McGeary, Joseph D., 23062A.
Melvin, Walter W., Jr., 24126A.
Orth, John S., 24668A.
Peterson, John A., 25694A.
Remmar, Michael L., 29618A.
Richard, Eli F., 25471A.
Robards, Robert E., 23061A.
Russell, Carl M., 20536A.
Screws, Carl, Jr., 27488A.
Scripter, Lyman J., 25461A.
Shea, Edward J., 24188A.
Smith, Robert B. W., 26352A.
Stavig, Paul H., 20538A.
Steele, Jack E., 55210A.
Stumpe, Alfred R., Jr., 29474A.
Thiele, Arthur J., Jr., 23105A.
Tracey, John F., 20527A.
Upp, Charles W., 23174A.
White, Stanley C., 23173A.
Wuesthoff, Hubert E., 24665A.

Dental Corps

Askinas, Samuel W., 28127A.
Hagen, Sidney A., 23178A.
Jones, Edward, 26734A.
Lee, Donald S., 20015A.
Lindberg, Robert L., 25464A.
Lord, Hunting J., Jr., 55772A.
Peer, Wayne A., 25484A.
Roth, Louis H., 29414A.
Segreto, Vincent A., 22405A.
Sture, Vernon J., 20554A.

Veterinary Corps

Halstead, James R., 25333A.
Harris, Milford D., Jr., 25670A.

Medical Service Corps

Bethurum, James L., 48933A.
Black, Wilbert A., 21629A.
English, Robert L., 48934A.
Flavion, Raymond A., 21637A.
Heitlinger, Robert V., 48932A.
Jones, Harold M., 55329A.
Kobylk, Nickolas F., 48936A.
Leahy, Joseph H., 55326A.
McLellan, Walter J., Jr., 55327A.
Moss, Robert J., 55328A.
Munroe, Duncan J., 48935A.
Nicely, Harry B., Jr., 21622A.
Spiers, Don J., 21636A.
Sturtevant, Robert M., 48939A.
Sullivan, Robert E., 21631A.
Zinnemann, George, 21644A.

Nurse Corps

Anderson, Carol L., 56171W.
Ditchfield, Flora J., 21065W.
Falkenhagen, Irene C., 22063W.
Fannin, Juanita E., 21176W.
Grazin, Ann E., 21035W.
Haynes, Genevieve E., 22077W.
Henry, Arland R., 25746W.
Moreland, Catherine B., 21119W.
Stephens, Ruth E., 21006W.
Vereen, Bertha E., 21081W.
Whitehead, Zada Z., 22076W.
Wilson, Betty J., 21182W.

Biomedical Science Corps

Ballentine, Frances G., 22084W.
Ellis, Thomas G., 48937A.
Woods, Dorothy G., 22082W.

Chaplains

Behnken, John W., Jr., 48592A.
Carlock, Freddie W., 23203A.
Durkin, John R., 48599A.
Edmonds, Leonard S., 48591A.
Finke, Frederick K., 48593A.
Graf, John F., 55111A.
Groome, Thomas M., Jr., 24689A.
Henry, Leroy, 55110A.
Hobgood, Clarence E., 48589A.
Jorgensen, Daniel B., 48597A.
Kullowatz, Vernon F., 24686A.
New, John W., 76629A.
Rutan, Robert M., 55112A.
Schade, Paul G., 48595A.
Stowers, Willis L., 48594A.
Tinsley, Raymond E., 25736A.
Tomme, Wade K., 23205A.
Wolk, Henry C., Jr., 24688A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 5, 1965:

UNITED NATIONS

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be deputy representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Jack Hood Vaughn, of Virginia, to be representative of the United States of America in the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Nathaniel Davis, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

Henry J. Tasca, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco.

Henry A. Hoyt, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted these words of Scripture: I John 4: 11: *Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.*

Almighty God, help us to feel that this exhortation to love one another has meanings and prophecies of which we have never dreamed or explored.

May we feel that we are being inspired and moved by this divine compulsion and that the crying need of our democracy to love our fellow men is an idea whose time has come.

Grant that the emphasis which our President is giving to the Great Society may enlist the dedication of strong and heroic spirits everywhere.

May we truly believe in the oneness of humanity and that as members of the human family we are bound together and inseparably related.

Give us a clearer vision of the higher unity of mankind and help us to understand that it is something more wonderful than we have ever imagined.

Hear us in the name of our Blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the designation of a grove of redwood trees as a memorial to the late Dag Hammarskjold.

FILING OF REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Thursday to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1966.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that a quorum is not present; evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 91]

Blatnik	Holland	Rodino
Cahill	Jones, Mo.	Schmidhauser
Curtis	McDowell	Senner
Giaimo	MacGregor	Shipley
Gilligan	Mathias	Sullivan
Griffiths	May	Toll
Halleck	O'Hara, Mich.	Williams
Hamilton	Powell	
Hays	Resnick	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 409 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency 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.

VETERANS REOPENED INSURANCE FUND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7597) to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective May 1, 1965, section 725 of title 36, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By placing a period after the word "basis" in clause (8) of subsection (b) and striking all of the remainder of such clause.

(2) By substituting a period for the semicolon at the end of clause (7) of subsection (c) and striking all of the remainder of the subsection.

(3) By amending subsection (d) (1) to read as follows:

"(d) (1) All premiums and collections on insurance issued pursuant to this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be credited to the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund, a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States, and all payments on such insurance and any total disability provision attached thereto shall be made from the fund. For actuarial and accounting purposes, the assets and liabilities (including liabilities for repayment of advances hereinafter authorized and adjustment of premiums) attributable to the insured groups established under this section shall be separately determined. Such amounts in the Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund in the Treasury, as may hereafter be determined by the Administrator to be in excess of the actuarial liabilities of that fund, including contingency reserves, shall be available for transfer to the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund as needed to provide initial capital. Any amounts so transferred shall be repaid to the Treasury over a reasonable period of time with interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt."

(4) By striking the words "subsection (b) of" wherever they appear in subsection (d) (2).

(5) By striking the following words from subsection (d) (3): "or the National Service Life Insurance appropriation, as appropriate,".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike "36" and insert "38",

On page 2, line 17, after the comma, insert "not exceeding $1,650,000 in the aggregate,".

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and explain the action taken by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on this legislation.

I just want to remind the Speaker and the Members of the House that the chairman and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee have kept faith with the House of Representatives in accordance with the action taken last week. When the House sustained the position of the Veterans' Affairs Committee on the supplemental appropriation bill, we met, introduced a bill, and took appropriate action. The committee placed a limitation of $1,650,000 which is to be turned over to the Veterans' Administration for the proper handling of this insurance fund.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United State Code, section 725."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR MILITARY FUNCTIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. MAHON. 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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to 1 hour, the time to be divided equally between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447), with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for one-half hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the fact that when the occasion demands it, the House can act and does act. There is a requirement for action today with respect to the international situation.

The President called certain Members of Congress to the White House on Sunday evening for the purpose of discussing problems in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic. On yesterday, the President called the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations to the White House for the purpose of discussing the situation with them.

I believe this is evidence of teamwork of the highest quality. I am glad we have a President who takes the Congress into his confidence in regard to important international matters.

Shortly after the meeting yesterday, the President called upon the Congress to appropriate $700 million to meet certain military requirements of an urgent nature in the current fiscal year. I must point out that, by the transfer of funds and within the framework of existing law, the President could have met this emergency without the action we will take today. He could have transferred the $274 million for ammunition procurement from other appropriation items in the Defense Department bill, and he could have taken certain other funding actions without the enactment of legislation. Certainly he could have coped with the situation for a considerable time, but the President asked us to counsel with him and work with him, as members of the team, in dealing with this matter. In spite of existing authorities, for the President to disregard the Congress, while the Congress is in session, in this kind of special circumstance, in my opinion, would have been ill advised. I am glad he did call upon us for legislation in connection with this matter.

We have had teamwork not only with the White House but within the House. The Armed Services Committee, by reason of legislation on the books, must authorize military construction and certain defense procurement. This requirement has been waived in this instance under the able leadership of the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and with the unanimous approval of that committee. There has been nonpartisan action by the Appropriations Committee. This morning our members unanimously approved this appropriation.

I do not believe this action to be necessary to show that Congress is behind the President in his determination to follow a firm policy in dealing with Communist aggression. The President and the country already know it. This will simply reaffirm our position established on August 10, 1964, when the last Congress passed a resolution placing itself squarely on record in favor of a firm policy in southeast Asia.

