wish to take away the rights of any Senator. I assure the Senator that once the bill is called up, it will not be called up for the purpose of being laid aside. There will be plenty of time to devote to the civil rights bill. I am sure, the Senator is aware, that it will take not weeks, but very possibly months, before we can come to a definitive conclusion on that matter. So, if the Senator and the Senate would allow us a little flexibility, we would appreciate it most deeply, because our task is not too easy.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will indulge me, certainly we are assured that the controversial bills—the farm bill and the military procurement bill—are the only two bills which will stand in the way. Second, the Senator will have to move to take up the farm bill and the military procurement bill. If any of us feel strongly about the order of precedence at that time, we shall naturally have an opportunity to bring before the Senate that issue. I hope we will not have to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That right is the right of every Senator. But, as always, the leadership anticipates that Senators will give us their most serious consideration and cooperation.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator be willing to estimate the time when the civil rights bill would be taken up under that schedule?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I could not give an answer to that question until we get underway on the farm bill. Then I would be able to answer the question better, but it will be as soon as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not like to have the Senator engage in suppositions. I know the Senator has read, as I have, speculation on the intercession of a farm bill between the present time and the time of taking up the civil rights bill. I think it would be most reassuring if the Senator should choose—and I submit it to the Senator—to tell the Senate what will be done if there is an inordinate delay.

For example, suppose there were a filibuster against one of the other bills. Will the Senator continue in his determination to bring up the civil rights bill within a very proximate time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would say on behalf of the majority leader that at least on four separate and distinct occasions we have conferred with respect to bringing up the farm bill. At the very first of those meetings, I told him there was some opposition on this side, and there was the expressed hope that perhaps it could be deferred until after civil rights came up for consideration in the Senate.

At the second meeting I had occasion to confer with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], all of whom have quite an abiding interest in the farm bill. As a result of the many conversations that have taken place within the past 2 days, it was quite agreed that the farm bill could be laid before the Senate as of tomorrow, after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

So I think we have composed all of our differences on this side, in the hope that we can dispose of the farm bill, and, for as long as it takes, the military procurement bill, about which there is some urgency, and then proceed to civil rights. Then we will stay on civil rights. I think that it is the distinguished majority leader's intention, once we take up civil rights, to stay with it until we either resolve the issue or discover there is no sword sharp enough to cut the Gordian knot.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator answer the same question I propounded to the majority leader? Would the minority leader join with the majority leader in the statement that should there prove to be an inordinate delay with respect to these measures, which will be interposed, that such delay will not be permitted to defer the consideration of the civil rights bill beyond that reasonably proximate time within which the leader had intended to bring it up?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Speaking only for the minority leader, it would be easy for me to give the Senator from New York that assurance, because my attitude on the

farm bill is anything but a felicitous one.

It strikes a note of deep and durable unhappiness in me. In my present frame of mind, I expect to oppose it on every possible count, so that if it tailed off, with the hope that perhaps it could be cast into outer darkness, it would make the minority leader happy indeed. But I do not wish to speak for the majority leader on that point.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the majority leader has already answered the question, but being a fairly experienced lawyer, I will not ask the majority leader again.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But I have an abiding faith in the understanding and tolerance of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—an abiding faith based on long personal experience.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we know what the request is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what was my request? I have forgotten it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To take up the farm bill tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I am not making that request. I merely have announced to the Senate that it is the intention of the leadership, at the conclusion of the reading of the Washington's Farewell Address, to lay before the Senate H.R. 6196, the agricultural bill on cotton and wheat, reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BEEF AND VEAL IMPORTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, yesterday I received a telegram from a man in Oklahoma City. I think he expressed a timely thought, and I should like to quote it:

> Beef imports based on 1962–63 quotas—
>
> He wired—
>
> is like throwing a drowning man a life line with a rock tied to it.

He went on to say that the cattlemen are in trouble and that, to survive, they need action now. He ended the telegram with a plantive cry of "help."

I concur. I have been calling on the administration to do something about the beef and veal import problem for a year. I agree with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who, on February 18, said the agreement entered into with Australia and New Zealand represented a surrender on our part—see pages 3082–3086, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 18, 1964.

I believe that selecting the 2 highest import years and using the average as the limitation base for 1964 imports does not meet the problem. It is only a token gesture.

So I have joined in a bill introduced by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], which would provide a base or limitation represented by the average of the last 5 years of imports of these items. I think this is a far better solution to the problem than what has been a voluntary measure. Although I have some reservations about the bill, we want to see some action taken; and the fact that the majority leader has seen fit to introduce the legislation speaks for itself.

I fear that if we do not meet the problem without further delay, the situation this year may worsen.

I suggest the possibility that if all the beef and veal exporting countries eventually come under the terms of the new agreement, beef and veal imports into the United States this year may well be higher, not lower, than in 1963.

I realize that press releases on the agreement with Australia and New Zealand suggest that the 1964 importation level will be 6 percent lower than in 1963. If this 6-percent stipulation were applied to all types of imports of beef and veal—based on the assumption that all exporting nations will eventually be covered by the agreement—imports of all types of beef and veal would drop to 1,095,175,000 pounds—product weight—from the 1963 total of 1,165 million pounds—estimated. But this will not happen under the agreement. Moreover, imports should be rolled back much more than that.

Let me explain. There is a defect in the agreement. Australia and New Zealand propose to limit exports to the United States of beef and veal "in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat and live animals." But these excepted items are still included in the totals for 1962 and 1963, which establish the base for continuing future limits.

Granted canned, cured, and cooked meat represents today only a minor portion of the imports from Australia and New Zealand. Nevertheless, these products should have been excluded from the base, and it is unlikely that other countries will accept a different base when agreements are negotiated with them.

In 1963, total imports of canned, cured, and cooked beef and veal amounted to approximately 114 million pounds—one-tenth of the total beef and veal imports. If exclusion of these canned, cured, and cooked meats from the base were provided for by all agreements covering all imports, the 1964 ceiling on beef and veal imports—other than canned, cured, and cooked—would be 987 million pounds, one hundred and eight million pounds less than it will be. So, Mr. President, as the result of this defect in the agreement we can expect 108 million pounds of imports of fresh and frozen bone and boneless beef and veal which should not come into this country to aggravate the markets of our livestock feeders and our cattlemen.

In addition, as I have pointed out, the agreement fails to put any limitation at all on the amounts of canned, cured, and cooked meat imported into this country.

And if you do not think that this will occur, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a press release of January 26 by the Australian Minister for Primary Industry, the Honorable C. F. Aderman.

In agreement with the Australian livestock industry, it is planned "to introduce legislation in the next session of Parliament to give effect to industry proposals for meat market diversification."

The legislation, according to the release, will take the form of imposing a levy on all cattle over 200-pound dressed weight, sheep and lambs slaughtered for human consumption "to provide the finance necessary to undertake additional measures to diversify markets for Australian meat."

Continuing:

> Without doubt, the continued prosperity of the Australian meat industry is bound up with the necessity to insure that satisfactory arrangements are made to preserve our existing markets and to develop new ones. The proposed legislation is aimed at the maximum development of the domestic market and diversification of export markets in the long-term interests of the Australian meat industry.

There, in a nutshell, is what Australia plans to do. And we can rest assured that this diversification will be felt here.

But there are other weaknesses in that agreement negotiated by the United States.

In its press release, the State Department said that "both exporting countries have agreed that the proportion of primal cuts, such as steaks or roasts, should not exceed approximately the current levels."

In a background statement to Members of Congress, the State Department had this comment:

> Agreements provide that the proportion of primal cuts—i.e., better-quality cuts such as steaks and roasts—in each country's beef and veal shipments to the United States is not to exceed the present percentage these cuts constitute in the country's total beef and veal exports to the U.S. market.

"Not to exceed the present percentage" is underlined.

Parenthetically, I might add the State Department says that imports of primal cuts have been blamed by the domestic cattle industry as important causes of low prices. Australian exports to the United States of this grade, incidentally, amount to about 5 percent of their total.

Now let us turn to the text of the Australian note to the United States—the New Zealand text is worded similarly:

> Australia shall use its best endeavors to limit its exports to the United States of better-quality primal cuts of beef and veal, such as steaks and roasts, approximately to the percentage these cuts currently constitute of total annual exports of beef and veal from Australia to the United States.

Note the difference in wording—the United States says the two have agreed to a limitation; Australia and New Zealand both say they shall use their "best endeavors" to limit its export of this type of cuts.

Thus, in my mind at least, it is questionable whether those countries must limit this type. And if their "best endeavors" do not prove good enough, they could actually step up these imports.

Mr. President, there are commitments in that agreement: it assures these nations a definite share of our market; it may assure, in effect, that the Congress cannot take any action to correct the situation and if it does, the President may be obligated to veto the measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the State Department press release and the press statement of the Australian Minister may be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES CONCLUDES MEAT AGREEMENTS WITH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

The Governments of Australia and New Zealand have agreed to limit meat exports to the United States, the Departments of State and Agriculture announced today.

Australia and New Zealand are the principal suppliers to the United States of beef and veal. The agreements announced today were concluded because U.S. imports of these products have increased markedly the past few years. Beef cattle prices are low and declined importantly in 1963. Low domestic prices were mostly caused by heavy domestic production of fed beef. However, analysis by the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that imports also were a contributing factor.

The agreement with Australia covers beef, veal and mutton in all forms other than canned, cured and cooked meats and live animals. The one with New Zealand covers only beef and veal. Australia is the only substantial foreign supplier of mutton to the U.S. market. Mutton is partially interchangeable in use with manufacturing beef, the kind of beef which constitutes the bulk of American imports.

Australia has agreed to limit its exports in 1964 to 242,000 long tons (542 million pounds), in 1965 to 251,000 long tons (562 million pounds) and in 1966 to 260,000 long tons (582 million pounds) product weight of the meats covered in its agreement.

New Zealand has agreed to limit its exports in 1964 to 103,000 long tons (231 million pounds), in 1965 to 107,000 long tons (239 million pounds) and in 1966 to 111,000 long tons (248 million pounds) product weight of the meats covered in its agreement.

The quantities for 1964 reflect the average level of U.S. imports from each country in 1962 and 1963. The quantities specified for 1965 and 1966 are calculated at an annual growth rate of 3.7 percent based on the agreed limits for 1964 exports. This growth rate corresponds to the expected rate of increase in the total U.S. market for these meats. The agreements provide for triennial review of this growth factor and adjustment as appropriate for each succeeding period.

The agreements provide for preservation of the present pattern of trade in meat products between the United States and Australia and New Zealand. Both exporting countries have agreed that the proportion of primal cuts, such as steaks or roasts, should not exceed approximately the current levels.

The agreements represent an important contribution to the stability of the meat industries of the three countries. U.S. domestic producers and Australian and New Zealand suppliers will be able to share equitably in the growth in the U.S. market.

The United States has received assurances from both Australia and New Zealand that in implementing the agreements they will not discriminate against U.S.-owned meat-industry interests in their countries.

Both agreements are of indefinite duration, but they may be terminated by either party upon at least 6 months' notice prior to the end of any calendar year.

The three Governments agreed on the desirability of expanding world trade in meat and meat products. To that end they reaffirm their intention to continue efforts under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to negotiate broader international arrangements to expand access of meat exporting countries to all major world markets. The agreements with Australia and New Zealand could be incorporated into such a broader arrangement.

TEXT OF AUSTRALIAN NOTE TO THE UNITED STATES

I have the honor to refer to recent discussions in Washington between representatives of the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States with regard to the desire of the Government of the United States to arrive at an understanding concerning the level of future exports of Australian beef, veal, and mutton to the United States. As a result of these discussions, I have further the honor to propose that the following agreement shall become effective between our Governments:

The Governments of Australia and the United States have agreed to the following measures in the interest of promoting the orderly development of trade in beef, veal, and mutton between Australia and the United States. In assuming the following obligations, the Governments of Australia and the United States are seeking as well to preserve approximately the present pattern of trade in beef, veal, and mutton between the two countries.

1. Accordingly, the Australian Government shall limit exports from Australia to the United States of beef, veal, and mutton (in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat and live animals), in accordance with the following:

(a) Exports shall be limited to a total of 242,000 long tons in calendar year 1964, 251,000 long tons in calendar year 1965, and 260,000 long tons in calendar year 1966, all in terms of product weight.

(b) In each succeeding calendar year there shall be an increase, corresponding to the estimated rate of increase in the total U.S. market for these meats. This increase in the total U.S. market is presently estimated to be 3.7 percent annually.

(c) The purpose of the annual increases established in paragraphs (a) and (b) is to secure to Australia a fair and reasonable share in the growth of the U.S. market. There shall be a triennial review and, as appropriate, an adjustment of this estimated rate of increase in consumption to apply to the succeeding 3-year period. The first such review shall take place no later than October 1, 1966.

(d) Australia shall maintain approximately the present relationship between beef and mutton exports to the United States.

(e) Australia shall use its best endeavors to limit its exports to the United States of better-quality primal cuts of beef and veal, such as steaks and roasts, approximately to the percentage these cuts currently constitute of total annual exports of beef and veal from Australia to the United States.

2. Australia undertakes to limit its exports to the United States upon the understanding that Australia will not be adversely affected by such limitations in relation to the position of other substantial suppliers in the U.S. market and so long as Australia's access to the U.S. market for beef, veal, and mutton is not limited by an increase in the duties of these products.

3. The U.S. Government shall continue to permit access each year into the United States of beef, veal, and mutton exported from Australia, up to the maximum quantity determined for that year in accordance with provisions of paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) of this agreement.

4. The Governments shall continue to take an active and leading role in negotiating in the GATT, in harmony with the objectives agreed at the ministerial meeting of the GATT in May 1963, arrangements leading to expanding access in meat importing countries.