By providing these funds and participating in this action we shall set a good example of democracy at work. I urge the approval of the resolution now before the House to provide these additional funds for the security of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as I noted earlier, the pending resolution was reported unanimously by the 50-member Committee on Appropriations. In view of the importance of the matter I think it would be well to include the text of the committee's report at this point:

The resolution provides a supplemental appropriation of $700 million for the fiscal year 1965, to remain available until expended, as requested by the President in a special message to the Congress on May 4, 1965 (H. Doc. 157). The funds provided may be transferred as required to any appropriation account available to the Department of Defense for military functions. Testimony indicates that these funds will be transferred as needed from the "Emergency fund, southeast Asia" account to "Operation and maintenance," "Procurement," and "Military con-

struction" accounts. The Committee on Armed Services, as well as the Committee on Appropriations, is to be notified immediately upon determination by the Secretary of Defense of any requirements to be funded under this authority.

As the President stated in his message of May 4, "This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam."

The unsettled condition of the world has not been unanticipated. Consequently, the committee has consistently invited the Secretary of Defense to submit requests for whatever additional appropriations may be needed from time to time to provide for the security of the country. Circumstances have arisen which have required an acceleration of our effort in southeast Asia. The President has requested and the Secretary of Defense has testified in support of the recommended supplemental appropriation.

Congress has provided the funds which have enabled the United States to acquire the most powerful military forces in the world. Congress has also provided the means of increasing the strength of these forces over and above requirements foreseen at the time of the enactment of defense appropriations. Sections 512 and 536 of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1965, contain language which has been carried in the bill for several years making certain additional funding immediately available without further action by the Congress.

Our expenditures in southeast Asia, while large, represent only a small part of our total military resources. The authorities in existing law could have been utilized in lieu of the proposed appropriation. Supplies and equipment could have been diverted from other, less active areas and replaced at a later date.

Prudence dictates the enactment of the proposed supplemental appropriation. Although we probably would not adversely affect our overall military strength by delaying in a minor way the continuing increase in military inventories, the committee believes a position of plenty—militarily—is to be desired in the light of world conditions.

The enactment of the accompanying resolution will provide the means for continuing the build-up of modern supplies, equipment, and facilities for our forces. It will also provide Congress an opportunity to again make known to our friends and foes alike that the people of the United States have every intention of standing firm in their opposition to Communist aggression.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 447.

Mr. Chairman, let no man, whether he be in Moscow, Peiping, Hanoi, or Havana, have any illusions that the Congress of the United States, speaking for all the people, does not support the President's action in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. We do.

Let no man now planning a Communist coup among free people have any illusions that this Nation is weak in its intention to defend the God-given rights of freedom and liberty when our aid is sought.

The ruthless onslaught of Communist infiltration, which perpetrates murder of the civilian population of South Vietnam—murder of men, women, and children in their homes, their fields, and their villages—men, women, and children whose only offense against the Communists is that they wish to be free and independent—this ruthless murder cannot and will not be tolerated.

In this hemisphere, the overthrow of governments and law enforcement by firing squad, the intrusion of an alien philosophy which holds the state to be all powerful and disregards the dignity of the individual man, a philosophy that violates all the precepts upon which Western civilization has been founded, cannot and should not be tolerated.

The President of the United States, the President of all of the people of this Nation, has acted with courage and firmness to bring an end to the spread of this malignant growth, recognizing that it has but one purpose—our destruction.

The President should not stand alone in this awesome task. He should and must have the support of the Congress and, through the Congress, of the people. I would urge unanimous support of this joint resolution.

Again, let me say there should be no illusion—in Moscow, Peiping, Hanoi, or Havana. Freedom and liberty may be costly in lives and treasure. But we recognize that the freedom and liberty of our people will not long endure while freedom and liberty is destroyed among our neighbors.

Let us speak loud and clear here today, that we shall preserve our heritage and defend against ensalvement of ourselves and those who desire to be free.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, we commend the great Committee on Appropriations upon the legislation that it has reported to the House today. I am sure that we all agree with the statements which have been made by the distinguished chairman of that committee and its distinguished ranking minority member. We also agree with and commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and his great committee for the action which they have taken to expedite the consideration of this measure. Certainly the distinguished minority leader and all of the Members of the leadership on the Republican side have fully cooperated in this matter, not only in bringing this supplemental appropriation bill to the floor but in supporting down the line President Johnson's strong action in connection with the crisis in Vietnam and the crisis in the Dominican Republic. To my knowledge, it was the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], who first suggested—and I concur wholeheartedly—that a direct approach through a supplemental appropriation by the Congress itself, is not only in order but more appropriate than reprograming appropriated funds.

This is important action which we take today. This resolution will demonstrate that the American people are united in their support of the strong action taken by the President of the United States. We will demonstrate here today before the entire world that our people have resolved that this Nation shall keep its commitments.

Mr. Chairman, world peace and human freedom are no stronger than the determination of the United States to keep its word. We are in southeast Asia under an obligation made in 1954 when we entered into the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. We pledged at that time to meet aggression against South Vietnam. Today South Vietnam suffers aggression from North Vietnam. This aggression may not always be in orthodox military style, but it is designed to conquer South Vietnam. We can recognize aggression whatever its disguise, and we will act to meet it with whatever is required.

The invasion is being carried out not by marching armies but by a guerrilla infiltration effort supported by North Vietnam with both arms and men to a degree which avoids any possibility of lessening the conflict or restoring the peace without American involvement. Outrages are being committed against civilians as well as against military personnel; against our own people and our own installations, against our own embassy as well as the towns, the civilian population, and the military personnel of South Vietnam.

If we withdraw, we give realization to the Communist aim to show, in the President's words, that the "American commitment is worthless." Mr. Chairman, the road of appeasement is the road to war. History teaches no plainer lesson than this. This was true in the Saar Basin, when Hitler first moved. It was true in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, and in Ethiopia. The only road to possible peace is the road of determination backed up by resolution and action.

This was proved in Greece and Turkey. It was proved in the Berlin crisis. It was proved in Korea.

The risks of inaction are more dangerous than the risks of action. We cannot, we must not fail to act now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this act of confidence in our President, this resolution of determination to keep our word, this resolution to tell the entire world that we are not going to bow to Communist aggression. Let us pass this resolution by an overwhelming and resounding vote.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the action which we will take here today and which I hope will be followed by prompt action in the other body should answer the critics of the Congress who from time to time have said that in the 1960's the Congress was outdated, it could not respond to crises at home or abroad. The action taken by the leadership on the majority side with the cooperation of those of us on the minority side is the best illustration that the Congress is competent to meet these challenges and to do what is right for our country.

Secondly, what we will do here today and what the other body will do, I hope promptly, should convince our enemies that we, Democrats or Republicans, can stand together to do that which is right, legislatively speaking, in conjunction

with the requests of the executive branch of the Government. This is an excellent illustration of teamwork between those at one end of Pennsylvania Avenue and those at this end of Pennsylvania Avenue. And I am proud to be a participant in any way I can with this demonstration of national unity.

Mr. Chairman, from what I have said you know I support what we are doing here today. We do it for two reasons. Last fall when the military budget was put together in the executive branch we were not engaged in any military operations comparable to that which we are undertaking today in South Vietnam. We had no sizable military operation going on in the Caribbean. At that time, We did not have 35,000 or 40,000 military personnel in South Vietnam. We did not have 14,000 or 15,000 U.S. military personnel in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Chairman, circumstances have changed. If we as a legislative body are to err in providing military hardware for those who are serving on the frontlines for the defense of freedom and our own country, we should err on the side of generosity.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that with the $700 million we make available long leadtime items can be put into the pipeline. I am convinced that there are requests, legitimate and bona fide, that our Defense Department should grant. I am told that the Army, Navy, and Air Force last fall, in submitting their budget requests to Secretary of Defense McNamara, asked for between $8 and $9 billion more than what was submitted by Mr. McNamara to the Congress in January at the time the President submitted his budget.

So, Mr. Chairman, we know there is a shopping list in the Pentagon of needed equipment for which these funds can be used to procure these needed items of equipment.

I would not want the Department of Defense to think that we are giving them a blank check and that they can have this kind of hurried consideration every time something happens around the world. They will be held accountable as I understand it by the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. They will be held accountable by the Armed Services Committee for the proper expenditure of these funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the second reason why this resolution is before us is psychological. Some people thought that we ought to have another resolution on Vietnam and that we ought to have a resolution on the Caribbean. Such resolutions have been passed previously.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Those resolutions we have passed heretofore and they are still in effect. If the enemy wants to see what we said he can read them. There has been no change in congressional attitude. I do not believe a reiteration by us, a repeat of the words which we said before, would have near the impact as what we are doing here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, we are saying to the President, "You need this; we are willing to give you the money with which to buy the hardware so that the troops in the frontlines in southeast Asia or the Caribbean will have all they need."

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has never treated the Defense Department on the basis of austerity and economy when the need was shown. We do not believe in economy as far as the troops in the trenches are concerned. This action which we shall take today will reassure our soldiers, sailors, and airmen that we mean what we said. But more importantly it means to the enemy that those of us on both sides of the aisle are standing unanimously, I hope, in supporting a policy of firmness in South Vietnam and in the Caribbean. Certainly, Republicans in the House stand unanimously behind the President on this matter.

One final comment. I hope we can resolve the problem in the Dominican Republic honorably, forthrightly, and firmly. I do not believe, however, that the real solution of the Caribbean will come about by what we do in the Dominican Republic. We have a "starter of fires" in the Caribbean. We have an arsonist 90 miles from the shores of the United States. His name is Castro. We will not prevent this arsonist, this fire starter, from creating one problem after another, until we prevent his exporting communism to other nations in the Caribbean.

In October of 1962 the late President, John F. Kennedy, in a very tense moment in the history of the United States, and perhaps the world, said that among other things he would never permit the export of communism from Cuba to any other place in the Caribbean.

I believe this policy is a necessary policy for the United States today. We cannot permit the exportation of communism to the Dominican Republic from Castro's regime. We cannot permit the exportation of Castroism to any other place in the Caribbean. I hope and trust by this action today we are letting him know, among others, that this is the firm, unanimous policy of our country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of the President's request for the $700 million emergency and contingency appropriation.

The Armed Services Committee met on yesterday afternoon with the Secretary of Defense and I am happy to say that our participation in this action was agreed to by a committee vote of 37 to 0.

This appropriation is a simple reaffirmation of the action taken on August 10, 1964, when 504 Members of this Congress—both bodies—went on record as supporting the struggle for freedom in South Vietnam. It is as simple as that.

There are other ways in which we could have done this same thing. The Armed Services Committee could have assumed jurisdiction over its portion of the $700 million relating to weapons procurement and military construction and presented a bill to this House. The Armed Services Committee could have acted just as expeditiously as we are acting here today. Of this there can be no doubt.

However, I think the way that we are proceeding provides the opportunity for more unified, concentrated, and pointed support for the President.

It is clear to both the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee that this is a one-time thing. The jurisdiction which the Armed Services Committee is temporarily surrendering is not a precedent for any future activity of this kind. It is a single, isolated, and wholly voluntary relinquishment of its rights for the sole purpose of dramatically illustrating the unanimity of this Congress in its support of the President in his actions in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. You see the maps here. I will refer to them later on.

There are voices of dissent in the country and in the Congress. These voices must be shown as unrepresentative of the great weight of public and congressional opinion. And this is the way to do it.

I am certain that the overwhelming vote of 37 to 0 of the Armed Services Committee on yesterday will be matched and reflected on the floor of the House today.

We cannot vacillate—we cannot withdraw—we cannot adopt multiple positions on South Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

We must raise one clear, unified, and unmistakable voice against those who would sow dissension within our country, and at the same time present to the Communist world an absolute and intractable and eternal opposition to all that it stands for—whether it be in South Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, or anywhere else.

I think it is the responsibility of this House today to vote unanimously for this appropriation. We do not have the right to do any less.

Lowell has said:

New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward,
Who would keep abreast of truth.

This is the time to do it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, as ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I want to say I am in full accord, as are all the Members on the Republican side of the aisle, in regard to this appropriation. The question might properly arise here today that in view of the fact that we will have a similar bill totaling $15.3 billion before us before this day is gone, why was it that we did not provide for those items which the President has indicated in his message? The fact of the matter is that we have, except that we had intended to handle emergency situations in a different way.

First. There is $150 million that the Secretary of Defense can use for emer-

gency purposes. So that money was available.

In addition to that, there is a reprograming process which have already speeded up which the Secretary of Defense could also use. But I think in coming here today, this is the right way to do it—not through the back door by reprograming, and not by using emergency funds when the Congress is in a position to act. So I am in agreement with the purposes of this appropriation.

I do want to say one thing, however. This is a most unusual procedure. The House Committee on Armed Services has the responsibility to authorize many of the items which are in this $700 million bill. We had a hearing yesterday and even before our meeting was completed this Congress had already given unanimous consent for this procedure to be adopted. I take no issue with that. Time was of essence and the chairman of the committee came to our committee before our meeting had been completed and told us of the problem which he faced. I find no disagreement on that score. But let it be clearly understood that this is not a precedent. Our committee does not intend in the future to give up its jurisdiction. And if this is not a precedent in that regard, let me say perhaps in another regard it is a precedent. It is a precedent that here and now we say that the Monroe Doctrine still lives and this Congress and the American people do not intend to stand idly by while communism gobbles up one nation after another either in this hemisphere or anywhere else.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, in this resolution there is $100 million for military construction, all of it to be expended in southeast Asia. There is more of an emergency situation possibly on construction than in any other facet of the program.

The commitment of American forces to the southeast Asia area and to South Vietnam has substantially doubled since the first of the year. Living quarters and operational facilities must be provided for them. Stocks of planes, equipment, and supplies have increased manifold. They must be stored and maintained.

This is not the total estimated requirement for military construction. Actually, it approximates $280 million, but the remainder will be met with funds from other sources. The work will be done as far as practicable with Seabees and Engineer battalions. It is essential that the program move forward immediately if our forces are to operate effectively in the area.

Now, let me discuss the resolution as a whole. It would be easy to call it a blank check. It would be easy to say that the services do not really need the money now. It would be easy to say we do not actually know in detail what is going to be done with it. It is always easy to criticize, and it must be admitted that criticism can be constructive.

Actually, there would be some truth in all of those statements. But more literally this is an action on faith; faith in the destiny of the United States. This is a declaration of America's determination to honor its responsibilities. It is no less an investment in peace for tomorrow. Without actions such as this, we shall not have an honorable peace in our time, but continuing harassment until our downfall.

Whether this money is needed on today or even before the end of the fiscal year, 2 months hence, is immaterial. It is certain that all of it will be required very soon. War is a costly business. At the present rate of activity by our Armed Forces, this money could literally be burned up within a few days.

America's peacetime military missions cost this Nation nearly a billion dollars a week. It takes little escalation to consume an additional $700 million, and already we have seen the escalation of war in southeast Asia multiply many times since the beginning of the year. We now have a peacekeeping operation requiring 15,000 men in the Dominican Republic. There may be much more on tomorrow.

But a vote for this resolution is a vote for victory with the least possible delay. It will show there is no serious division among the American people on the question of standing together against the enemies of our way of life. This is the real value of the action which we undertake. The North Vietnamese have been hurt and hurt badly. The kind of help which they anticipated from Red China and Russia has not been forthcoming. A show of solidarity and determination by the United States at this time could be the decisive blow. It could be the action which would demonstrate the folly of continued aggression by the North Vietnamese. We could bring a realistic bid for peace by the Communists.

If it has that effect, this will be the finest investment in modern history. An end to aggression by the North Vietnamese could for years to come free southeast Asia of harassment, provide an opportunity for its peaceful development, and give world tensions an opportunity to subside. More importantly, it could free the United States from an increasing drain of men and money, lost lives, torn and crippled bodies, and the frustrations and tensions of separation for families. It could save us also a greater part of the billion and a half dollars a year that we are spending there. This is a small investment indeed for such an attractive prospect. Regardless of that outcome. This now is a necessary action. The world must know clearly where the people of America and their leaders stand.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on the Defense Department.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this resolution. This measure is more than just a supplemental appropriation resolution. It is a forceful expression of the Congress and the people of the United States to the world that we are prepared to take whatever steps necessary to halt Communist aggression.

This supplemental appropriation will make available for transfer by the Secretary of Defense, upon determination by the President, an additional $700 million for fiscal year 1965 to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions. We are acting on this at the specific request of the President to meet the mounting military requirements in Vietnam.

This is a sizable amount, and obviously the American people are being asked to make an additional sacrifice. I believe, however, that it is the sense of Congress and the will of the American people that such sacrifices as may be required are willingly accepted.

These additional funds will continue to provide our forces with the best and most modern supplies and equipment. They will increase our inventory of ammunition and other expendables. They will be used to build facilities to house and protect our men and supplies.

We have committed American men to the struggle. Lives are being lost. Our allies are also suffering losses. If it takes additional funds for these purposes to help save lives and insure a victory for freedom, then there cannot be any hesitancy on our part.

Communists have repeatedly made clear that they will undertake whatever forms of aggression they believe suitable in which they believe they can be successful. It, therefore, requires us to maintain a superior posture at all levels of conflict primarily to deter such aggression; but if that is not successful, to be able to undertake the conflict with complete assurance of winning.

Though I strongly support this supplemental budget request, the apparent need for this $700 million to deal with the southeast Asia situation logically appears to raise far-reaching questions.