5. Should such a wider international arrangement be reached, it could subsume this agreement.

6. The Governments agree to consult, at the request of either Government, on any questions arising on the implementation of this agreement.

7. Either Government may terminate this agreement, effective at the end of a calendar year, by written notice given at least 180 days prior to the end of that calendar year.

If these proposals are acceptable to your Government, this note and your note of acceptance shall form an agreement between our Governments.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

TEXT OF U.S. NOTE TO AUSTRALIA

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your note of February 17, 1964, concerning trade in beef, veal, and mutton between Australia and the United States which reads as follows:

"I have the honor to refer to recent discussions in Washington between representatives of the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States with regard to exports of Australian beef, veal, and mutton to the United States. As a result of these discussions, I have further the honor to propose that the following agreement shall become effective between our Governments:

"The Governments of Australia and the United States have agreed to the following measures in the interest of promoting the orderly development of trade in beef, veal, and mutton between Australia and the United States. In assuming the following obligations, the Governments of Australia and the United States are seeking as well to preserve approximately the present pattern of trade in beef, veal, and mutton between the two countries.

"1. Accordingly, the Australian Government shall limit exports from Australia to the United States of beef, veal, and mutton (in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat and live animals), in accordance with the following:

"(a) Exports shall be limited to a total of 242,000 long tons in calendar year 1964, 251,000 long tons in calendar year 1965, and 260,000 long tons in calendar year 1966, all in terms of product weight.

"(b) In each succeeding calendar year there shall be an increase, corresponding to the estimated rate of increase in the total U.S. market for these meats. This increase in the total U.S. market is presently estimated to be 3.7 percent annually.

"(c) The purpose of the annual increases established in paragraphs (a) and (b) is to

secure to Australia a fair and reasonable share in the growth of the U.S. market. There shall be a triennial review and, as appropriate, an adjustment of this estimated rate of increase in consumption to apply to the succeeding 3-year period. The first such review shall take place no later than October 1, 1966.

"(d) Australia shall maintain approximately the present relationship between beef and mutton exports to the United States.

"(e) Australia shall use its best endeavors to limit its exports to the United States of better quality primal cuts of beef and veal, such as steaks and roasts, approximately to the percentage these cuts currently constitute of total annual exports of beef and veal from Australia to the United States.

"2. Australia undertakes to limit its exports to the United States upon the understanding that Australia will not be adversely affected by such limitations in relation to the position of other substantial suppliers in the U.S. market and so long as Australia's access to the U.S. market for beef, veal, and mutton is not limited by an increase in the duties on these products.

"3. The U.S. Government shall continue to permit access each year into the United States for beef, veal, and mutton exported from Australia, up to the maximum quantity determined for that year in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) of this agreement.

"4. The Governments shall continue to take an active and leading role in negotiating in the GATT, in harmony with the objectives agreed at the ministerial meeting of the GATT in May 1963, arrangements leading to expanding access in meat importing countries.

"5. Should such a wider international arrangement be reached, it could subsume this agreement.

"6. The Governments agreed to consult, at the request of either Government, on any questions arising on the implementation of this agreement.

"7. Either Government may terminate this agreement, effective at the end of a calendar year, by written notice given at least 180 days prior to the end of that calendar year.

"If these proposals are acceptable to your Government, this note and your note of acceptance shall form an agreement between our Governments."

I have the honor to confirm on behalf of the Government of the United States that the agreement outlined in your note is acceptable to the U.S. Government and will govern trade in beef, veal, and mutton between Australia and the United States.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(For the Secretary of State).

TEXT OF NEW ZEALAND NOTE TO THE UNITED STATES

SIR: I have the honor to refer to recent discussions in Washington between representatives of the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United States with regard to the desire of the Government of the United States to arrive at an understanding concerning the level of future exports of beef and veal from New Zealand to the United States. As a result of these discussions, I have the honor to propose that the following agreement shall become effective between our Governments:

The Governments of New Zealand and the United States have agreed to the following measures in the interest of promoting the orderly development of trade in beef and veal between New Zealand and the United States. In assuming the following obligations, the Governments of New Zealand and the United States have agreed on the desirability of preserving approximately the present pattern of trade in these products between the two countries.

1. Accordingly, the New Zealand Government agrees to limit exports from New Zealand to the United States of beef and veal (in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat and live cattle), in accordance with the following:

(a) Exports shall be limited to a total of 103,000 long tons in calendar year 1964, 107,000 long tons in calendar year 1965, and 111,000 long tons in calendar year 1966, all in terms of product weight.

(b) In each succeeding calendar year there shall be an increase, corresponding to the estimated rate of increase in the total U.S. market for these meats. This increase in the total U.S. market is presently estimated to be 3.7 percent annually.

(c) The purpose of the annual increases established in paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) is to secure to New Zealand a fair and reasonable share in the growth of the U.S. market. There shall be a triennial review and, as appropriate, an adjustment of this estimated rate of increase in consumption to apply to the succeeding 3-year period. The first such review shall take place no later than October 1, 1966.

(d) The New Zealand Government shall use its best endeavors to limit exports from New Zealand to the United States of better quality primal cuts of beef and veal, such as steaks and roasts, approximately to the percentage these cuts currently constitute of total annual exports of beef and veal from New Zealand to the United States.

2. The New Zealand Government shall limit exports from New Zealand to the United States upon the understanding that New Zealand will not be adversely affected by such limitations in relation to the position of other substantial suppliers in the U.S. market and so long as New Zealand's access to the U.S. market for beef and veal is not limited by an increase in the duties on these products.

3. The U.S. Government shall continue to permit access each year into the United States for beef and veal exported from New Zealand, up to the maximum quantity determined for that year in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) of this agreement.

4. The Governments shall continue to take an active and leading role in negotiating in the GATT, in harmony with the objectives agreed at the ministerial meeting of the GATT, in May 1963, arrangements leading to expanding access in meat importing countries.

5. Should such a wider international arrangement be reached, it could subsume this agreement.

6. The Governments agreed to consult, at the request of either Government, on any questions arising on the implementation of this agreement.

7. Either Government may terminate this agreement, effective at the end of a calendar year, by written notice given at least 180 days prior to the end of that calendar year.

If these proposals are acceptable to your Government this note and your note of acceptance shall form an agreement between our Governments.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

TEXT OF U.S. NOTE TO NEW ZEALAND

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your note of February 17, 1964, concerning trade in beef and veal between New Zealand and the United States which reads as follows:

"I have the honor to refer to recent discussions in Washington between representatives of the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United States with regard to the desire of the Government of the United States to arrive at an understanding concerning the level of future exports of beef and veal from New Zealand to the United States. As a result of these discussions, I have the honor to propose that the following agreement shall become effective between our Governments:

"The Governments of New Zealand and the United States have agreed to the following measures in the interest of promoting the orderly development of trade in beef and veal between New Zealand and the United States. In assuming the following obligations, the Governments of New Zealand and the United States have agreed on the desirability of preserving approximately the present pattern of trade in these products between the two countries.

"1. Accordingly, the New Zealand Government agrees to limit exports from New Zealand to the United States of beef and veal (in all forms except canned, cured and cooked meat and live cattle), in accordance with the following.

"(a) Exports shall be limited to a total of 103,000 long tons in calendar year 1964, 107,000 long tons in calendar year 1965, and 111,000 long tons in calendar years 1966, all in terms of product weight.

"(b) In each succeeding calendar year there shall be an increase, corresponding to the estimated rate of increase in the total U.S. market for these meats. This increase in the total U.S. market is presently estimated to be 3.7 percent annually.

"(c) The purpose of the annual increases established in paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) is to secure to New Zealand a fair and reasonable share in the growth of the U.S. market. There shall be a triennial review and, as appropriate, an adjustment of this estimated rate of increase in consumption to apply to the succeeding 3-year period. The first such review shall take place no later than October 1, 1966.

"(d) The New Zealand Government shall use its best endeavors to limit exports from New Zealand to the United States of better-quality primal cuts of beef and veal, such as steaks and roasts, approximately to the percentage these cuts currently constitute of total annual exports of beef and veal from New Zealand to the United States.

"2. The New Zealand Government shall limit exports from New Zealand to the United States upon the understanding that New Zealand will not be adversely affected by such limitations in relation to the position of other substantial suppliers in the U.S. market and so long as New Zealand's access to the U.S. market for beef and veal is not limited by an increase in the duties on these products.

"3. The U.S. Government shall continue to permit access each year into the United States for beef and veal exported from New Zealand, up to the maximum quantity determined for that year in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) of this agreement.

"4. The Governments shall continue to take an active and leading role in negotiating in the GATT, in harmony with the objectives agreed at the Ministerial meeting of the GATT in May 1963 arrangements leading to expanding access in meat importing countries.

"5. Should such a wider international arrangement be reached, it could subsume this agreement.

"6. The Governments agree to consult, at the request of either Government, on any questions arising on the implementation of this agreement.

"7. Either Government may terminate this agreement, effective at the end of a calendar year, by written notice given at least 180 days prior to the end of that calendar year.

"If these proposals are acceptable to your Government this note and your note of acceptance shall form an agreement between our Governments."

I have the honor to confirm on behalf of the Government of the United States that the agreement proposed in your note is acceptable to the U.S. Government and will govern trade in beef and veal between New Zealand and the United States.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(For the Secretary of State).

MEAT MARKETS PLAN: STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRY, THE HONORABLE C. F. ADERMANN

The Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. C. F. Adermann, announced today that the Commonwealth Government has agreed to introduce legislation in the next session of Parliament to give effect to industry proposals for meat market diversification.

Mr. Adermann said the legislation would provide for the introduction of a levy on all cattle (over 200 pounds dressed weight), sheep and lambs slaughtered for human consumption to provide the finance necessary to undertake additional measures to diversify markets for Australian meat.

"The rate of levy will be fixed annually on the recommendation of the Australian Meat Board after consultation with the industry. The incidence of the levy will be borne by the producer sector of the industry, and provision will be made in the legislation for meat operators and selling agents to have the legal right to pass back the incidence of the levy at the time the stock are purchased for slaughter.

"The funds derived from the proposed slaughter levy would be used by the Australian Meat Board for market diversification and to undertake additional meat promotion in Australia and overseas," Mr. Adermann said.

There were special factors associated with the Australian meat export trade which pointed to the need for new measures in the marketing of Australian meat.

"Without doubt, the continued prosperity of the Australian meat industry is bound up with the necessity to insure that satisfactory arrangements are made to preserve our existing markets and to develop new ones. The proposed legislation is aimed at the maximum development of the domestic market and diversification of export markets in the long-term interests of the Australian meat industry," Mr. Adermann said.

The Minister said that provision would also be made in the legislation for the reconstitution of the membership of the Australian Meat Board. The reconstituted Board would comprise nine members—a chairman, five meat producer representatives, two meat exporter representatives and a Commonwealth Government representative.

Mr. Adermann said that the proposed livestock slaughter levy would replace the existing cattle slaughter levy and the current charge on meat exports. However, the cattle and beef research scheme would continue, part of the new levy being used to finance this research scheme.

"The principles of these proposals were submitted to the Government by the Australian Woolgrowers' and Graziers' Council and the Australian Wool and Meat Producers Federation. The proposals have been approved in principle by the Australian Agricultural Council, which includes all State Ministers for Agriculture, and by the Australian Meat Exporters' Federal Council," Mr. Adermann said.

"The initiative taken by the meat industry is an important step in the right direction. The proposals, when implemented, will contribute substantially to the future welfare of this great industry. As such, they have the full support of the Government," Mr. Adermann said.

DECLINE OF EGG PRICES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the egg producers of the United States, in recent days, have seen the bottom drop out of their market.

Egg prices have declined by more than 12 cents a dozen and there is no assurance that the decline will not continue.

Market fluctuations are to be expected in any industry, but this one felt by the egg producers is particularly severe.

The Department of Agriculture correctly forecast last November that there would be a drop in prices in early 1964. But I am wondering why remedial measures could not have been set in motion to prevent a decline of such proportion.

On February 10, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, in which I pointed out the seriousness of the situation and asked whether there was any program relating to Government purchases of whole and dried eggs, or any other action taken to improve the situation.

I am pleased to report that last Wednesday evening the Secretary of Agriculture did take steps to ease the producers' plight by plans to make available soon dried eggs to families receiving foods under the direct food distribution program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter of February 10 to the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1964.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The New York market on fancy large white eggs opened at 34 cents per dozen today. This is a drop of 11½ cents in 3 weeks. Corresponding losses have been reflected at Chicago and other commodity exchanges.

I recognize that in the November outlook issue on the poultry and egg situation, published by the USDA Economic Research Service, it was forecast that prices were likely to fall below the 1963 level in the first quarter of 1964.

Market fluctuations naturally are to be expected, but this one is particularly severe and is working hardship on farmers in the egg producing business.

I am wondering whether you have any program relating to Government purchases of whole or dried eggs or any other action designed to improve the situation.

Sincerely,

JACK MILLER.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I believe the Department of Agriculture had sufficient knowledge of a trend to anticipate this problem before now:

The annual average of prices farmers received for eggs dropped from 36.2 cents a dozen in 1960 to 34 cents in 1963.

The average price of a dozen eggs as a percentage of annual averaged parity price declined from 76 percent in 1960 to 71 percent in 1963.

Per capita consumption of eggs dropped from 334 in 1960 to 316 last year.

A stepup in production is cited as one possible reason for the drop although available statistics do not indicate that this boost in production is so great as to have had a noticeable effect.

Another possible reason for part of the decline, I believe, could be attributed to the unpredictable Government purchasing policy, as well as the sharp drop in such purchases. I hope the Secretary's action of Wednesday will do much to correct this situation.