Within a very short time this House will be considering the 1966 fiscal year budget for the Department of Defense. The 1966 fiscal year budget requests for the Department of Defense were made by the President some time ago. I respectfully suggest that the Secretary of Defense and the President review the requirements for fiscal year 1966 in the light of the present world situation and specifically in southeast Asia to determine whether an addition to the 1966 budget request should be made to adequately meet our military needs.

Since the conditions necessitating this supplemental request are expected to extend into the next fiscal year, an up-to-date evaluation of the President's 1966 fiscal year budget appears to be called for before the Congress acts on the regular defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966. It is vital to our security that we have adequate planning.

Mr. Chairman, the $700 million recommended in this resolution will reflect the determination of the American people to remain free and assist those who are striving to be free.

I join with my colleagues and respectfully recommend this resolution be given unanimous approval by this body.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], ranking minority member of the Military Construction Subcommittee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in support of the President's request for $700 million to effectively continue our efforts to assist South Vietnam in its determination to remain free from Communist domination. The President, the Secretary of State, and leaders of both political parties have forcefully and effectively set forth to our people and to the world the reasons why this action is necessary.

Our Appropriations Military Construction Subcommittee attended, with other committees charged with responsibility in this area, the White House meeting with the President yesterday. The Secretary of Defense Mr. McNamara, briefed us in secret session later in the day. It is not possible to go into the usual detailed explanation of the need for these funds. We can only assure you that the Secretary has assured us that we will be kept completely informed as these funds are used. If we, as Representatives of our great Nation, fail to heed the lessons of history at this hour we will not be worthy of our trust. We must be more dedicated to freedom than the Communists are to world domination. How can anyone reasonably believe that the situation in South Vietnam is not a part of the Communist plan for the eventual control of all of southeast Asia. I am grieved when I read of supposedly learned men questioning the need for positive action which will indicate to the world our determination that communism will not be allowed to force its ideology on helpless nations.

There is nothing so dangerous as a little knowledge. I submit that the vast majority of the professors and others who question our Nation's policy have little or no knowledge of the real fundamental problem confronting the free world. They prefer to close their eyes to the lessons of history and the tragic results of appeasing a godless ideology. These apostles of appeasement should be grateful that they live under a government that allows the right of dissent. That is what this fight is all about. I respect their right to disagree but when I receive wires that read, "The President should not be given the $700 million to carry on his wars," or "Urge you vote against Vietnam and Dominican military appropriation. Our intervention undemocratic and un-American." I confess I fail to understand how educated Americans can be so blind as to not understand that the real policy of our Government is to strive for peace, not war.

I support this request of the President as a father and I hope someday a grandfather concerned about the heritage we will leave our children. If freedom is worth anything it is worth everything and its protection cannot be bought by dollars, but by our determination to make whatever sacrifices as are necessary that it be preserved. May God grant us wisdom to see clearly our responsibilities.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. As a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I have felt since the start of our hearings this year that the request of the Department of Defense to cover the funding of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and the Defense Department activities was not a realistic budget submission in view of the international and world conditions which existed. I believe a budget ceiling was established on the Department of Defense early in November of this past year and in order for the Department of Defense to live within this budget ceiling certain reductions were made in the requests of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Secretary of Defense in the review that was made of this budget prior to its submission to the Congress in January.

The real danger we face in the world today is that the potential enemy will miscalculate the intentions of the United States of America to defend freedom and to live up to its treaty obligations, whether they be in southeast Asia or whether they be in Central or Latin America. Miscalculation as to the will and the intent of the United States of America can cause a major war in our time. It is because of the possibility of this miscalculation that the psychological impact of the action of the Congress today can do a great deal to set aside any possible miscalculation which could occur.

I do feel, however, Mr. Chairman, that there are actions taken by our Government which could cause the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese to doubt the intentions of the United States of America, and it is for that reason that I have called to the attention of the President several actions which have been taken by our Government in the last few months which I believe are not in keeping with the national security and the national purpose of the United States.

We have all heard a great deal about the teach-ins that are being conducted at some of our universities and colleges in the United States. These teach-ins are a protest against the national policy of our country. It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as leaders in these groups, that it is not in the best interests of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financing projects in which these same people play a prominent role.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a newspaper clipping telling about a teach-in at one of our campuses under the direction of a certain professor.

I also have another newspaper clipping which announces the award of a $545,000 grant to the University of Pennsylvania to finance a project which will be under the direction of this same professor who figured so prominently in the teach-in.

Under this grant, Mr. Chairman, the study is to be directed at Communist decisionmaking in the United States and foreign countries.

During the first year, the study will reportedly concentrate on the United States, India, Communist Poland, and Communist Yugoslavia.

Under unanimous consent I include the two articles referred to, one from the Daily Pennsylvanian, dated April 8, 1965, and the other from the Philadelphia Inquirer, dated December 9, 1964, in the RECORD at this point:

ALMOST 1,200 PEOPLE PARTICIPATE IN SOUTH VIETNAM TEACH-IN

(By Robert A. Gross)

Almost 1,200 people heard Representative GEORGE BROWN, Democrat of California, call for American acceptance of self-determination by the people of South Vietnam at last night's teach-in.

Sponsored by over 30 faculty members, the teach-in heard talks on South Vietnam by Congressman BROWN, President Lyndon B. Johnson, A. J. Muste, Helen Lamb, and several teachers and students at the university, in Irvine Auditorium.

The teach-in was held in coordination with simultaneous programs last night at Temple University and Swarthmore College as "a dramatization of concern with U.S. policy in South Vietnam."

ASKS FOR CARROT

Representative BROWN asked for "the additional offer of the carrot of self-determination" in response to what he termed "the package of carrots" set forth by President Johnson in his nationwide talk last night.

President Johnson called for negotiations in Vietnam at the earliest possible date and said that he would request from Congress "a billion-dollar effort" to aid the nations of southeast Asia. His talk was broadcast into Irvine Auditorium as part of the teach-in program.

"I call on U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, to use the power and prestige of his office to set up a plan for the cooperative development of southeast Asia," Mr. Johnson said in his address to the Nation. "I will ask Congress for a $1 billion effort to aid southeast Asia and to speed up the distribution of our farm surplus to those countries."

At the same time the President reaffirmed American commitment to the defense of South Vietnam, to the preservation of a world "where each people may choose its own path for change." "We have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence. I intend to keep that promise."

"The deepening shadow of Communist China" is threatening "the independence of South Vietnam," Johnson continued, "it is the new face of an old enemy." North Vietnam "has attacked the independence of the people of South Vietnam," and it "has been urged on by Communist China in the attack."

"There are some things the President of the United States cannot do," Representative BROWN stated following President Johnson's address. "He cannot come before the American people and admit he is wrong, that the position of the U.S. Government is wrong. But that position is in fact wrong."

The Congressman denied the President's assertion that North Vietnam has attacked the independence of South Vietnam.

Congressman BROWN also rejected the President's statement that the "deepening shadow" of Communist China is behind the war in South Vietnam. "There is no proof that the Red Chinese were behind Ho Chih Minh (the premier of North Vietnam) in his original rebellion against the French. The rebellion was an indigenous nationalist revolt at that time and it remains so now," the California Democrat stated.

In response to the President's contention that an American withdrawal from South Vietnam "would leave that country to its fate," shaking world faith in the value of American commitment. Representative BROWN commented that "in our defense of South Vietnam we may be forcing closer together Communist China and the anti-Chinese Communists. The small nations all over the world are not waiting to ask the United States to come in to defend their freedom."

SITUATION "POSSIBLY HOPEFUL"

Rev. A. J. Muste, executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, declared that the "situation in South Vietnam is possibly hopeful because it may serve to reveal the fact that we have to make some unrepeatable decisions if we are to survive."

"We are in a world situation in which everything is in flux, old alliances are in flux, and a state of confusion prevails in the world, the radical pacifist. We are in an absurd position in South Vietnam; we are in a position of trying to accomplish what the French failed to do. We are in a situation in which we are unable to find a clear statement of why we're there and what constitutes victory."

The peoples of the Asian world are "not going to submit to Western domination," said the Reverend Muste, "We are acting insensitively and incredibly stupid if we do not accept the fact that the Asian nations are identifying with the successes of Communist China. While these nations do not wish to be under the control of Communist China." Muste continued, "they resent the attempts of the West to regulate their political system."

Helen Lamb, former Smith College professor who has spent the past several years in an intensive study of South Vietnam, declared that President Johnson's proposal for "a Marshall plan for southeast Asia" is "no substitute for a political settlement of the situation."

The "teach-in" also featured speeches by Dr. F. Hilary Conroy, associate professor of history. Dr. Philip Jacob, professor of political science, Martin Margolis, news editor of the Daily Pennsylvanian, Robin Maisel, of the Young Socialist Alliance, and Joel Aber, of the Student Peace Union.