Government purchases of dried eggs, according to the January issue of the "Poultry and Egg Situation" put out by the Department, decreased from 1,763,000 cases in 1960 to 778,000 cases in 1963. In 1963, Government purchases were made in only 4 months while in 1960 such purchases were spread over 10 months. In 1961, Government purchases were made in only 6 months and in 1962, only 5 months.

It would seem that if the Government returned to a policy of spreading its purchases as was the case in 1960, it would do much to stabilize the market.

Secretary Freeman, in his statement of Wednesday, indicated as much when he said:

> Removal of surplus egg supplies will help also stabilize prices to producers during the coming peak season of production.

And perhaps the egg producers, at the same time, could intensify their efforts to open up new oversea markets for their products. It should be noted that in 1960 egg exports of frozen or preserved types totaled 2,640,000 pounds while in 1963 they had dropped to 801,000 pounds.

Perhaps an investigation is warranted, to determine the extent speculators may have had a hand in the severe market fluctuations.

These are all proposals which merit serious consideration if a repetition of the current problems are to be avoided.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables and Department of Agriculture statement be placed in the RECORD:

First. "Factors in monthly supply of shell eggs, 1960 to date."

Second. "Number of layers on farms, rate of egg production, and total egg output on farms, by months, January 1957 to date."

Third. "Eggs, Exports, Imports."

Fourth. "USDA's Purchases, Dried Whole Egg Solids."

Fifth. "Text, Freeman's announcement on egg product purchases."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Factors in monthly supply of shell eggs, 1960 to date [1]

[In thousands of cases]

Year and item	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
1960:													
Eggs produced on farms	15,092	14,319	15,542	15,356	15,753	14,442	13,936	13,344	12,672	13,117	13,144	14,092	170,809
Shell eggs to storage	116	41	−164	118	454	357	−81	−283	−263	−214	−173	−20	−112
Eggs broken commercially [2]	853	1,297	1,240	1,280	2,521	2,247	1,034	919	499	476	258	359	12,983
Eggs used for hatching	760	954	1,073	1,170	910	773	660	603	617	617	683	773	9,503
Balance	13,363	12,027	13,393	12,788	11,868	11,065	12,323	12,105	11,819	12,238	12,376	12,980	148,345
Government purchases: Dried [3]	255	248	202	116	25		376	282	222	29	8		1,763
1961:													
Eggs produced on farms	14,394	13,617	15,831	15,394	15,467	14,289	14,033	13,597	13,100	13,803	13,828	14,653	172,006
Shell eggs to storage	4	−31	2	27	160	127	−51	−34	−55	−80	−62	−44	−37
Eggs broken commercially [2]	792	797	1,100	1,726	2,088	1,977	1,302	1,059	772	801	790	786	13,990
Eggs used for hatching	861	1,155	1,260	1,167	910	823	731	635	621	627	677	787	10,254
Balance	12,737	11,696	13,469	12,474	12,309	11,362	12,051	11,937	11,762	12,455	12,423	13,124	147,799
Government purchases: Dried [3]		345	642	186	421	382	108						2,084
1962:													
Eggs produced on farms	14,708	13,736	15,961	15,653	15,872	14,656	14,395	13,919	13,439	14,114	13,947	14,561	174,961
Shell eggs to storage	−10	9	18	−4	267	75	−54	−93	−23	9	−74	−45	78
Eggs broken commercially [2]	812	938	1,457	1,562	2,277	2,230	1,713	1,238	815	704	584	534	14,865
Eggs used for hatching	801	1,102	1,197	1,153	907	823	747	699	741	737	737	789	10,433
Balance	13,105	11,687	13,289	12,942	12,421	11,528	11,989	12,075	11,906	12,664	12,700	13,283	149,585
Government purchases: Dried [3]			112	340	278	338	138						1,205
1963:													
Eggs produced on farms	14,369	13,333	15,736	15,656	15,867	14,733	14,594	14,208	13,625	14,244	14,136	14,675	175,175
Shell eggs to storage	−53	−35	22	5	144	74	−41	−27	−52	−17	−26	−44	−50
Eggs broken commercially [2]	650	737	1,333	1,860	2,169	1,850	1,481	1,715	778	725	629		
Eggs used for hatching	799	1,030	1,178	1,160	941	847	768	698	738	753	795	847	10,554
Balance	12,973	11,601	13,203	12,631	12,613	11,962	12,386	12,362	12,161	12,783	12,738		
Government purchases: Dried [3]				155	298	280	45						778

[1] 48 States.
[2] Excluding equivalent of Government purchases of dried or frozen eggs.
[3] Shell equivalent.

Source: Poultry and Egg Situation, January 1964, Economic Research Service, USDA.

Number of layers on farms, rate of egg production, and total egg output on farms, by months, January 1957 to date [1]

A. AVERAGE FOR THE MONTH

Item and year	Unit	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Average number of layers on farms:													
1957	Million	333	325	316	305	294	284	280	286	300	313	321	324
1958	do	321	314	307	299	290	284	282	288	301	315	324	329
1959	do	327	321	316	308	297	286	281	286	299	311	317	319
1960	do	316	309	302	295	288	281	276	277	285	295	303	308
1961 [1]	do	306	301	297	292	286	281	279	282	293	303	309	312
1962 [1]	do	310	306	303	297	290	285	282	286	295	303	308	308
1963 [1]	do	306	302	300	296	291	287	286	289	295	302	306	307
1964 [1]	do												
Eggs laid per 100 layers:													
1957	Eggs	1,606	1,543	1,862	1,872	1,919	1,772	1,718	1,621	1,491	1,489	1,459	1,588
1958	do	1,664	1,537	1,806	1,861	1,933	1,796	1,757	1,660	1,530	1,564	1,548	1,632
1959	do	1,676	1,612	1,908	1,911	1,963	1,828	1,798	1,701	1,565	1,580	1,542	1,661
1960	do	1,719	1,667	1,851	1,873	1,969	1,850	1,816	1,736	1,601	1,600	1,561	1,649
1961 [1]	do	1,699	1,634	1,923	1,903	1,952	1,833	1,815	1,739	1,616	1,645	1,617	1,697
1962 [1]	do	1,713	1,618	1,902	1,901	1,972	1,859	1,840	1,757	1,646	1,680	1,637	1,706
1963 [1]	do	1,698	1,593	1,895	1,906	1,965	1,855	1,845	1,777	1,665	1,702	1,668	1,724
1964 [1]	do												
Total monthly egg production:													
1957	Million cases	14.9	13.9	16.3	15.9	15.7	14.0	13.3	12.9	12.4	13.0	13.0	14.3
1958	do	14.8	13.4	15.4	15.4	15.6	14.2	13.8	13.2	12.8	13.7	13.9	14.9
1959	do	15.2	14.4	16.7	16.3	16.2	14.5	14.1	13.5	13.0	13.6	13.6	14.7
1960	do	15.1	14.3	15.5	15.4	15.8	14.4	13.9	13.3	12.7	13.1	13.1	14.1
1961 [1]	do	14.4	13.6	15.9	15.4	15.5	14.3	14.1	13.6	13.1	13.8	13.9	14.7
1962 [1]	do	14.7	13.8	16.0	15.7	15.9	14.7	14.4	14.0	13.5	14.2	14.0	14.6
1963 [1]	do	14.4	13.4	15.8	15.7	15.9	14.8	14.6	14.2	13.7	14.3	14.2	14.7
1964 [1]	do												

B. FIRST-OF-MONTH

Number of layers on farms:													
1957	Million	337	328	321	310	300	289	279	280	292	309	317	324
1958	do	324	317	311	304	294	286	281	283	292	309	320	329
1959	do	330	324	319	312	303	291	281	282	291	306	315	319
1960	do	319	313	306	299	292	284	278	275	279	291	299	307
1961 [1]	do	309	303	299	295	289	283	280	279	286	299	306	311
1962 [1]	do	312	308	305	301	294	287	282	283	289	300	306	309
1963 [1]	do	308	303	301	299	294	289	285	286	291	300	305	307
1964 [1]	do	307											
Eggs laid per 100 layers:													
1957	Eggs	51.8	51.9	58.3	61.9	63.0	60.8	57.3	53.5	51.0	48.4	47.8	49.6
1958	do	52.9	54.5	55.3	60.8	63.2	61.5	58.2	55.1	52.0	50.0	50.9	52.4
1959	do	52.9	55.2	59.9	63.2	64.0	62.6	59.3	56.6	53.1	51.3	50.7	52.2
1960	do	54.9	56.0	58.9	60.6	64.2	62.9	60.0	57.3	54.7	52.0	51.2	52.8
1961 [1]	do	53.6	55.9	60.8	63.2	63.6	62.4	59.8	57.3	54.9	52.9	53.3	54.5
1962 [1]	do	55.0	55.4	60.2	62.5	64.2	63.0	60.9	57.8	55.5	54.3	54.1	55.0
1963 [1]	do	55.0	54.7	59.1	63.1	63.9	62.9	60.8	58.3	56.4	54.7	55.2	56.0
1964 [1]	do	55.3											
Daily rate of egg production:													
1957	Million eggs	175	170	187	192	189	176	160	150	149	150	152	161
1958	do	171	173	172	185	186	176	164	156	152	155	163	172
1959	do	175	179	191	198	194	182	167	159	155	157	160	166
1960	do	175	175	180	181	187	179	167	157	153	151	153	162
1961 [1]	do	166	169	182	187	184	177	167	160	157	158	163	169
1962 [1]	do	172	170	184	188	189	181	172	164	160	163	166	170
1963 [1]	do	169	166	178	188	188	181	173	167	164	164	168	172
1964 [1]	do	170											

[1] Includes Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Poultry and Egg Situation, January 1964, Economic Research Service USDA.

Eggs

	1960		1961		1962		1963	
	Total	Value	Total	Value	Total	Value	Total	Value
Exports:	*Dozen*		*Dozen*		*Dozen*		*Dozen*	
In shell	17,547,000	$11,847,000	14,677,000	$11,645,000	8,572,000	$7,970,000	17,591,000	$11,706,000
Hatching	6,207,000	7,403,000	8,842,000	9,259,000	6,842,000	7,272,000	9,906,000	9,157,000
Other	11,340,000	4,444,000	5,835,000	2,386,000	1,730,000	698,000	7,685,000	2,549,000
	Pounds		*Pounds*		*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Dried	5,417,000	5,218,000	4,949,000	4,424,000	4,353,000	4,372,000	5,074,000	5,475,000
Frozen/preserved	2,640,000	1,166,000	3,657,000	1,737,000	2,035,000	971,000	801,000	416,000
Imports:	*Dozen*		*Dozen*		*Dozen*		*Dozen*	
In shell	2,610,000	1,194,000	2,522,000	1,071,000	1,560,000	508,000	[1] 1,334,506	[1] 954,000
Chicken	2,405,000	974,000	2,369,000	883,000	1,326,000	478,000	[1] 984,199	
Other	205,000	220,000	153,000	188,000	234,000	300,000	[1] 350,307	
	Pounds		*Pounds*		*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Dried, whole, yolks, albumen	3,000	4,000	40,000	46,000	None	None	[1] 185	7,000
Frozen/prepared	13,000	8,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	5,000	[1] 4,765	

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Library of Congress, Agricultural Division, Feb. 18, 1964.

USDA's purchases

	Sec. 32		Sec. 6	
	Million pounds	Million dollars	Million pounds	Million dollars
Dried whole egg solids:				
1959	12	14	8	9
1960	19	21	----	----
1961	22	27	----	----
1962	13	13	----	----
1963	8	9	----	----

Source: Secretary's Office, Department of Agriculture, Feb. 20, 1964.

Mr. MILLER. Here is full text of story released in Washington at 5 p.m., Wednesday, February 19:

FREEMAN ANNOUNCES ADDITION OF EGG PRODUCTS TO NEEDY PERSONS DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced today that the Department would soon make available dried eggs to families receiving foods under the direct food distribution program. Purchases of dried whole egg solids will be made with section 32 funds.

The Secretary said, "This action is being taken in response to President Johnson's overall objective of easing the impact of poverty among needy people. The recent substantial decline in egg prices to producers makes a highly nutritious protein food readily available for supplementing the diets of hungry people. A second consideration is that the removal of surplus egg supplies will help also stabilize prices to producers during the coming peak season of production."

Currently, over 5 million needy persons are being provided with surplus foods in 48 States and over 1,500 counties.

Procurement details regarding the purchase program will be mailed to the trade next week.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ASSISTANT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Associated Press, in a dispatch appearing in the New York Times of February 16, performed a service in calling attention to the possibility of a duality of functions stemming from a recent action of President Johnson.

In placing the new post of Presidential Assistant for Consumer Affairs in the Labor Department, the report pointed out, the President may have overlooked or may not have been fully aware of the consumer-oriented services of the Department of Agriculture.

I hope that when the new post becomes fully operational, that there will be no overlapping of services. I hope also that establishment of the new post is not the first step toward a new agency.

I believe that the Congress should be informed as to the scope of this new position of Presidential assistant and exactly what services will be entailed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Consumers Aided by Farm Agency," be placed in the RECORD.

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

CONSUMERS AIDED BY FARM AGENCY—DEPARTMENT PRIDES ITSELF AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES

WASHINGTON, February 15.—President Johnson gave the Agriculture Department a jolt when he put the new post of Presidential Assistant for Consumer Affairs in the Labor Department.

The Agriculture Department has prided itself on its services aimed at helping consumers. But the President gave the new position to Mrs. Esther Peterson, an Assistant Secretary of Labor. Some in the Department believe that Mr. Johnson may have overlooked or may not have been fully aware of the many consumer-oriented services carried out along with farm programs.

The Department says that its consumer services reach into 50 areas, ranging from food grading, nutritional research and clothing studies to house planning.

Yet the Department quite obviously has not had great success in impressing its consumer interests on the general public.

Aside from consumer benefits from farm production research, the Department offers the general public such services as inspection and grading of meats, poultry, eggs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables—services designed to assure consumers good, clean, wholesome food.

The Department has some of the world's leading authorities on nutrition, textiles, horticulture, and other fields of interest to city people as well as farm people.

If the consumer has any question regarding soil, water, fruits, vegetables, flowers, trees, shrubs—any that are connected with food, its preparation, care, preservation, how to buy, nutrition, planning houses or kitchens, making or mending clothes, controlling insects, he can get a bulletin covering the subject or a personal answer to a specific question by writing the Department.

For years the Department has been issuing guides on best food buys at various seasons of the year. It has done much of the research leading to new wash-and-wear fabrics.

The Department studies and advises housewives on buying and care of household appliances, cookwear, and other equipment. It has developed fire-resistant cotton materials. It has issued a shopper's guide for men's suits. It has developed a durable fire-retardant paint for outside use.

The Department has helped develop wool sweaters and blankets that can be washed by machine, permanently pleated wool skirts, and permanently creased wool trousers.

It has bulletins on stain removal, mildew control, repair of rugs, laundry methods, pattern alteration, house location, fireplaces, and chimneys, care of wood floors, household pest control, drainage, house plants, recreation, community projects, family budgeting, consumer credit, and on how to meet national defense emergencies.

LEE P. LOOMIS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a journalistic giant whose influence and reputation extended far beyond the borders of the State of Iowa, died on February 10. He was Lee P. Loomis, chairman of the board of Lee Enterprises, Inc., a group of Midwest and Rocky Mountain newspapers and radio-television stations.

Many things can be said about Lee P. Loomis—of his vision, his warmheartedness, his love of Mason City, Iowa, and the State of Iowa.

But no more fitting tribute can be given than the words of those with whom he was associated for so long. I believe the remarks of Philip Adler, publisher of the Davenport, Iowa, Daily Times, and president of Lee Enterprises, Inc., and W. Earl Hall, editorial consultant and former publisher-editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, best sum up the life and contributions of Lee P. Loomis.

Said Mr. Adler:

He had a lifelong dedication to newspaper work, a faculty for making friends, an enthusiasm for selling and a business foresight which will long be remembered. He leaves a legacy of good works in his home community of Mason City, his church, and among newspapermen everywhere.

Said Mr. Hall:

Newspapering was not merely the lifework, it was the life of Lee Loomis. While he possessed a singularly wide range of interests, all of the others were linked to journalism. Just about every recognition that could come to him did come but his greatest satisfactions came from the performance of the task at hand each day.

Lee P. Loomis will not soon be forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles relating to the death of Mr. Loomis be placed in the RECORD: First, "We Were Proud To Call Him Boss," "Lee Loomis Leaves Legacy of Good Work," "Lee P. Loomis: A Man of Contracts," and "Thanks, Boss," all from the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette; and second, "Lee Loomis," from the Sioux City, Iowa, Journal.

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

[From the Globe-Gazette, Feb. 11, 1964]

WE WERE PROUD TO CALL HIM BOSS

An association of almost 40 years between Lee Loomis and the writer has come to an end in the death of our beloved publisher emeritus. There is sadness around the office where he presided with a smile, a soft voice and a general tone of friendliness that made "Boss" a term of affection.

Newspapering was not merely the lifework, it was the life of Lee Loomis. While he possessed a singularly wide range of interests, all of the others were linked to journalism. Just about every recognition that could come to him did come but his greatest satisfactions came from the performance of the task at hand each day.

His first contact with newspapering was at Ottumwa where on the parent paper he was assigned to the most onerous tasks of the profession—farm-to-farm subscription solicitation, bookkeeping and the like. His uncle, A. W. Lee, founder of the Lee papers, wanted to test him. His being a nephew wasn't enough. At Muscatine the trial was continued. He measured up by earning first the managing editorship, then the publishership.

In 1925 when he came to Mason City as publisher, he had reached full professional maturity. His discipline had given him not merely an understanding but a mastery of every phase of newspapering. His coming was an event of significance not alone to the Globe-Gazette but for Mason City and the extensive area in north Iowa and southern Minnesota served by our daily newspaper.

The Loomis journalistic credo contained two cardinal guidelines:

1. The accent must always be on the news in newspaper. While reasonable earnings are essential to a free press, they must never be at the expense of news content.

2. A newspaper, to fulfill its fundamental responsibility, must make itself a part of the life of the community in which it exists. In short, it must be a good citizen.

This philosophy made working with and under Lee Loomis a joy. It meant separation of the editorial and the business operations of the paper. News has been handled with no restraints other than those suggested by editorial judgment and good taste.

In the working out of things, too, the determination of editorial policy resided in the editorial department. This is not to say, however, that the Loomis counsel was not sought on matters of import. It was freely sought and freely given.

The amazing range of the Loomis interest in his church and in all projects designed to advance the cause of Mason City and north Iowa, as well as those of journalism, is set forth elsewhere. His imprint on the face of our community will be discernible far into the future.

A distinguishing mark of the Lee Loomis personality was his ability—and it amounted almost to a genius—for giving leadership quietly and from behind the scenes. He was content to let others, including this writer, represent him and the newspaper over which he presided so long and so ably.

A profound sorrow is manifest in all departments of the Globe-Gazette. No "boss" ever had a greater love or loyalty from his associates. When the plant now nearing completion is dedicated later this year, there will be one fact uppermost in the minds of us all:

"That's a monument to Lee Loomis."

[From the Globe-Gazette, Feb. 11, 1964]

LEE LOOMIS LEAVES LEGACY OF GOOD WORK

(By Philip Adler)

Philip D. Adler, president, Lee Enterprises, Inc.: "Lee Loomis stood tall as a newspaper publisher in the Midwest. His publishing career touched three cities and largely developed the Lee newspaper group in the Midwest and Montana. His interest in radio and television brought the Lee interests into this field.

"For 60 active years as a newspaperman, Lee Loomis devoted himself wholeheartedly to the task which A. W. Lee began. He had a lifelong dedication to newspaper work, a faculty for making friends, an enthusiasm for selling, and a business foresight which will long be remembered.

"He leaves a legacy of good works in his home community of Mason City, his church, and among newspapermen everywhere.

"Mr. Loomis' accomplishments included an invaluable contribution to the development of the Davenport newspapers. His interest in their success made him a frequent visitor who became a familiar figure in the offices of the Times and the Democrat for two generations.

"In the Lee group his death brings a personal loss to hundreds of newspapermen and women with whom he worked and whom he inspired."

Ray N. Rorick, Globe-Gazette publisher: "The uplifting influence of Lee P. Loomis will be the star on which Globe-Gazette employees will set their sights for all of the foreseeable future. Woe to that employee who sought to practice anything less than the very highest in ethics. He was personal counselor to every one of his employees and revered by every single one. His passing is very real and personal to each of us."

W. Earl Hall, editorial consultant and former editor of the Globe-Gazette: "Our 39 years together on the Globe-Gazette have proved a rich and stimulating association. I have been proud always to call Lee Loomis 'Boss.' At the core of his professional credo was an insistence that the 'news' in 'newspaper' have the emphasis. This meant news and editorial independence in the making of our daily newspaper. This is one of the rich heritages bequeathed by Lee Loomis to our newspaper."

[From the Globe-Gazette, Feb. 12, 1964]

LEE P. LOOMIS: A MAN OF CONTRAST

(By Thor J. Jensen)

Active supervision of 10 daily newspapers and associated radio stations means managing of millions of dollars of business and more millions of property.

It made Lee Loomis one of the biggest businessmen in Iowa for many years. Few of his neighbors realized it. He didn't talk about it.

His wife didn't talk about it either. She was used to it. "I had a husband for 6 months," Mrs. Loomis once observed, "and after that, I had a newspaperman."

She referred to the fact that Mr. Loomis, at the age of 31, was called back from his honeymoon to become publisher of the Muscatin Journal. That was in 1915. Within 6 months the newspaper took his time.

He came to Mason City April 1, 1925, when the Globe-Gazette became affiliated with the Lee Newspapers. That led him to say later: "What a hell of an April Fool's joke to play on good, unsuspecting Mason City people."

He used strong language, no doubt dating back to his days as police reporter in Ottumwa. It took him 4 years to persuade Margaret Anna Hakes to marry him, complicated by the fact that her minister father kept asking:

"Are you sure you want to marry this young man, who uses such strong language over the phone?"

On the other hand, he was for some years one of two men who kept the financial head of St. John's Episcopal Church in Mason City above water. Said the man who at that time was in charge of the finances:

"Several times I went to Lee or 'Bide' Way and told them the problem. Each time Lee would call in his secretary and tell her to make out a check. Mr. Way did the same."

The language he had learned in his youth followed a short term as a bookkeeper of the Ottumwa Courier. One day the publisher, A. W. Lee, looked over his shoulder and said:

"Lee, you'd make a good bookkeeper—if you could only write."

So Loomis became a cub reporter. He was a born versifier. Even his police report was in verse. It was spicy, he said in later years, because that's the way the town was then.

It was so spicy, he recalled with a laugh, that some days he and the city editor would make it a point to be out of the building when the paper got to Mr. Lee's desk. It was read.

The Ottumwa publisher may not have thought much of Lee Loomis as a bookkeeper, but when he became head of the Lee Group, he became again a bookkeeper.

Every month he received from each of the 10 Lee papers a report on that month's business by departments. That record he kept in his little black book. He could tell at all times how business was going in each of the 10 newspapers. He was in command.

When he walked into the composing room of the Globe-Gazette, the printers said, "Good morning, Lee." They went to work at 7 a.m. and he was there then or soon after. He was earlier than the reporters.

Despite his command of 10 newspapers, he never overlooked the smaller details. Mrs. Loomis confesses that was the one thing she complained to him about—wearing himself out with details. He couldn't help it. He had to be at the newspaper whenever the press was running and before, including Sunday evenings if he was in Mason City.

His minute attention to Globe-Gazette matters didn't keep him from giving a full measure of his time to civic affairs.

Bank failures plagued north Iowa when he came to Mason City. He took a leading part in trying to stop them and in softening the effects of their closing.

The depression followed the bank closings and brought him new community worries. When the Mason City Community Chest had an immediate need for more money for relief, he told others:

"I'm subscribing the first $100 toward $1,000 more. Now you go out and get the other $900."

He was usually first.

When it became obvious that Mason City must have an airport to take the place of railroad passenger traffic, he took the lead in raising a special fund of $3,000 to send emissaries to Washington. The result was the Federal grant which made possible the Mason City Municipal Airport.

When World War II was over and housing was a problem, he subscribed the first $1,000

for the Globe-Gazette and the second $1,000 for KGLO to organize the Mason City Development Association. He added more thousands later, when needed.

Lee Loomis led but usually was not the one in the public eye. Someone else was chairman, as a rule. In later years, however, he was chairman of the fund drive which made possible the conversion of what had been built as a hospital into our Good Samaritan Home.

His versifying stayed with him as long as he was active. The annual gridiron show at the Mason City Chamber of Commerce Christmas party died when he stopped writing it.

So long as he wrote it, the script was full of verse and spicy (but never barbed) comments about his neighbors. For more than 20 years, with Lester Milligan at the piano, he wrote parodies on popular songs and poked fun at the Mason City scene.

He didn't mind kidding himself. In 1930 he wrote in the script:

"Say, this crime situation is getting worse. I saw two men stick up a guy on the street Friday afternoon."

"Aw, that wasn't a holdup. That was Bide Way and Lee Loomis raising money for the Episcopal Church."

"How did Bide and Lee get on that church board anyway?"

"Well, they say the rough element rose up and demanded recognition."

His parodies were not always funny. One, a parody on "Oklahoma," was used for many years by the Mason City Chamber of Commerce chorus:

"Mason City, where the corn grows tow'ring round about,
Where men work and play, and fill each day
With a lust for living like a shout.
Every day we're milling out cement, making brick and tile; our pork's the style.
Happy, busy, yes, and so content.
We know we belong to our State,
And the State we belong to is great.
And when we say
Yeeow—I-O-W-A—I-o-way,
We're only saying,
You're mighty fine.
Mason City, Mason City, Okay!"

An active Republican, he nevertheless never hesitated to kid politics and politicians. In the minstrel chorus, Earl Dean, Democrat, and Earl Hall, Republican, were constantly pitted against each other as donkey and elephant.

Dean, in 1943, sang this one:

"The Republicans think they are lucky,
And they boast to the vote in Kentucky.
You partisans gloat; on the prospects you dote.
But wait till our Franklin goes after the vote."

The chorus was prophetic:

"Oh, what a beautiful morning.
Oh, what a beautiful day!
I've got a wonderful feeling
Everything's going our way."

Lee Loomis brought radio to Mason City. In 1940 he even kidded about that:

"Earl Hall cheers for the GOP
While Eighmey loves Democracy.
But Old Lee Loomis, ain't it so?
He just loves KGLO."

One of the most beautiful things he wrote was in 1946 when the Reds had exploded their atom bomb, the Communists had taken China and things were going not too well at home. After a recital in song of all the discouraging events, came these concluding lines:

"Oh, all is gloom and all is woe—
But stop—What cynic told you so?
Green grows the holly—the snow is white.
The Yule log fire gives crimson light.
Throughout the land the churchbells ring,
And carols of joy the children sing.
Old Santa comes in fabled sleigh—
If we could only make him stay—
One day we'll banish doubt and fear
And fill their void with love and cheer.
Our fondest wish to you, our peers,
May your days be turned to Christmas years!"

[From the Globe-Gazette, Feb. 13, 1964]

THANKS, BOSS

We said goodby to "the boss" today.

Each of us who still tread the steps of the building Lee Loomis loved so much did it in our own individual way.

How does one give a parting heartfelt salute to a man who was father to all, a counselor to many and a gentle critic of both the veteran and the neophyte alike?