About 350 students participated in a series of discussion groups in Houston Hall until 2 a.m. after the lectures in Irvine. The seminars were moderated by 40 faculty members.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 9, 1964]

PENN IS GIVEN $545,000 FOR DECISION STUDY

The University of Pennsylvania has received $545,000 in grants for a study of community decisionmaking in the United States and foreign countries.

The 5-year international study will be directed by Dr. Philip L. Jacob, professor of political science at Penn and head of its Program of International Cooperative Research on Social Values and Political Behavior.

Main focus will be on the identification, comparison, and measurement of values held by community leaders which influence policy decisions.

During the first year, the study will concentrate on the United States, India, Yugoslavia, and Poland. It will then be extended.

A $400,000 grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development will finance the exploratory phase in India over a 3-year period.

The cultural affairs division of the State Department has made available $85,000 in rupees for support of the first year of study in India, $25,000 in dinars for the first year in Yugoslavia and $20,000 in zlotys for the first year in Poland.

Other grants include $10,000 from the McNeil Trusts of Philadelphia to explore political behavior in the United States and $5,000 from the National Science Foundation for an inventory of relevant materials.

COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mrs. Jacob explained that the rupees, dinars, and zlotys being more available by the State Department for the study in India, Yugoslavia, and Poland consist of so-called "counterpart funds."

These are moneys of foreign countries paid to the United States for goods and services supplied under various foreign economic and technical aid programs. The funds must be spent in the countries themselves.

She said that AID (the Agency for International Development) is barred by U.S. law from operating in Eastern Europe, and it was for this reason that the counterpart funds were obtained.

INTERNATIONAL TEAMS

An unusual feature of the program, said Mrs. Jacob, will be the use of international teams of scholars. Thus, Indian, Polish, and American scholars will be studying decisionmaking in Yugoslav villages, for example, she said.

She said the international teams will be working primarily in villages, trying to isolate and evaluate the divisive and cohesive forces at work when schools are planned or industrial plants are constructed.

Eventually, she said, the study expects to expand into the United Arab Republic, which has already invited the Jacobs to come in, as well as into other countries of Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

The Jacobs expect to return here February 15.

Mr. Chairman, we on our side of the aisle wish to lead and give true support to the President of the United States in matters of foreign policy, particularly when our national security is involved. I believe that we have given more responsible support in this Congress than has been given in many cases by members of the President's own party. It seems to me when we, in the spirit of true bipartisanship, call these matters to the attention of our leaders and to the President of the United States in the form of personal letters, that some attention should be given them and that some attempt should be made by the executive branch at least to explain the rationale behind such seemingly inconsistent actions.

Instead, the letter in which I called this matter to the President's attention—a personal letter to him on April 20—that letter was answered by Mr. O'Brien to the effect that this matter would be brought up with the President at some future time, and this, Mr. Chairman, is the only acknowledgment I have received to date.

Under unanimous consent, I include my letter to the President and the reply from Mr. O'Brien at this point in the RECORD:

APRIL 20, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I enclose clippings of two newspaper articles which are self-explanatory. One, from the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 9, 1964, announces the award of a grant by the State Department and the Agency for International Development to Dr. Philip E. Jacob, professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania. This grant is to finance a study of community decisionmaking in Yugoslavia and Poland and certain other countries. The other article, from the Daily Pennsylvanian of April 8, 1965, deals with the participation of Dr. Philip Jacob in a recent "teach-in" at the University of Pennsylvania, held to urge the abandonment of southeast Asia to the Communists.

I should be grateful for any comment you care to make on what appears to me to amount to shocking inconsistency.

Those of us in Congress who attempt to give loyal support to a firm foreign policy in southeast Asia are puzzled by the apparent ambivalence of our Government exemplified in these two newspaper clippings.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1965.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 20 to the President enclosing clippings of two newspaper articles.

Your letter will be brought to the President's attention at the first possible opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, as chairman of the Republicans in this House, that if we are truly going to support and develop bipartisanship in these very important areas we must have better communications and we must be in a position where we can truly be in on the takeoff, not only on the landing because today, as much as any time in our history, there is an urgent need for a broad-gaged revival of genuine bipartisanship in foreign policy in the spirit of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg.

Senator Vandenberg once said that "every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs."

This is my view and the view of all members of the Republican Party who occupy leadership positions and act as spokesmen for the party in the House. Some confusion has developed over my exchange with Defense Secretary McNamara over attending future leadership meetings with the President and members of his Cabinet.

To clear up this confusion, let me state unequivocally that it has been and will continue to be my position to attend any and all briefing sessions set up by the executive branch. As a matter of fact, I attend briefing sessions on a regular basis and will continue to do so.

My objection was to the format of the leadership meetings called by the President. These should be, not briefings, but frank and full discussions which take place before policy decisions are made. The leadership meetings, attended by both Republican and Democrat leaders, have been in the nature of briefings rather than consultations. At the end of the first meeting, for example, the President called in the photographers, pictures were taken, and the country was given the impression that true consultation had occurred and a real bipartisan policy had been developed.

Even without true consultations having occurred, Republicans, for national security purposes, have given solid support to the President on his Vietnam

policy, a statement that cannot be made by the President's own party. But even though Republicans have supported the President by putting country first and party second, this does not solve the problem of returning to a genuine bipartisanship in developing foreign policy in the Vandenberg tradition.

In an attempt to return to this tradition, it has been my position that as the chairman of the House Republicans, I will attend further leadership meetings on foreign policy when an agenda is provided for those meetings. Such an agenda would insure that the minority party will also have an opportunity to present its views before policies are established.

In my view, this is the only realistic way true bipartisanship in the Vandenberg tradition can be revived and sustained. This is vital to the national security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I support this resolution. I support this resolution because it is vital that the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese understand the firm intentions of this country and in order to prevent the miscalculation of these Communist nations and Communist leaders as to the will of the American people to resist their efforts to dominate the world.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give support to the President's request for an additional $700 million to continue the fight against communism in Vietnam.

The President has issued a challenge to us all in asking for an additional appropriation at this time. He has given us the chance to give him a vote of confidence for his vigorous pursuits in southeast Asia.

There can be but one answer to his request—unanimous approval by a resounding vote of this body.

Such an answer will be consistent with the course of action thus far followed by the legislative and administrative leaders of this great country.

We are directly committed to the defense of South Vietnam by the 1954 Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.

Less than a year ago the Congress reiterated its support of the policies of the administration to help the people of South Vietnam ward off attack.

Furthermore our Committee on Appropriations has consistently invited the Secretary of Defense to submit requests for whatever additional appropriations may be needed from time to time to provide for the security of the country.

By lending our collective voice to the mighty military effort being made in Vietnam we are doing more than merely appropriating a sum of money to keep the military effort moving.

We are letting the world know that the legislative branch of a great world power, here and now, stands overwhelmingly behind the President in the fight for freedom.

Indeed, the aggression by the North Vietnamese and the Red Chinese involves more than the country of Vietnam itself. The President has said, and rightly so, that the aim of the north is not simply the conquest of the south. It is to try to show that American commitments are worthless. This is all the more reason why we must act today.

There are those who would suggest there is division among the leaders of this Nation as to the wisdom of our policy in southeast Asia. Thus we must use this opportunity to dispel any doubt that this Congress stands behind the President in the noble effort to protect the independence of the South Vietnamese and the world.

I would like especially to commend the Committee on Appropriations for the dispatch with which they have handled this request. It is something I feel gives a fitting answer to those who make the assertion from time to time that Congress does not act with dispatch, that we are not capable of meeting the problems of defense and of the economies of this society of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this committee has demonstrated not only the support of the President in this effort that we are making to preserve the freedom of mankind, but it has also demonstrated the great efficiency of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate every member of the Committee on Appropriations, particularly the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was invited to the White House yesterday and heard the President request these funds. I am wholeheartedly in support of this resolution. I believe strongly that a policy of firmness and decisive action is essential to maintain our own security.

However, I am deeply troubled at the way in which this request for funds is being handled? Perhaps this is so because I have not had the opportunity of an off-the-record briefing by someone who knows the details about how this money is to be spent. Very few of us here today have had such a briefing. The President gave us no details, though press accounts indicate he later discussed the matter with reporters.

The size of the amount requested, the way in which this resolution is being rushed through the House, and the failure of anyone who has thus far spoken today to give any details regarding the way in which this money will be used, make it difficult to make an honest evaluation of a resolution of such tremendous significance.

Mr. Chairman, very few of us have any idea as to what the specific programs are that are to be funded with this money. We have not even an idea whether it is to be used within the next 2 months, as President Johnson indicated yesterday, or whether, since it will remain available until expended, that this implies that there is no special urgency to spend this huge sum so quickly.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I feel we have established an unfortunate precedent in the speed with which we have considered this resolution. Whether or not we assert that this is not to be a precedent for future actions will not be decisive; the fact is that this resolution may well stand as a way of bypassing normal legislative procedures.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have seen here today—in the remarks thus far made—a fine example of nonpartisanship and cooperation in international affairs involving the security of the United States.