One does it best with thoughts, those and little mental images painted by the broad pen of personal relationship.

For some of us in the Globe-Gazette family this intimate contact was established and nurtured over a span of nearly 40 years. For others, the more-or-less newcomers, it represents only a millisecond in this man's long and venerable newspaper career.

There was, for instance, that blustery February afternoon almost 10 years ago to the day.

We had just come to the wire news desk assignment from the city hall beat and were still unaccustomed to all the workings. Mr. Loomis happened into the newsroom, as he often did late in the day, and noticed the consternation written on our face.

"There's a tremendous photo here on the shooting at Des Moines," we almost shouted, "and we could get it into the North Iowa edition if we call the engraver back from home."

This, of course, necessitated a juggling of schedule and extra expense.

It was at this point that the voice from the doorway made the decision for us.

"If it will make it a better paper, go ahead and do it," was the never-to-be-forgotten bit of advice. "Your job is to get the news into this edition."

The decision, of course, was the correct one. His basic tenet that news is the very essence of newspapering can never be challenged.

Then there were those seemingly too-frequent intraoffice telephone calls "from downstairs"—pointing out what we at that time believed to be inconsequential corrections of grammar or wrist-slappings on picayunish deviations from fact.

"Let the little things get away from you and you're in trouble" was the admonition we received—and deserved.

Yes, we all have learned there is an important place for such critical "flyspecking" in carrying out our daily assignments. We learned because we had a superior teacher.

These are just two indelible vignettes of a good friend we'll never forget. We could recite many, many more.

But now it's back to the job at hand. There are deadlines to meet and readers to serve.

That's the way Lee Loomis would have wanted it. After all, the readers were his friends, too.

[From the Sioux City Journal, Feb. 12, 1964]

LEE LOOMIS

Everybody who was at all active in the newspaper business in Iowa from the early 1920's to the early 1960's knew Lee P. Loomis, chairman of the board of Lee Enterprises, which owns newspapers and radio stations in a number of midwestern and Rocky Mountain cities. Most people knew him as publisher of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, which he helped make into one of the State's fine newspapers. Older persons in the profession recall him as publisher of the Muscatine Journal, for several years prior to 1925.

Mr. Loomis was truly an Iowa newspaperman, receiving his early training on the Ottumwa Courier before going to Muscatine. There and at Mason City he was active in the affairs of the profession on both State and regional basis. He loved Iowa and "sold" Iowa to everyone who would listen. His organizational and administrative abilities were great, and he was one of the State's most respected newspapermen. His many contributions to his profession will long stand to mark his time in Iowa journalism.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have important speaking engagements in my State on March 13, 14, 20, 21, and 24, and on April 1, 2, 18, 21, and 22.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on those days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PLANS FOR A CHANCERY CENTER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on January 20 I introduced S. 2444, a bill to create a chancery center in the District of Columbia. An unfortunate oversight in preparing the official copy of the bill led to the omission of the name of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] who joined as a cosponsor in offering the bill. The Senator from Maryland is a distinguished member of the District of Columbia Committee, whose constructive influence has brought many urgently needed projects to completion in the District of Columbia. I regret that his name was omitted from this bill and ask unanimous consent that it may be added at the next printing.

There has been much interest generated in the proposal for an international chancery center. WMAL, a radio and television broadcasting company in the District of Columbia, has stated editorial support for the idea of an international center. I ask unanimous consent that copies of recent WMAL editorials be reprinted at this point in my remarks.

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

CHANCERY BUILDING

Senator McINTYRE, of New Hampshire, has proposed a handsome international center in Washington for the location of chanceries and other office buildings of foreign governments. We have proposed the same idea before and strongly believe in the merits of such a project. When completed, the center would eliminate the need for chanceries in residental areas.

Foreign governments, particularly those of new nations, could lease office space to conduct their affairs. Developed by private investors, the project would cost the taxpayers nothing. Proposed legislation would authorize the use of urban renewal powers to clear land for the enclave. The center would also serve as a convenient place for diplomatic, social, and recreational events.

We agree with Senator McINTYRE that an international center is feasible and would be a great asset to Washington.

RUSSIAN EMBASSY—CHANCERY LOCATION

The controversy over the Chevy Chase location of the Russian Embassy-Chancery remains unsettled. Construction of the proposed facility on the Bonnie Brae estate has been temporarily blocked. A Federal judge recently ruled that permission for the site was granted after the White House and State Department exerted undue pressure in favor of the location.

Judge Pine suggests that a new board be created specifically to hear the Bonnie Brae case. We believe the zoning application should be denied.

Neighbors opposed the proposed embassy-chancery because it would be incompatible with the neighborhood. They also feared heavy traffic congestion and possible demonstrations against the Russian Government.

We advocate that an international center, to serve all nations, be built in downtown Washington. The center could easily become a new urban renewal project. An international center is the only appropriate place for countries to establish new accommodations.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I was also greatly encouraged by the editorial support given to the idea by the Washington Post on February 3, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted at this point in my remarks.

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

CENTER FOR CHANCERIES

A certain urgency attends the suggestion of a center for foreign governments' chanceries. Several large missions are currently looking for sites into which to expand. If a center is to be established by Congress, it needs to be done in time for these tenants.

Senator McINTYRE's bill for this purpose is warmly regarded by the State Department, and for good reason. The chanceries, with their air of commerce and their parking difficulties, are not welcomed in Washington's residential neighborhoods. Their intrusions have proved a source of continued local friction, trivial but by no means negligible. Senator FULBRIGHT's bill, passed last year by the Senate, would prohibit any new chanceries in residential zones. Senator McINTYRE now proposes to authorize a 30-acre site, under the District's urban renewal program, for a spacious and well-designed new center in which foreign governments could find quarters.

Before Congress passes the bill, it will demand the answer to one obvious question: Where is the chancery center to be? If the National Capital Planning Commission can bring itself to make a recommendation promptly, the McIntyre bill may yet be enacted in time to serve the diplomats, and to save the neighborhoods into which their chanceries would otherwise have moved.

Of course, no chancery center will meet all the office needs of foreign diplomats. For this reason further action on the Fulbright bill is also important. Before it goes any further, however, it should be amended so as to ease the restrictions on the location of chanceries. If Congress is unwilling to lay down guidelines for the Board of Zoning Adjustment in granting exceptions for the location of chanceries in residential neighborhoods, it should at least keep the door open for such facilities in apartment zones.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the Post's statement that a certain urgency attends this problem. Therefore I would like to state that every effort will be made to convene hearings before the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the first week of March or, failing that, the week following.

I recently addressed the Chevy Chase Citizen's Association on this problem. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that address appear in the RECORD.

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

CHANCERIES AND THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(An address by U.S. Senator TOM McINTYRE, Chevy Chase Citizens' Association, February 17, 1964)

As you know, the Congress is entrusted with the power of legislating for the District of Columbia. As a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia I share in the responsibility for governing its 680,000 citizens and 68 square miles. My experience in local government in New Hampshire has convinced me that progress, which is after all why governments are instituted among us, comes from strong local concern for local government. When the machinery of government is dismantled and the National Legislature has to concern itself with local affairs, it doesn't take long for public opinion to die down to a dead calm. From 1802 to 1874 there was a measure of home rule in the District of Columbia, but by the end of the Civil War the problems of the Capital City had really become intolerable. Population was growing far more rapidly than the city could pay for needed public works and services.

Exceptionally difficult racial problems arose. The city became ugly and grew in a heedless fashion. These problems were solved, for a short time, by giving control of the District to Congress. But new problems have arisen, and I think the time has come when Congress should begin to yield back local control and at least a limited amount of home rule. Only then can citizens and their Government, in close and continuing consultation, begin to make meaningful progress on problems of deprivation, the quality of municipal services, the city's finances, and its problems of persistent crime.

And another of these problems is the city's unplanned growth. In my few months in the Nation's Capital, I have come to feel that almost every residential area is threatened by freeways, commercial invasion, crime, blight, and other problems. Any fine vista, whether a downtown street or a stretch of wild country, can be put on the block. There is little confidence that what is best in this beautiful metropolitan area will necessarily endure. And I think it is this lack of confidence, well justified to be sure, that has accounted for the strong fight waged by many local groups, including the Chevy Chase Citizens' Association, against chancery development.

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL DIPLOMATIC COMMUNITY

The public law creating the Capital area, passed in 1790, calls the District of Columbia "the permanent seat of government of the United States." And to our Government, over 100 foreign governments are accredited for the conduct of diplomatic relations. I believe that Washington's status as an international capital is welcome to almost all residents of the area. The diplomats who come here and their families receive a warm welcome in this characteristically American and friendly city. But it seems extremely shortsighted to me, that better provision should not have been made for the location of the offices which these governments employ in conducting relations. I was astonished to discover that chanceries were not even subject to zoning regulations until 1957. Their growth has been largely unplanned and has tended to center in the Sheraton-Kalorama area between Rock Creek Park, Massachusetts Avenue, and Connecticut Avenue. And as the number of new countries has grown, so have the pressures for new chancery locations. But I have formed the impression that the lightning of chancery location can strike just about anywhere, without any regard to the real needs of the neighborhood.

Now it is one thing to be bewitched by advertisements in Holiday magazine: palm trees, tropic sunsets, snow-covered mountains, or French villages. But it is quite another to find a five-story bustling office building, surrounded by swarms of cars, with streams of visitors, right in the middle of a residential area. There was abundant testimony at the hearing before our subcommittee that no one could be sure which neighborhood would be chosen next for chancery development. Since 1957 chanceries have been defined as commercial uses of property under the District of Columbia zoning law. Whenever a property owner wanted to sell to a foreign government for chancery purposes in a residential neighborhood, it was necessary to apply to the Board of Zoning Adjustment for a special exception. The standard by which these were granted was never defined in so many words, but compatibility with the neighborhood was the most important requirement. If a proposed foreign government business office was out of place, a special exception would be denied. If it was compatible, the special exception would be granted. Some 30 special exceptions have been granted since this procedure began in 1957.

ROLE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

I do not, however, share in the view sometimes expressed, that the State Department is a leading cause for unplanned chancery development in Washington. The Department actually has never been granted legal authority to equal its undeniable responsibility for chancery affairs. It is an exceedingly unsatisfactory legal situation. If the Department does not intervene, an ambitious real estate salesman may fill a residential block with chanceries. If it does intervene with the foreign government, the real estate salesman can still promise to sell. If it intervenes with the Board of Zoning Adjustment, it may invalidate the order of the Board, as recently happened with the Soviet chancery application. No one here would deny that the State Department ought to exercise general guidance of chancery matters, in line with its responsibilities to the President and the Congress. But the law ought to be clear as to what the Department can and should do, and what it cannot and should not do. It is an invitation to confusion to give the Board of Zoning Adjustment authority to waive the law. On the other hand, without a measure of home rule, it is very hard for the District government to resist the State Department once its mind is made up. Now some measure of discretion is proper in government, but we should have a much more definite law governing chancery affairs in the District of Columbia. The legal situation is chaotic. The real estate situation is uncertain. I can tell you that the foreign governments themselves find the uncertainty, confusion, and delay

just about as troublesome as the residents of the District do.

That is a brief glance at the problem as I see it. I am not a member of the international set and am certainly not an expert on District of Columbia residential areas. Up in New Hampshire we have a wry saying that an expert is an ordinary fellow from out of town. Well, I am certainly from out of town, and I think my approach to this problem is ordinary enough, but I'm not an expert. We all want to preserve the quality of the Nation's Capital. We all want to do what is right by the diplomatic community. And I think it is possible to strike a fair balance in adjusting these different interests.

THE FULBRIGHT BILL, S. 646

In July the Senate passed the Fulbright bill, S. 646, which bans chanceries from all neighborhoods zoned for residential purposes. It is presently before the Multer subcommittee of the House District Committee for their consideration. That bill was quite simple. Upon the date of its enactment no chancery or business office could be built in a residential area, and no existing chancery could be enlarged beyond the extent of what would require a building permit. The principal purpose of the bill was to close a loophole in the Zoning Act whereby chanceries could acquire these special exceptions. It would treat foreign government business operations just as present law treats foreign commercial operations or American commercial operations. Still, on examination, there would be problems remaining if the bill were enacted. Chanceries would have to acquire property in special purpose or commercial districts which are beyond the means of many countries. There would still be no planning. And the measure would seem to be aimed at countries which are newly independent and do not yet have chanceries in Washington. "Why can't we be permitted to have chanceries in the same kind of area as all the other countries?" would be the question.

THE CHANCERY CENTER BILL

Partly because the Fulbright bill would not solve the whole problem, I gave considerable thought to the possibility of establishing somewhere in Washington a precinct for chanceries—an international center. Within the boundaries of such a center foreign governments could construct buildings or rent space for the conduct of their business of diplomatic representation. Social and recreational facilities might be provided for the diplomatic corps. Businesses and charities with oversea interests might construct offices or rent space. Tour facilities could be provided for students and others visiting Washington to learn more about our foreign relations.

The bill I have introduced, with the very welcome cosponsorship of Senator GLENN BEALL, of Maryland, would grant to the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia the power to condemn up to 30 acres for this purpose. The Senate has passed a bill, S. 628, to give this Agency such powers over commercial areas of the city, but it has not passed the House. The Redevelopment Land Agency would have the power to create a chancery center in any blighted residential area of the city, but the Beall-McIntyre bill would give them this power for commercial areas as well. Thus, it is entirely consistent with the earlier Fulbright bill and would complement it nicely, or so it seems to me.