I want to particularly commend the President of the United States for calling committees of the Congress to the White House, so that the Congress was able to participate in the initiation of the proposal before us today.

It is well to bear in mind that our policy in southeast Asia did not originate yesterday, but in 1954 when we declared our resolution with respect to containing Communist aggression in southeast Asia. I interpret the pending resolution to be even broader in the sense that it applies throughout the world in the program of nonappeasement.

Mr. Chairman, the breakdown of the amount requested as presented yesterday would be roughly, construction: $100 million; operation and maintenance: $137 million; ammunition: $274 million; additional aircraft and helicopters: $180 million; and miscellaneous smaller items totaling $12 million. Those are the approximate amounts and purposes that would be involved.

The Congress has provided the funds which have enabled the United States to attain unparalleled military strength. This strength has increased substantially in recent years.

Appropriations for military functions have, over the past 4 years, averaged more than $8 billion a year above the average of the preceding 4 years. During the last 4 years our military strength has increased tremendously in both the nuclear strategic retaliatory areas and the conventional, or limited war areas. These increases, in numbers of aircraft, helicopters, vehicles, bombs, and so forth, are continuing. The diversion, however small in relation to the total force, of military assets to southeast Asia reduces the rate of increase of our assets at least to the extent of losses, and somewhat further in terms of loss of military flexibility because equipment is tied down.

Of the funds previously made available to the Defense Department, an unexpended amount of $29.9 billion was carried into the current fiscal year. Appropriations for this fiscal year, 1965, total $48.6 billion. Thus $78.6 billion—the figures are rounded—was available for expenditure in fiscal year 1965. On March 31 of this calendar year, $44.5 billion remained unexpended. Of course, much of this sum obligated. But the point I make is that we should not delay the constant planned increases in our military supplies, vehicles, ammunition, and equipment of all kinds. We will not deny our forces, wherever engaged, the

best and most modern in equipment, facilities, and so forth, for lack of sufficient statutory authority, funding provisions, or otherwise.

The President, faced with the necessity for increasing our support in South Vietnam, has asked us to cooperate with him by approving this special request, thus making it unnecessary for him to rob Peter to pay Paul, so to speak, even in a minor way.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to close the debate on this resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House of Representatives and as Speaker of this great body I am proud of the cooperation, the understanding, the thought and actions that have taken place between the message that was sent yesterday by President Johnson and the action of the House today in taking up and considering this resolution.

I am proud of the leadership—and I exclude myself, so that what I may say in praise will not include myself—but the leadership in both sides of the aisle, who have risen to the greatest heights of Americanism and idealism humanly possible.

I am proud of the action of the two committees and the members of the two Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations. I am proud of the membership of the House because this resolution is more than an appropriation of $700 million.

The action of the House today is a clear indication to the entire world that our people are united behind the President of the United States, and not whether a Democrat or Republican presently occupies the White House, but our President, united behind the announcement of the President of the United States of his determination to continue the fight against aggression against him, you, and all. We know, or ought to know, that history has shown that appeasement means weakness, and weakness and appeasement lead to war.

In a time of crisis, I prefer the leadership of action, with the calculated risk involved therein, rather than the leadership of inaction.

Might I say to some of my friends, if I might without appearing to be presumptuous, before this debate is over and the vote is taken, ask yourself the question: If I were the President of the United States charged with the grave responsibility that rests upon the occupant of the office of President, what would I have done? What decision would I make? Would I make the decision of inaction—inaction to be construed as fear—such as Chamberlain did before World War II? Would I have seen that history was in the making? Would the impact of history—the impact of the history of the past and of history in the making be lost upon me? Would I, in my mind, be thinking in the words of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], so effectively expressed, when he said that he is thinking not only of himself, but of his children and of the grandchildren that he and Mrs. Cederberg hope to have some day?

Because what we are doing today is not only determining the present and future lives of ourselves—we are laying the groundwork of basic conditions and considerations for the future that are going to confront our children and our children's children.

The law of natural and probable consequences that we are so well acquainted with operates whether we like it or not. And the law of natural and probable consequences from inaction is the other side of the coin.

What is likely to be the natural and probable consequences of inaction? If South Vietnam goes, then all of southeast Asia goes. That means Australia. That means the Philippines will be threatened. Formosa—South Korea—even Okinawa—all of the Far East defenses will be threatened.

Do not let yourselves be deceived. When the aggressor gets away with one act of aggression, they will continue. The aggressor is never satisfied.

Let us not fail to remember what happened a little over 20 years ago.

We have got firm leadership. We have got strong leadership. We have courageous leadership not only in the White House but in the Congress of the United States and particularly in this great body, the House of Representatives of which we are all Members.

You are not going to stop war by inaction.

You are not going to stop the natural and probable consequences that will flow from weakness through fear.

The only way that we can rightly determine what course of action we will take is to understand that history is in the making and to realize that fact so that we may be able, so far as it is humanly possible to do so, to lay the groundwork for a course of action and to commit ourselves to taking such action that in all probability will be for the best interests of our country and in the best interests of a world of the future—a world at peace.

So this resolution now before us involves more than merely an appropriation of $700 million. It is a manifestation to the whole world—to the free world—to the Communist world—a manifestation of unity of the American people through their elected officials in the legislative branch of the Government and in the executive branch of the Government that we are not going to be driven underground through fear—that we are going to meet the problems that confront us—that we realize the lessons of a little over 20 years ago—that we realize what fear means and what it means to live in a dream world of hope—that such inaction led to war.

But, our action today means that we are going to take the right course under strong and courageous leadership, not only for ourselves but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the supplemental appropriation to support our efforts in Vietnam.

I do not think, however, that the United States should submit itself to a course of dispatching armed forces throughout the world whenever there is turmoil. I am convinced that our actions in Vietnam is well justified by reason of the evidence that we are faced there with outright Communist invasion and subversion from the north.

Turning to the Dominican situation, I hope we are not now adopting a national course obligating ourselves by implication to intervene in the future in the case of every Latin American unrest. We have no right to interfere in internal matters of other nations. Only in cases where there is clear evidence of outside Communist activity should we become involved.

We must remember that our Nation itself was born out of revolution and that we must not discourage legitimate attempts by downtrodden people to work out their own destiny.

We will forfeit the loyalty and respect of the people throughout the world if we go back to gunboat diplomacy. I am for fighting Communist aggression. I am opposed to American involvement in any other situation except that involving such aggression or subversion.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriation to pursue the war in Vietnam. Every schoolboy learns Charles C. Pinckney's famous quote "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute," a time-worn statement, yet as true today as it was when spoken. I, like so many others, have deplored the use of American dollars to aid the economies of unfriendly nations, feeling, as Pinckney said, that these are dollars for "tribute."

Yet today we are asked to give millions for defense, and I feel that we can put no price tag on the defense of freedom.

If this world is ever to live in peace, we must halt aggression wherever we can, and we must halt it before it is too late. Certainly the price is high, both in dollars and cents, and in American lives; and certainly we all wish that America did not have to pay it. Yet we know, and the President knows, that what we pay now is far less than what we shall pay if we do not act.

Let us therefore unite ourselves in a firm stand against Communist aggression. Let us show the enemy that we do not fight halfhearted wars. Let us show the American people that this Congress will do its part to fulfill America's committment to freedom. And let us show the President that we all seek a firm stand in Vietnam.

If we can do all this for $700 million, Mr. Chairman, I, for one, say it is a bargain.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, U.S. involvement to halt so-called wars of liberation by the Communists has solid support on this side of the aisle.

Many of us are deeply concerned, however, over the go-it-alone position in which we find ourselves in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Our free-world allies obviously did not share in the basic decisionmaking Obviously, neither SEATO nor NATO was used to develop policy in Vietnam. The current SEATO meeting is but the regular annual customary April meeting.

Teamwork is sadly lacking. Consultation with our allies has been grossly inadequate.

We are trying to sell our Dominican policy after the fact.

We are trying to sell our Vietnam policy after the fact.

Every indication is the basic decisions were made by the United States alone, and continue to be. No real teamwork sharing is visible.

Military action is being undertaken by the United States practically alone, except of course for local forces. Little real free-world teamwork sharing is visible.

The cost is being met, for all practical purposes by the United States alone. No real teamwork sharing is evident.

We have not even achieved free world cooperation in economic sanctions against Communist North Vietnam or Communist Cuba.

So far as I can determine we have not even tried to stop free-world shipping to North Vietnam, and of course economic sanctions against Cuba fell apart when our administration insisted upon selling wheat to Russia. From January 31, 1964, through May 3, 1965, 474 free world flags entered Cuban ports.

Free-world shipping to Communist North Vietnma has risen each of the last 3 years, with British and French flags most prominent.

In 1962 it was over $13 million.

In 1963 it was over $24 million.

In 1964 it was over $31 million.

The primary threat to free world security arises not from the Communists but from division and discord within the free-world community itself.

A free world torn apart by misunderstanding gives communism its greatest hope for advancement, its best chance to acquire vast resources untouched by nuclear destruction.

Our most urgent need is to get the free nations to act together.

We need imaginative leadership to rebuild our principal and most promising free world alliance, NATO. NATO should be used automatically to develop unified policy in problem areas like Vietnam and Dominican Republic. Instead we have neglected this alliance and let it fall apart.

We need not take on the Communists alone. The United States, France, Britain, and other free nations actually have identical long-range goals in foreign policy, and they should stand together.

We have failed to bring them together to share in decisionmaking, military action, and cost sharing.

This failure is the most dangerous aspect of the danger-filled situation in Vietnam.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt this resolution will be approved by an overwhelming vote.

Nothing less will express to the world the strong support which President Johnson commands in this Congress and throughout the Nation, as he acts to safeguard the cause of freedom against the Communist conspiracy.

The President has left no doubt that the funds requested are urgently needed to assure maximum effectiveness of our effort, both in southeast Asia and in this hemisphere. Surely there can be no thought of delay in making the necessary funds available.

I support the resolution and support with equal conviction the strong policy of our President in meeting the Communist danger with determination and decisive action.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I support the President's call for additional funds for the preservation of freedom in Vietnam. The prompt action of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees in supporting this appropriation reflects the deep feelings of unity and purpose the American people feel in the face of Communist aggression against peaceful nations. It is further evidence that in times of crisis and adversity the American people stand firmly united behind their President.

I do feel, however, that we must steadfastly press, as the President repeatedly has pressed, for any move to achieve an honorable and secure peace in southeast Asia. I wholeheartedly support the President in his untiring efforts to bring about a peaceful conclusion to the struggle.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I wish to make it very clear that I fully support the request of President Johnson for $700 million to firm up our military posture against communism, yet in so doing, I am not rising to question the motives of any persons who may disagree with me. However, I think the American people should realize the position of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in this issue.

Today, the Communist Party, U.S.A., asks us—no, it demands—that we abandon our great heritage as protectors of freedom and allow the forces of communism to engulf the world. Communist Party, U.S.A., urges us to follow a course that has been carefully mapped by these practitioners of deceit and treachery.

As pointed out on the floor of Congress recently, during the last several months, the international event which has most occupied the attention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Communist-inspired youth group, the Du Bois Clubs of America, has been the war in Vietnam. Following long-established practice, of supporting Communist causes wherever they exist, the Communist Party, U.S.A., justifies and supports with propaganda the Vietcong. At the same time, the party criticizes with vehemence and protests against U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam.

Deliberately ignoring the real issues of Communist invasion, Communist terror, and Communist insurgency in Vietnam, the Communist Party, U.S.A., accuses the United States of engaging in a "dirty war of imperialist aggression." To implement its steady and mounting propaganda attack against the American policy in Vietnam, the Communist Party, U.S.A., in this regard gives its full support to all mass protests.

It is recognized, of course, that other individuals who are not members of the Communist Party or its front groups have participated in these protest demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam. Many individuals who have taken part in demonstrations of this type may not have been directly influenced by the Communist Party, but the fact remains that Communist have endorsed and supported any group which organizes such a demonstration. What these individuals surely do not realize is that such protests play into the hands of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Let us take a look at the development of this Communist campaign against U.S. policy in Vietnam.

During March 1964 a directive, entitled "The United States and South Vietnam Developments," was sent out from the Communist Party's national headquarters to all of its districts. The situation in southeast Asia was described in this directive as an even greater threat to peace than Cuba or Berlin. Party members were urged to send telegrams to President Johnson, protesting American "military aggression" in South Vietnam, to place advertisements in newspapers throughout the country, organize protest meetings and picket lines, and to enlist the support of non-Communist groups in these activities.

Vietnam was the principal topic of discussion at a meeting of the top Communist Party leaders in June 1964. At this meeting, Jack Stachel, a member of the party's national committee, stressed that Communits China must be a participant in any negotiations. Stachel also proposed that the Communist Party, U.S.A., take the position that at issue in Vietnam is not U.S. prevention of Communist domination, but the right of all nations in southeast Asia to manage their own internal affairs. As a further suggestion of the party's campaign against U.S. policy in Vietnam, Stachel relied on a typically Communist tactic when he urged adoption of the slogan, "Bring the boys home."

Mr. Chairman, if the American people follow this line of thinking—and succeed in the effort to bring the boys home—soon we will have no home to bring them to. I totally agree with Secretary Rusk's statement, when he said he wondered at the gullibility of some people who disregard the plain facts in the case of Vietnam. They not only disregard the facts, but history also. If history has shown us anything, it has shown us that when there is a vacuum, the Communists will fill it. What these critics of our foreign policy fail to explain is just where will the Communists be stopped—will it be in southeast Asia, the Philippines, Hawaii, or Seattle?

So, as I say, I am voting in favor of the $700 million emergency appropriation requested by the administration for use in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, on at least five or six occasions since I have been a Member of the House, resolutions similar in intent and purpose to that now before us have been introduced and have been adopted by near unanimous votes. The resolution following the Lebanon landing was one. This was during the Eisenhower administration.

I have made it a fixed practice to vote for such resolutions on the theory that when an international crisis exists, and

our President has taken a position that conceivably could have frightful repercussions for us and for mankind, our position is immeasurably strengthened and the chance of unwanted sequences greatly reduced by a show of national unity. To my way of thinking this is just commonsense.

A nation divided against itself is as impotent and unhappy as a family divided by disagreeing members hanging the family differences on the clothesline for the entertainment of the neighbors. How much better it would be if they maintained a show of family unity while quietly reaching amiable settlement of their differences within the family circle.

The President has the grave responsibility in the conduct of foreign affairs that he cannot always share, and of which certainly he cannot divest himself. It, at times, is a frightful responsibility. Such it was with President Johnson when informed that unless he acted at once hundreds of American lives, and the lives of other innocent nationals, in the Dominican Republic would be forfeited. The report may or may not have been grounded on conclusions reached in the most logical and convincing manner. That the President, and only the President could decide, and we may be sure he made the decision only after deep consideration and doubtless silent prayer.

In Vietnam we have commitments, and as the guardian of a world of freedom against the threats of communism, we have obligations. In a government such as ours it is proper that there should be full and free discussions of all the angles and facets in the situation in the Caribbean, and in Asia, and in our foreign policy in those areas. It is proper too, and highly desirable, that in all of this the American people should participate and their voice be heard.

All that will come—full and free discussion—as always it has when the American mind is in the process of being made up.

But this is not the time. This is the time when every legitimate interest of our country is served, and the chance reduced of that happening which we wish not to happen, by a strong show of national unity.

I shall vote for the resolution in the same spirit with which I voted for the Lebanon resolution, and similarly intended resolutions in past administrations—the spirit of upholding the President of the United States in time of crisis, and of reliance upon a show of national unity, indeed, of real actual national unity, as the greatest barrier we have to the ills and the curses that would invade our peace and security.

Mr. Chairman, I stand with the President of the United States now, as I have in the past, and shall continue to as in the future, when the security of our country, the welfare of her people, and her place in the society of nations, all call for national unity—in spirit and in fact.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the resolution before us today, making supplemental appropriations to finance our commitments in southeast Asia and in the Dominican Republic, represents the first opportunity this Congress has had to express formal sentiments on the Government's policies in those areas.

Less than a year ago, on August 7, 1964, the 88th Congress adopted House Joint Resolution 1145, the so-called Gulf of Tonkin resolution. The vote in the House was 414 to 0. In view of the dramatic developments since then, the escalation of the conflict in South Vietnam, and the addition of new aggravations in the Caribbean, it is well that the President returns for new expressions of congressional support.

Along with most Members of Congress, I support the President and shall vote for this resolution as I voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. It is obvious that heavy new commitments by our Armed Forces have placed on them burdens not foreseen when their current operating budgets were drawn up and approved by Congress. The new commitments require new appropriations. Through this appropriation of $700 million, the Congress not only will assure the President of its confidence in the Government but will notify the world that the United States is going to honor its commitments and defend the interests of freedom as we always have done, regardless of the cost.