This bill would also solve the pressing problem of the need for chancery space on the part of new countries. It would provide that foreign governments awaiting the completion of space within the chancery center could occupy an existing building in a residential area for up to 3 years while space was being completed in the center. No new building permits would be issued. With permission of the District Government and the State Department, under appropriate regulations which would be issued after passage of the bill, a foreign government could rent existing space until it was able to move into the center. Thus the long-range objective of the Fulbright bill would be preserved, because the governments would have to leave the space when their time was up, but the short-term needs could also be met. It is my hope that this slight liberalization in the terms of the Fulbright bill will help it to win passage in the House.

The countries seeking to enlarge their chanceries or build new ones is about one dozen. As new nations become independent, the list will grow. Larger nations on every continent seek to construct or lease office space in the next few years. The presence of their governments, and famous international corporations and charities would reassure the newly independent nations that the American people were not relegating them to any position of unimportance. Thus this would not be a ghetto. Far from being a preserve for smaller nations, the chancery center could rapidly become a spot of international architectural distinction, and countries would welcome a chance to locate there.

That is one reason for the use of the urban renewal power. It would then be possible to give the center a unified design, like a handsome college campus or group of buildings. It would be my hope that the developer would be willing to construct sufficient low-cost housing in the vicinity so that displaced families could continue to live in their familiar neighborhood.

The diplomats are welcome in every section of Washington, so it would not be the intention to reserve housing space for them either in or near the center. There might be a club, and a hotel for transients, but that is a different matter. Thus, there would be no suspicion that the diplomats, as opposed to their offices, would be asked to locate in any particular part of Washington.

One of the advantages of bringing these offices together in a center would be that services, such as secure electronic communications, might be made available to the smaller countries whose facilities at the United Nations are increasingly burdened. For the first time they would be able to transmit and receive messages direct from Washington, without having to wait for them to be relayed back and forth from New York. There would also be service businesses, such as travel and office services, perhaps a foreign bookshop, and almost certainly an American hospitality center somewhere in the chancery precinct.

This bill would make a distinct contribution to the beautification of Washington. Development would be in private hands without cost to the taxpayer. I hope that you, with your concern for our foreign relations and also the integrity of neighborhoods, would give it your support. I am confident that the foreign governments and our State Department will support this idea. I warmly hope that city planners and others who are professionally concerned with the urban progress of Washington will soon agree upon a site. In light of the fact that participation by both large and small, wealthy and less wealthy countries will be necessary for the center, one of the principal needs is for a rapid growth of public support for this project and rapid action by the agencies of Government. I hope I will enjoy your support in the campaign to create such a center in the District. I can assure you that I will urge the Government agencies to hasten in their work toward passage of the bill and active planning for the chancery center. The disputes over the Soviet Chancery and perhaps some of the other well-publicized chancery problems will have served a useful public purpose if they help to bring about this outcome.

RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 21, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20 (legislative day of February 10), 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Nicholas Johnson, of Iowa, to be Maritime Administrator, Department of Commerce.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Fulton Freeman, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Perry H. Culley, of California.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.

Elmer E. Yelton, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Donald C. Ide, of Washington, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John R. Vought, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Raymond J. Alvarez, of California.
William Bodde, Jr., of Maryland.
John S. Brims, of New Jersey.
John W. Campbell, of California.
Richard P. Draves, of New York.
Irving Lewis Fuller, Jr., of Virginia.
Marshall J. Jeannero, of Florida.
Francis M. Kinnelly, of Maine.
Clint A. Lauderdale, of California.
Allan M. Parrent, of Kentucky.
James D. Phillips, of Kansas.
John E. Reinertson, of Wisconsin.
G. Henry M. Schuler, of Pennsylvania.
Frederick S. Vaznaugh, of California.
Eugene R. Vikingson, of Minnesota.
David E. Zweifel, of Colorado.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Miss Peggy A. Antonides, of Illinois.
Charles H. Barr, of Washington.
Adrian Anthony Basora, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
John Franklin Campbell, of California.
Donald D. Casteel, of Wyoming.
Reed Cecil, of Texas.
John H. Christensen, of Iowa.
Daniel H. Clare III, of New York.
Harvey T. Clew, of Connecticut.
Edward Knapp Dey, of New York.
Clarke N. Ellis, of California.
Henry A. Engelbrecht, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Patrick J. Flood, of Ohio.
William A. Garland, of Maryland.
Ralph E. Hamil, of New York.
William B. Harris, of California.

F. Stephen Hoffman, of New York.
Robert Onan Homme, of Minnesota.
Robert G. Houdek, of Illinois.
David A. Hughes, of Washington.
William P. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
William A. K. Lake, of Connecticut.
William Harold Levit, Jr., of California.
Joseph Charles Luman, of Pennsylvania.
James Richard Matz, of Texas.
Bradford William Miller, Jr., of New York.
Ronald Peter Myers, of Michigan.
Miss Leona M. Nelles, of South Dakota.
Robert F. Ober, Jr., of Illinois.
Bradford C. Oelman, of Ohio.
Samuel R. Peale, of New York.
Reynold A. Riemer, of New York.
Robert M. Ruenitz, of California.
Murray C. Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Richard L. Storch, of Illinois.
Maurice M. Tanner, of Arizona.
Milton J. Wilkinson, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John M. Beshoar, of Colorado.
Michael V. Connors, of Washington.
John P. Ferriter, of New York.
John H. Fincher, of Illinois.
T. Patrick Killough, of Texas.
Miss JulieAnn McGrath, of Illinois.
Franz H. Misch, of California.
John C. Stephens, of Colorado.
William L. Swing, of North Carolina.
Norman E. Terrell, of Washington.
Miss Paula Ann Wiegard, of Maryland.
Augustus J. Williams, Jr., of Georgia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard C. Alvarado, of Texas.
Lynn Darrell Bender, of California.
Miss Kirsten Campbell, of New Jersey.
L. Selwyn Coates, of Ohio.
Peter Collins, of New York.
John H. Hawes, of New Jersey.
Alvin Helfeld, of New York.
Herbert J. Horowitz, of Michigan.
Richard M. Ogden, of Connecticut.
Karl S. Richardson, of Nebraska.
David H. Shinn, of Washington.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Lewis P. Achen, of Montana.
Miss Aileen Aderton, of Pennsylvania.
Dewey W. Conner, of Kansas.
Samuel P. Dieli, of Michigan.
Michael L. Di Legge, of Virginia.
Philip F. Dorman, of California.
John F. Fay, of Virginia.
George G. Jespersen, of Maryland.
Robert F. Jordan, of Massachusetts.
Joseph Kinal, of Nevada.
Samuel H. Rickard III, of Maryland.
John H. Scanlon, of Missouri.
Edward H. Sims, of South Carolina.
Peter N. Synodis, of California.
Wilbur F. Weeks, of Connecticut.
Gerold D. O'Grady, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

John J. Ewing, of California.
Leonard C. Gmirkin, of Ohio.
Nicholas Letsou, of New Hampshire.
Leonard Whistler, of Connecticut.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Donald Porter Barnes, of Colorado.
Stuart T. Baron, of California.
William A. Bell, of the District of Columbia.
Robert E. Button, of New Jersey.
Richard D. Drain, of Maryland.
Orville J. Emory, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
James A. Higham, of Massachusetts.
Jack H. Mower, of California.
John B. Riordan, of Virginia.
William C. Simenson, of Virginia.
David L. Smock, of Florida.
Arthur Stein, of Florida.
Marvin Weissman, of Ohio.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Alexander S. Heyward, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George E. Tomlinson
John L. Winston

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Merlin L. Brubaker
Jean-Maurice Poitras
John E. Scott

To be senior assistant surgeons

William L. Wilkie
Larry H. Dizmang
Donald W. Dippe
Peter L. Putnam

To be dental surgeon

John D. Suomi

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Benjamin H. Brown, Jr.
John Folio
Robert C. Birch
Ray E. Holloway, II
Alan J. Trager
Edward Kuzma

To be sanitary engineer

Charles W. Northington

To be sanitary engineer

Thomas M. Moore
James D. Russell
Richard F. Boggs
John P. Sorg
Ralph R. Wirt
William F. Buchholz, Jr.
Jerry L. Butler

To be junior assistant sanitary engineer

Robert P. Stein

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Jesse P. Walker, Jr.

To be assistant pharmacists

Leighton H. Tooms
Ronald A. Gomes
Norman L. Dunfee
Francis P. Barletta

To be senior assistant sanitarians

John G. Todd
Donald R. Smith

To be assistant sanitarian

John J. Bolen

To be senior assistant therapist

William D. Wallis

To be senior assistant health services officer

Roger W. Turenne

To be assistant health services officers

Robert M. Moroney
Philip C. Hoyer
Charles W. Roach

II. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior nurse officer

Mildred K. McDermott

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy as an instructor with the grade of lieutenant:

Jimmie D. Woods

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Armed Forces Help in a Civil Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a blizzard of immense proportions recently swept across the Texas Panhandle, the district I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives, piling up snow on the level to a depth of 25 inches and more. Drifting of this new fallen snow caused enormous drifts and it was virtually impossible for ranchers in some sections of the Panhandle to transport feed to their starving cattle.

In this emergency, which threatened to result in severe losses of cattle, the Army and the Air Force came to the assistance of National Guard units based in the Panhandle. An aerial hay drop from C–119 flying boxcars was organized and executed, more than 2,200 bales of hay were dropped to snowbound cattle in isolated pastures, and as a result the loss of cattle was held to a minimum.

I am proud to pay deserved tribute to the men of our armed services who participated in this mission. I described the operation and its success in my weekly newsletter to my constituents, and I include it in the RECORD as a tribute to the officers and men who served so well:

DEAR FELLOW TEXAN: When I first received word that a blizzard had begun in the Panhandle, I knew that human lives might be endangered and that thousands of cattle might be stranded without feed in the driving, drifting snow. I telephoned my friend Maj. Gen. Selden Simpson in Amarillo and offered my help should the National Guard division he commands—the famous 36th Division—require the help of the U.S. Army or Air Force in alleviating distress. General Simpson said he would keep me advised of the situation. We both recognized that an airdrop of cattle feed might be necessary before the storm abated.

Late Thursday night, General Simpson telephoned to inform me that Panhandle ranchers, particularly in Gray County, feared

their herds would suffer heavy losses unless feed could be delivered to them. Blizzard-bound cattle had been without feed since the previous Monday, and General Simpson said losses would mount rapidly unless feed could be gotten to them within 36 hours. An air-drop of feed—a "haydrop"—appeared necessary, he said. He suggested that cargo helicopters might be employed and said that men from Panhandle units of the 36th Division stood ready to load the aircraft and mark drop zones.

I then conferred with Lt. Gen. Carl H. Jark, the commanding general of the 4th Army at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. General Jark well understands the problems that can develop on the plains when a heavy snowstorm strikes, and he promised immediate assistance in planning and organizing a hay drop to the stranded cattle. The general assigned the duty of working out the details to the 4th Army's young operations officer, Maj. Conrad K. Hausman. The job was one for the Army and the Army area command because the Defense Department has designated the Army as the action agent for coordinating the emergency assistance of all services when problems arise within the continental United States.

Major Hausman obviously relishes such assignments—not only because they provide a means by which the Army can be of direct assistance to American citizens but also because planning and executing such operations provide good training for more warlike emergencies.

Working closely with General Jark, Major Hausman quickly determined that the Air National Guard in Texas was not equipped for the task. The Texas ANG has fighter aircraft and a few reconnaisance helicopters but no cargo aircraft. Major Hausman contacted the 4th Air Force Reserve Region to determine the status of Reserve air crews which might be coming on active duty for training or which might be on emergency call. He and General Jark had determined that the most suitable aircraft for the hay drop mission were C–119's, the old flying boxcars, and such planes were based at Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, and Ellington Air Force Base, Houston. Major Hausman lined up crews for four C–119's at Ellington Air Force Base, home base of the 924th Squadron of the 446th Troop Carrier Wing. Crews were alerted and Major Hausman messaged headquarters in Washington for the necessary high-level approval. That was quick in coming, and at the Pentagon the people who knew of the plans for the operation dubbed it "The Case of the Hungry Cows."

Meanwhile, General Jark's staff members were in contact with General Simpson and also with me and with Maj. Gen. Dwight O. Monteith, the commanding general at Amarillo Air Force Base. All was in readiness for the planes to fly from Houston to Amarillo to begin loading hay—but as of Friday afternoon not enough hay had been rounded up. While waiting for the hay to be accumulated, General Simpson reported to me, he was dispatching National Guardsmen in trucks to go to the ranches to see if they could push through to the pastures.

At noon Saturday, the four planes of the 924th Squadron reached Amarillo Air Force Base and hay was loaded aboard. Through that afternoon and on into Sunday afternoon, the wonderful crewmen of the 924th flew sortie after sortie over 5 Panhandle counties, dropping more than 2,200 bales of hay to the cattle below. So hungry were the cattle that as the planes swung around for a second pass over the fields, the men aboard could see the cattle beginning to eat hay dropped to them moments before. General Simpson reported to me that the operation was highly successful. "The ranchers were 100 percent enthusiastic about it," he said. "It saved their necks." The good news that came this week was that the air drop helped reduce cattle losses from the storm far below the loss experienced in the 1957 blizzard.

To General Jark and Major Hausman, General Simpson, General Monteith, and their staffs—and to the flying crewmen of the 924th Squadron at Ellington—my heartiest congratulations and thanks for a job well done.

An Episode During the Panama Riots—Panamanian Employees Protect the Property of an American Employer in a Voluntary Round-the-Clock Vigil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, although the news from Panama in recent weeks has emphasized existing tensions between the Panamanian Government and our own, there is considerable evidence that the people of Panama still recognize the close ties of friendship which have bound our two countries together over the years.

For instance, I have been told of one such event that took place during the critical days of rioting in Panama last month. Although the headlines pointed up the existing differences between the United States and Panama, this event reflects a happier picture of relations between our peoples.

At the time of the riots following the Canal Zone flag incident, I am told, the Sears Roebuck Store in Panama City had no company representatives at the store. The U.S. president of Sears' Panamanian operations was in the United States, and along with other Americans in the area, the store manager was warned to remain at home and stay off the streets by the State Department because of the volatile situation.

In the midst of the strife and confusion, and unbeknownst to Sears' store manager or any other company supervisor, 28 Panamanian employees voluntarily set up a 24-hour patrol of the store properties. The volunteer patrol continued throughout the crisis, and company property and interests were unharmed. After the weekend rioting, Sears reopened on Monday, but the patrol continued to guard the premises on a round-the-clock basis.

Small as it is, I believe this incident reflects the basic friendship that exists between Americans and Panamanians of good will—a hemispheric friendship that can and should increase between good neighbors and partners in progress.

The United States does have friends among the people of Panama and Central America. Despite the efforts of enemies who agitate to stir up anti-American feeling, this evidence of Sears' Panamanian employees who voluntarily protected American property, conceivably at some personal risk, demonstrates a commendable bond of friendship between our peoples—a bond that I hope will be strengthened by good citizens of both countries.

Statement Supporting Hospital Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I share the hope entertained by many of my colleagues that the able Committee on Ways and Means of this House will in this session favorably report to the House the hospital aid bill as strongly recommended by President Johnson and supported, I believe, by the great majority of the Members of the Congress and of the people of the country.

I should like to submit for the consideration of my colleagues in the House a statement in support of the hospital aid bill which I made before the House Ways and Means Committee on November 21, 1963.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE, NOVEMBER 21, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I am not altogether a stranger to this subject or related subjects. You will recall that back in the early days of the war our people were shocked at the large number of our men between the ages of 18 and 44 who were rejected from selective service because of physical and educational inadequacies. In the field of health alone, 2,997,000 men were rejected because of physical defects.

Because of the fact that that was a matter of vital concern to our national security, I introduced in the other body a resolution which led to the establishment of a committee which, among other things, had the obligation to make a full and complete study and investigation, in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult, regarding the distribution and utilization of medical personnel, facilities, and related health services.

For some 3 years, that committee functioned and was known generally as the Committee on War Time Health and Education, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Welfare of the other body. As I said, I had the honor to be chairman of that committee. We made a number of inquiries into the health needs of our people, the personnel which was available to care for the needs of our people in the area of physical health, and what, in addition to what was already available, the Federal Government might provide.

As a part of that investigation and as a result of the conclusions we reached on account of it, our committee recommended, among other things, that the Federal Government set up a program to assist in the building of hospitals over the country and our recommendations came to be the Hill-Burton bill which originated in the other body and which is now the law of the land, and it has done immeasurably good.

Fortunately, it maintains the principle of simply being primarily concerned with the provision of hospital facilities and, as you know, today Federal assistance is available to public or private hospitals on the basis of their serving the needs in the area where they happen to be located. There is no way to tell you how many lives have been saved, how

much the health of the people of this country has been promoted by that measure which was undertaken by the Congress of the United States and has been steadily maintained and enlarged by the Congress.

We also recommended an extensive program of Federal programs in the field of research and as an outgrowth of that and of other proposals we have today many institutions in the National Institutes of Health which are making immeasurably valuable contributions to the health of the people of our country * * * the prolonging of the lives of our citizens, by virtue of the research that is being carried on. But it became apparent to all of us, Mr. Chairman, that not only did we need the hospital facilities and the medical and other personnel of technical abilities, but we also had to find some way to make it possible for the people of this country to get the benefits of these facilities and the immeasurable skills that are now available in this country from our technical personnel in the medical field.

We discovered as a result of our investigation that the private insurance program as it then existed, and I think the same is true today; was not adequate to meet the needs of our people. We discovered that the people did not have the private means that would make those facilities and that personnel available to them.

Consequently, back near the middle forties, my committee strongly recommended a national health insurance program or compulsory health insurance program, as it was variously called and later recommended by President Truman. The bill came to be known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of which I was an introducer and I have constantly maintained the stability and soundness of that principle.

Today, however, I think our primary concern is to limit the application of that principle to the hospital area, to the provisions of hospital care, and today I do not favor the inclusion of anything in the principle or in the program except a provision of hospital facilities, because I think the principle should have a fair trial in the provision of those facilities. After sound experience the Congress and the country can determine whether we need to go or should go beyond the limitations of that program which is embodied today basically in the recommendations of the President and in the bill introduced by the able gentleman from California, Mr. KING, which with his permission I was permitted to introduce a copy of in the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the President of the United States deemed this subject of sufficient importance, that is, the provision of care for the elderly in many fields, to send a special message to the Congress in February 1963. In the course of that message the President said:

"Our senior citizens are sick more frequently and for more prolonged periods than the rest of the population. Of every 100 persons age 65 or over, 80 suffer some kind of chronic ailment, 28 have heart disease or high blood pressure, 27 have arthritis or rheumatism, 10 have impaired vision, and 17 have hearing impairments, 16 are hospitalized one or more times annually. They require three times as many days of hospital care every year as persons under the age of 65.

"Yet, only half of those age 65 and over have any kind of health insurance, only one-third of those with incomes under $2,000 a year have such insurance; only one-third of those age 75 and over have such insurance; and it has been estimated that 10 to 15 percent of the health costs of older people are reimbursed by insurance."

The able chairman of the special committee which has been making a study in the province of the aging in the other body, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator MCNAMARA, in a report he made in February of 1963 said:

"Even those of the aged who are fortunate at one time or another to be able to secure some degree of protection through the purchase of hospitalization insurance have felt these often frail needs slip or slipping from their grasp, for increases in the cost of hospitalization have even outstripped the rise in hospital charges. No other major items of consumer expense have experienced rises comparable to the increases in the cost of hospital services and hospitalization insurance. These two items are in a class by themselves. By way of comparison, during the period 1960 through 1962, the price of food increased by some 4 percent, clothing by about 2 percent, and housing by approximately 4 percent, as compared with an increase of an estimated 27 percent in hospital service charges."

Now, what are the needs of these people? How adequate is their ability to provide these facilities and services for themselves?

The President touched upon that point, Mr. Chairman, in his comments to the Congress in February of last year. The President said:

"The average annual income received by aged couples is half that of younger two-person families. Almost half of those over 65 living alone receive $1,000 or less a year, and three-fourths receive less than $2,000 a year. About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than $1,000. Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their homes, of less than $5,000. One out of 8—2¼ million people—are on public assistance, averaging about $60 per month per person, supplemented by medical care payments averaging about $15 a month."

Now, Mr. Chairman, prior to coming here this morning, I called on the telephone the county manager of Dade County—a part of which I have the honor to represent in this House—Mr. Irvin MacNair. We have two county hospitals in Dade County.

By the way, our population in our county is a little over a million. Jackson Memorial and Kendall hospitals are the county hospitals. In the last fiscal year, the fiscal year 1962–63, the budgets of those two hospitals were $17,727,000. Of that budget the county of Dade, from funds derived from the taxpayers of our county, contributed in excess of $8½ million. Less than half of the budgets of those two county hospitals was met by private-paid patients who were patients and hospitalized in those two county institutions.

In the current year, and the fiscal year begins October 1, for the fiscal year 1963–64, Mr. MacNair advised me the budget for those two county hospitals is $18,729,831 and the budget of the county contains funds of a little over $8½ million to be contributed by the county for meeting this budget of something over $18 million because of the inability of so many of the patients in these two institutions to meet the charges that were incurred by their hospitalization in those two institutions.

Now, the county welfare people of course determine how much the patient can pay of his own expenses incurred, and what the patient cannot pay is a part of this budget or taxpayer's contribution to the cost of hospital care for the people of our county. We do not in Dade County have any limitation of residence to make one eligible to get the benefit of this problem. As you know, under certain other programs there is a period of residence required before the citizen can get the benefit of the program.

Consequently, a good many of our people are transients that come or tourists that come from other parts of the country but they live in our county. They are human beings, and I am proud of the fact that our county has recognized and our people have supported the county in doing it, our Christian or our religious obligation to those people to provide that which they cannot themselves provide to enable them to get the hospital care that their physical condition requires.

Mr. Chairman, I want to lay down a premise upon which I stand before this honorable committee and our House and the country in advocating the King bill and the President's recommendations and hospital care for our senior citizens.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that if it is sound and desirable to have old-age and survivors insurance which when a citizen passes the age of retirement entitles him to an annuity of so much a month under that program, the extension of that program to provide a fund which would provide hospital care for the citizen when he or she reaches the same age of eligibility is not only sound, but more desirable than the one that would provide the monthly annuity.

I know there are those who say, Mr. Chairman, "Well, why give any hospital assistance to anybody who doesn't need it? Well, why provide an annuity to a retired citizen who doesn't need it? Why impose a tax upon the employer and upon every eligible employee under the old-age and survivors insurance program when there are many who could get along without it?"

Some of them would have means of their own when they retire. Some of them would be able to work and earn enough to provide their food, and lodging, and their clothing, and their essential requirements. Others could live on their children. Some of them could share the blessings of charity and the benedictions of kindness in their community. But why have we determined not to rely upon those sources in order that a man or woman when he or she comes to the age of 62 or 65 might have an assured minimum income which would contribute at least a minimum level of living to that citizen of the greatest and richest country in the world?

Because human experience has taught that most people don't save. Some are unable to save enough. Some are beset by the vicissitudes of misfortunes in the course of their life.

We know that the fact is that most of them, however worthy they are in character and possessed of virtue, come to that age in their lives without the necessary means to sustain them on a decent minimum level of living as America believes is the right of the people of this land; so through old-age and survivors insurance we tax the employer and through him the people and we tax every covered employee so that when the time of retirement comes there will be a little annuity available.

Prior to the recent amendment it was only $40 a month for some. I believe the maximum is now $140 or $150 a month for an individual, but, it is there. And, Mr. Chairman, have you ever heard anybody say that he regretted his contributions in his working lifetime to the old-age and survivors insurance fund with the provision that from that fund there would be a monthly sum available to him when he came to the age of retirement?

I have never heard an employer, Mr. Chairman, say, "I resent the compulsion of my Federal Government that made me contribute an amount equal to that contributed by my employees into a fund which will give an annuity to my employees when they reach the age of retirement." So the people who pay, the covered employee and the covered employer, I haven't heard protesting before this Congress or before your honorable committee, asking that you relieve them of that obligation to provide retirement benefits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that there is even greater reason to extend the same principle of social security to the provision of

a fund out of which hospital care could be provided to senior citizens than there is for the provision of a fund out of which a minimum annuity would be available when the covered person reached the age of retirement. Now, why?

Well, because hospital expenses, as everybody agrees, are more common to that segment of our citizens than to a younger group; in the second place, because hospital expenses are a contingent thing which nobody can evaluate. Nobody can tell how much the hospital bill is going to be. You can know what a minimum level of living is. You can get along on $50 or $75 or $100 or $150 a month, but suppose the hospital bill is $2,500. Where is the money coming from for that?

In regard to insurance on our homes nobody says, "Well, all right, you can insure your home and if it burns up you can get $75 a month for 30 years." If my home burns I don't want $75 for 30 years. I want the amount to restore my home, to repair it or rebuild it. If I have a fire I don't know what the extent of the fire will be. I don't know the amount of damage to my home, so the insurance policy provides that my home will be repaired or replaced in substance by the insurer, whatever the amount of the damage is, and it seems to me the same principle applies here.

I think I recall having seen the figures, and I am sure your able committee is thoroughly cognizant of all of them that of the senior citizens who went into hospitals—I believe something like 1 of 10 of those covered by social security—the average hospital bill was over $700.

Now, Mr. Chairman, $700 is a large amount of money to a lot of people, particularly in this age group of no longer earning, dependent upon the savings of a lifetime or upon good fortune which may have brought in some financial stability, so I say Mr. Chairman, that if old age and survivors insurance is sound and desirable, the extension of the principle and the proven principle—and you deserve great credit, Mr. Chairman, you and your able committee for this program—the extension of that program to provide the funds required for hospital care, is sound and even more desirable than the old age and survivors insurance program of today, which none would eliminate, which provides a limited annuity when the citizen comes to the time of retirement.

Mr. Chairman, I said I knew of no employee or employer coming here to protest to this honorable and able committee against extending the old age and survivors insurance program to cover hospital care. Where are the employees, Mr. Chairman, in your hearing room protesting against the possible imposition of this tax upon them?

What do the labor leaders say who represent as able spokesmen the organized working people of the country? Do they come here to protest against this burden that the President is asking you to impose upon their members? They come here to support this program, Mr. Chairman.

Do you see here in your hearing room or is your calendar crowded with protests from the employers who would pay half of the tax under this program? I haven't seen them. They don't trouble me. I haven't heard of an organized lobby from the employers of this country who would have to pay one-half the cost of this measure if it were enacted.

Mr. Chairman, the employees are asking you for this program. The senior citizens are begging for it, Mr. Chairman. The employers are not protesting and I believe in general they accept the principle as sound. So where does the opposition come from? Not from the people who would pay the tax.

I don't know how vigorous the opposition of hospital care but in general I think the only thing the hospital would fear is that maybe there might be interference in their administration. I think adequate safeguards can be thrown around that.

No, Mr. Chairman, according to my experience, and I do not say it in any way disparaging to them, the most articulate spokesmen in America today against this proposal are not the people who pay and the hospitals who would provide service, Mr. Chairman, but it comes from the medical profession, from the doctors.