In the special message requesting these additional funds, the President wisely pointed out that he was not asking for a complete endorsement of every detail of the Government's actions but rather support for what he described as "our basic course: resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power, and a constant search for peace." This is support we can give solemnly and wholeheartedly.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution now before the House, and commend the gentleman from Texas, the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MAHON], and the committee members, for having acted so expeditiously to bring this measure to the floor. The Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, the majority and minority leadership also deserve acclaim for their part in programing this resolution for action today.

It is my belief that this measure, appropriating an additional $700 million for national defense, deserves the unanimous approval of this body. These funds requested by President Johnson will insure that our American boys fighting Communist aggression in southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world are provided the most modern weapons and other equipment.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I was privileged to be among the group of Representatives and Senators which met with the President yesterday in the White House. At that time, President Johnson forcefully, eloquently, and persuasively explained the need for the additional money.

Some of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee and I had the pleasure of commending the President on his talk and of assuring him that the committee stands soldily behind his policies and efforts in combating Communist aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere.

The President deserves the full support of the American people for his determination that Communist aggression must be checked if the free world is to survive. His unequivocal attitude is particularly commendable when one considers that there are those who would advise him—directly or indirectly, formally or informally—to soften his approach as an answer to current world problems.

By this time it should be clear to all that the way to cope with the Vietcong menace is not through withdrawal, not by reckless escalation, not by referring the matter to the United Nations, but by the prudent use of force to meet Communist aggression.

Our action on the resolution before us will assist the President in implementing his firm, realistic policies to cope with communism in Vietnam and elsewhere.

Many other nations in emerging areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa also are threatened with the specter of guerrilla insurgency. The fate of those countries is linked with the outcome in South Vietnam.

If the United States can eventually bring stability to South Vietnam, the chances for stability will be increased elsewhere in the world. With stability—and freedom from internal or external Communist harassment—can come the kind of economic and social progress we wish for all mankind.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, in abruptly calling for $700 million, the President appears to be asking for an endorsement by Congress for the administration policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Since he has asked for these funds and assuming he has need for them—although there is serious doubt about the urgency for $700 million to be spent in the remaining 2 months of this fiscal year—I am sure Congress will support this measure, in some cases because of agreement with its implicit policy—in others because of an unwillingness to be placed on record as denying funds for elements of the Armed Forces abroad including "equipment, aircraft, and ammunition."

In this situation, however, it must be clear that this vote cannot be construed as an unqualified endorsement of our policies in either southeast Asia or in this hemisphere. A vote for these funds does not expunge the grave reservations many in this country have over these policies. The President's request for funds, coming at a time when he could use other existing appropriations, must be seen for what it is—the engineering of consent. While he will receive the votes of consent, the debate over our policies will not end today. While the President has a duty in foreign policy, Congress has an equal responsibility to give national expression to the strong opposition to our policies throughout the country. Congress ought not to acquiesce and rubberstamp policies which are, in some cases, radically different from those recently pursued.

Recent polls on the President's popularity and the approval of his policies in Vietnam show there is strong opposition to current policies.

For example, in a poll just completed in my district, 3,764 people answered the question on the war in Vietnam. Of these 2,345, or 62 percent of those responding, favored an end to the war by either U.N. supervision of a neutralized Vietnam or complete American withdrawal, 1,021 or 27 percent favored the President's current program of increased use of U.S. military force, 296 or 8 percent favored continuing the Kennedy program of limiting our aid to assistance to the South Vietnamese Army, and 102 or 3 percent favored more drastic measures than those now being pursued.

Accordingly, it could be argued that a vote reflecting the views of my district would be in opposition to increased funds for the military, particularly in the light of our military occupation of the Dominican Republic.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the record will show that I have long been critical of heavy reliance on military force in Vietnam and elsewhere whether such policies are advocated by Mr. Goldwater, as they were last year, or by someone else and in this respect I find it increasingly difficult to answer critics who argue that this administration is now pursuing Mr. Goldwater's policies implicitly rejected by the voters last November.

Our present policies have left our relations with other countries in shambles. The NATO alliance has never been in a greater state of disarray. While we may be receiving token lipservice support for our policies in Vietnam, we have little or no direct assistance in this effort as we had in Korea. The abrogation of the Kennedy policy of limiting our support to the South Vietnamese Army has changed the entire character of the war. We are now carrying a large part of the actual fighting of this war. The war is no longer limited geographically to South Vietnam and may be extended further at any time.

In this hemisphere, our actions in the Dominican Republic have cost us friends, as the votes in the Organization of American States reflect.

In this context, Mr. Chairman, I must in good conscience make it clear to the President and the country, that while I feel constrained to support the instant request for funds, my vote does not carry an unqualified endorsement of the underlying policies. The search for an alternative to the present policy must go on. Congress must continue to speak out against policies where they are weak and to offer alternatives.

While the President's tactics are designed to force acquiescence to his views, in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, as well as here in Congress, I am hopeful this effort to engineer consent will result in a more vigorous and continuing congressional debate of the basic policy questions involved.

I also am compelled to respond to and vigorously differ with those who insist that Congress must complacently endorse all hard-line foreign policies regardless how controversial, who would stifle public debate of these policies and who ridicule and threaten those within our society who oppose and question current policies. The argument that policies requiring the use of force must be unanimously supported and that proposals for peaceful initiatives or even the slightest reduction in our reliance on force are fair game for opposition and attack represent the attitude which inevitably presages general war.

Such blind and violent attacks on opponents of current policies, particularly on opponents within the academic community, as we have heard on the floor today reflect an incredible misunderstanding and lack of faith in the basic tenets of our democracy. It is in times of crisis such as the present when free discussion is the most valuable to the life of our country.

I can understand and am inspired by the sentiment of the man who said, "I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." I am confounded by those who have suggested on the floor today that dissenters in this country should be silenced in the interest of the country's welfare. Nothing could be less in keeping with this Nation's great democratic traditions. Nothing could more weaken our country's ability to meet today's challenges.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this historic proposal, which will not only help finance our defense of freedom in Vietnam, but more important, will serve notice on both friend and foe that the United States can be counted on to stand by its commitments.

Our American forces are now in Vietnam because this Nation has been committed by three of our Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson—to the defense of freedom in South Vietnam.

I am well aware of the arguments used by those who have tried to persuade us to abandon our present policy of bombing North Vietnamese military installations. These are the doves who, well meaning as they may be, fail to realize that their counsel is the surest way to war.

Had President Roosevelt been able to marshal the same kind of support for his pleas to stop the aggressors of the late thirties, as President Johnson is able to do today, World War II might have been avoided.

We can never forget that the appetite for victory is never satisfied among the Communists. One victory in aggression merely leads to another act of subversion and aggression.

I am very proud that we have this measure before us today. It is the first opportunity we in the legislative branch have had to indicate our complete support of President Johnson and his bold and determined policy in Vietnam.

It is also our first opportunity as a legislative body to assure the people of South Vietnam that the United States stands firmly behind them in their determination to withstand Communist aggression and subversion.

By voting for this appropriation today, we are in effect saying to the brave people of South Vietnam that we stand in awe of the great sacrifices that they have endured in the defense of freedom and we are telling them in a most effective manner that we owe them a large debt of gratitude for maintaining, against overwhelming odds, their effective bulwark against Communist aggression.

The entire free world owes the people of South Vietnam its admiration. Mr. Chairman, I deem it a great privilege to join my colleagues and the President today in approving this resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, on April 7, President Johnson made a brilliant and moving statement of his policy with regard to Vietnam at Johns Hopkins University in an address entitled "Peace Without Conquest."

While I do not agree with every detail of that statement or of the policy it outlines, in general I support it. Additional funds are needed to carry out the military operations which are an integral part of that policy, and accordingly I shall vote for the resolution before us providing supplemental appropriations in the amount of $700 million.

While the emphasis contained in the President's message to the Congress requesting this supplemental appropriation, dated May 4, 1965, is somewhat different from the emphasis in the Johns Hopkins address, there is no indication that the President's approach to the problem of Vietnam has been in any way changed. In that connection, I should like to call attention to the following sentences from the President's message of May 4:

> In the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution.

The President also stated, in the final paragraph of his message:

> I do not ask complete approval for every phrase and action of your Government. I do ask for prompt support of our basic course: Resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power, and a constant search for peace.

In his Johns Hopkins address, the President in effect accepted the proposal by 17 nonalined nations that negotiations without preconditions should be undertaken, looking toward a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem. The Communist government of North Vietnam, supported by Peiping, has rejected the same proposal.

There are some who maintain that the Communists would be willing to enter into negotiations if the bombings of North Vietnam were suspended, but there has been no evidence to that effect. If this were their attitude, the Communists could convey it through various channels to us without difficulty and I am confident that in that event the President would be willing to suspend such bombings, at least temporarily, to test the good faith of the Communists. In the meantime, I am persuaded that the President is seeking to keep the scope and nature of the force used in Vietnam to the minimum consistent with the objective of preventing the