I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that as outstanding as is the skill of the medical profession in its own area, we Americans can consider how the bill at the hospital of the retired senior citizens can be paid without necessarily relying upon the financial advice or the political sagacity, or the governmental knowledge of the medical profession, devoted to a technical area which is somewhat beyond the problems that you are considering here.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a most vital matter to so many of the people of our country. In my county, and I add only this in conclusion and I thank you for your indulgence, there are over 100,000 people who are covered by old-age and survivors insurance, and I don't have the figures as to how many of those people, Mr. Chairman, are included within the $8½ million that I as a taxpayer in my county contributed to the hospitalization of people who could not pay for hospitalization in my county, but if a tenth of my population is covered by old-age and survivors insurance, I can't but believe that a great deal of this burden upon us as taxpayers in our country would be relieved if these people had as they paid, as they worked, provided their own funds out of which these hospital charges could be paid.

Mr. Chairman, I end as I began. I affirm that if old-age and survivors insurance is sound and desirable, the extension of that principle to cover the provision of hospital coverage to retired citizens is not only sound, but even more desirable and imperative because it affects human life and health itself.

Progress Report on the 88th Congress to the Residents of the 15th Congressional District

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln-Washington birthday interval is an opportune time to assess the record, gains, and goals of the 88th Congress and report on my stewardship to the people of our district.

The 88th Congress, with its longest session in peacetime history, has already written some new records into history but, for that matter, so have the beloved Mets. Some may say the comparison is appropriate.

I believe that we stayed in there like Yankees, pitched as hard as Koufax, and will end our session with a major league legislative average.

No one can dispute that at this stage we have two eye-catching four-masters to our credit in the House; the successful passage of the tax cut and civil rights bills. The success of these bills is the result of intensive, tedious, and devoted committee study and action. Committee work is the keystone of an effective legislature.

In baseball, as in the National-American pastime we call Congress, spring training does the conditioning that wins ball games and we did our training in committees until our bills were fit and ready. This Congress took time because Members labored long and well to shake out the kinks and to bring bills to the floor in shape to meet any test.

THE TAX CUT

In the tax reduction bill, the preparation of the Committee on Ways and Means enabled us to pass the bill by an overwhelming margin. The report of the House-Senate conferees will probably be adopted by a landslide because the tax cut is sound and timely. This reduction is the first in the 20 years since withholding began and it will be retroactive to January 1, 1964. I supported this bill because the next best thing to earning more for your keep is keeping more of your earnings. It is a good bill because it ends the burden of Government as a majority shareholder in business profits and frees capital for the expansion of private enterprise with more employment. It is beneficial for salary and wage earners with an average cut of 20 percent and has especially favorable provisions for senior citizens and heads of families.

My sole disappointment is that the bill does not give effect to the plan I have sponsored to give tax credit for tuition and educational expense (H.R. 5491). It is commonsense that we encourage the investment in education which tuition represents. Tuition costs have increased 100 percent in 10 years and private colleges especially are hard put to meet higher costs. Unless these schools can handle their share of increased enrollment, public colleges will be called upon to do this with Government carrying the entire freight. This would be far more costly than tuition credit. I intend to press for hearings and consideration of my bill. The fact that a similar plan by Senator RIBICOFF of Connecticut came within three votes of passage in the Senate without the benefit of full hearings is a good sign for future action.

It is important to note that tax reduction is feasible only because Congress has fixed a tight lid on expenditures. Using a fine mesh strainer on appropriations, we sifted budget requests until we were able to effect reductions of $6.3 billion. This protects the soundness of the dollar and precludes inflation which could abate the effect of the tax cut. President Johnson's scaling down of budget requests by another $600 million is further evidence that responsive government need not be expensive government.

"THE EDUCATION CONGRESS"

At the outset of the 88th Congress I sought and secured a significant change in committee assignment. I asked to be shifted from the snug vaults of the Banking and Currency Committee to the stormy arena of the Education and Labor Committee. I did so because the greatest areas of challenge and opportunity before us are in the education of our children and all others who need

education or are needed by education. My activities on this committee have been gratifying to me and, I believe, meaningful to the people of our district and our country.

In fact, if this Congress could be rated by our children and their descendants as it is by our contemporaries, I feel it would be accorded a superior grade for its work in education alone. This is so because much of the legislation we passed is of far-reaching, long-range effect that will benefit many future generations.

I am not alone in this appraisal. President Johnson describes our deeds in education in this manner:

> This Congress is well on its way to doing more for education than any Congress since the Land Grant College Act was passed 100 years ago.

He later stated on signing one of our committee bills that—

> This session of the Congress will go down in history as the "Education Congress of 1963."

Our district was honored in that your Representative was invited to the White House for the signing of these vital education bills. The pens used by the President on three occasions will be displayed in our district office as a tribute to the devotion of our people to excellence in education.

Our district has more students enrolled in secondary, college, and graduate schools than any congressional area in the United States. It was my pleasure to demonstrate this to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Hon. Francis Keppel, during his visit to our county at my invitation during the American Education Week proclaimed by our late President John F. Kennedy. To his memory, because he had that special grace of intellect and devotion to knowledge, our work in education under his leadership will stand as his most effective monument. The last message I heard from him, during a visit to the President's house, was a wish expressed in the Lincoln bedroom that we would achieve the gains in education so necessary to true equality in opportunity for all Americans.

A recital of these gains will indicate how well we succeeded in our committee.

The Higher Education Facilities Act is the first general college aid program ever enacted. It provides for loans and grants for both public and private colleges on a fair and equal basis. The bill will provide the funds for expansion of college facilities so that all institutions can expand to meet the new wave of enrollment without raising tuition beyond reach.

To help students meet tuition costs through loans, we tripled the size of student loan funds so that no student may be denied access to financial assistance. All students in public and private colleges are eligible.

Recognizing technological developments and the impact of automation, we energized manpower development and training aid and expanded the Vocational Education Act.

These are designed to hit at hard core unemployment and the demand for new skills in a broad range from technical training to practical nursing. It is significant to note that vocational education has been a category of Federal aid since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, but it awaited the action of this Congress to bring its provisions into cadence with today's needs.

We recognized the advancing level of literacy and demand for good reading and extended the Federal Library Assistance Act. Until this Congress, the benefits of this act were available only to rural areas under 10,000 persons so that our own cities and others were ineligible. We struck down that wall of discrimination against city residents and made equal benefits available to all.

The Health Professions Education Act passed by this Congress will bring the long and expensive training required to become physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health and medical professionals within the means of thousands of qualified students. Until we passed this bill the number of medical school applicants was declining, from 22,279 in 1950 to 14,397 in 1960. One-fourth of our interns and residents were foreign medical school graduates. Existing medical schools could not accommodate increased numbers and the cost of education for careers in medicine and health was beyond average means. Now with construction grants for both public and private medical schools and loans available to students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, et cetera, we are reversing the scarcity-of-practitioner trend in the healing arts.

This entire report could be devoted to our gains in education but to do so would be to slight our progress in many other fields. But before leaving the subject of education, I wish to emphasize that every bill we passed made adequate provision for fair and equal treatment for all students and all interests in education—public and private—without discrimination. In considering every bill that comes before my committee I will continue to urge that the basic American principle of equality in educational assistance at every level of government must prevail. In general education, our GI bill for junior is earning support steadily.

A complete recital of all the measures enacted by the 88th Congress is beyond the compass of this synopsis but I do believe that areas where we initiated new or breakthrough programs deserve mention.

MENTAL RETARDATION AND MENTAL HEALTH

For the first time, acting on a beam of hope from enlightened research, this Congress met the national aspects of the problem of mental retardation. Through grants to be administered through the States' public and private nonprofit centers for research, clinical treatment, care and education of the mentally retarded will be provided. In the words of our late President, who was personally devoted to this legislation, we are now certain "that those who have felt the hand of fate will not be victims of neglect."

In the field of mental health we found that the Nation is suffering from overcrowded and inadequate facilities for the mentally ill. Half the hospital beds in the country are occupied by mental patients under the old system of quarantining the patient rather than pursuing care and treatment. New methods of therapy, rehabilitation, and research through community centers to be constructed, should result in long-term savings and restoration of human resources under this program.

In the entire field of handicaps we increased our commitment to crippled children and maternal health services, and in a variety of other programs we provided for new treatment, training and facilities for those impaired in vision, speech or hearing.

I was honored to be named last month by the Speaker of the House as a member of the Board of Directors of the National Institution for the Deaf, Gallaudet College, the only such college in the world. It is my hope that I can make a substantial contribution to education for the deaf in this new capacity.

THE CLEAN AIR BILL

In November 1953, New York City suffered a temperature inversion, a lid of warm air overlaid cooler, heavier air, at ground level. For 10 days a stagnant pall trapped pollutants and smog hung over the city. By the time it blew out to sea 240 persons had died. With the fumes of increasing traffic density and industrial and power production drifting across State borders, it was high time for the Government to act on air pollution. I am especially concerned for our area by reason of the imminent increase in vehicle exhaust fumes which will follow from the new bridge across the narrows and its approaches.

Now, by a joint undertaking of local, State, and Federal governments, the Clean Air Act of 1963 will abate the nuisance of respiratory poisons which cause chronic disease and aggravate heart conditions as well as causing economic damage of $11 billion yearly.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND MERCHANT MARINE

With half of every Federal dollar invested in our national security, we are assured that our defense is the strongest in the world. The words of Washington, 175 years ago, are still valid. "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace," he said in his first annual address. With Communist-fed eruptions freckling the face of the earth, we cannot let down in our firm policy of preparedness. This includes a mix of modern armaments. In specifics, it also means a strong surface fleet, modern and well maintained, with shipyards such as the New York Naval Shipyard modernized and up to strength to serve that fleet. I am pleased that our entire New York delegation without partisanship is committed to the preservation of the mission of our shipyard as a vital service.

At the same time we must probe in every way for peaceful reduction of world tensions and it is to the credit of President Kennedy and President Johnson that the peril of nuclear war is reduced and less threatening than at any time

since the weapons of ultimate destruction became operational.

As a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, I have a deep personal interest in the growth of our maritime service. I am distressed that our loss of freight to foreign-flag operators has reduced our share of seaborne commerce to less than 10 percent of the world market. I intend to support legislation now before Congress to build up a modern competitive merchant fleet built in our domestic shipyards and manned by American merchant sailors to gain a proper share of world tonnage. In the light of the fivefold expansion of the Soviet merchant fleet now underway, we must support a building program or yield our traditional position of sea supremacy.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION

In addition to my responsibilities on the Education and Labor Committee, I serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Our record in this committee continues to be one of achievement in the development of parks, preservation of natural resources, and creation of recreational opportunities. The land and water conservation fund bill to finance park and open space area acquisition of underdeveloped acreage is pending after favorable committee action. It is hopeful that we can also make progress on the wilderness bill to preserve primitive areas for future generations.

This year we enacted a law to set up the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to look to our future needs and cooperate with State and local agencies to see that the unspoiled areas of the Nation and our fish and wildlife opportunities are not overrun with asphalt.

In our own State the creation of a national seashore at Fire Island has had favorable hearings before my subcommittee and should be enacted during this session.

GENERAL

Since this report is meant only to hit the legislative high spots, it does not incorporate the many other items of garden-variety legislation on which the Congress has acted, such as equal pay for women, privately built housing for the elderly, the military pay raise, et cetera. Each of these was a gain which we produced after extended study demonstrated clear and definite needs and Federal responsibility.

Among others, our attention is now concentrated on such problems as that of the aging, treated in the Carey-Fogarty bill, the "Older Americans Act," which has been voted favorably in our subcommittee. This is not to be confused with hospital care for the aging on which we are continuing hearings to try and reach a solution worthy of broad support. In any solution we must not sacrifice our present health standards which the medical profession has made the highest in the world.

NEW DISTRICT OFFICE

In addition to the legislative activities here in the Capitol, I am encouraged that so many of our residents have seen fit to write on Federal matters of interest. Nothing is more inspiring to a Representative than to have an interested electorate, whether we agree or disagree.

It is a matter of regret that the extended session of Congress needed to cope with the complex of national problems has reduced the time that I am able to spend in our district in personal discussion with our residents.

To offset this and to provide close contact with my constituents and to make it convenient for people of our district to present their needs and problems I opened a new district office centrally located at 7718 Fourth Avenue.

This office is staffed by competent assistants throughout the week and you can contact us at any time by calling Terrace 9–2300. I am gratified that through our district offices we have handled many hundreds of requests such as information for school papers, explanation of Presidential succession, job opportunities in Federal service, and just plain complaints, which I welcome as a sign of healthy diversity.

I shall continue to be present in our district office every Saturday morning, when legislative duties permit, as I have been for the last 3 years. I extend a cordial invitation to any of our residents, regardless of age, origin, or party affiliation, to visit with me at my Washington or Brooklyn offices from Monday through Saturday. There are so many national problems I would like to solve with you and so little I can do without you.

In closing, it is my hope that before the adjournment sine die of the 88th Congress we can strive together without partisanship or prejudice to move toward the high destiny which lies ahead for this great Nation in order that the dreams and hopes of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be realized. We have made a good beginning and I will do my best to continue.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1964)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, we turn to Thee in the heat and burden of another day, grateful for the love that our indifference cannot discourage and for the patience that our folly cannot exhaust.

As noontide marks the fast-hurrying day and as the voices in this Chamber are hushed to silence in a moment of devotion, we would steady our hearts and minds in the glorious thought that amid all life's fleeting scenes, we are with Thee who changeth not.

We seek the sense of the invisible and the eternal that alone can bring peace and restoration to jaded bodies and to spirits whose strength is spent.

Grant us such a vision of our needy world, with all its yawning divisions and its poisoning suspicions, and yet with its dawning sense of human brotherhood, that the decisions that are here made may never have to be reversed by those who come after us, but that they may put us among the architects of a kindlier earth and of the final parliament of peace and plenty in which every kindred and tongue shall find their rightful place.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9637) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9637) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of January 24, 1901, as modified for this particular year, Washington's Farewell Address will now be read by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], heretofore designated for that purpose by the President pro tempore.

Mr. MUSKIE advanced to the desk, and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds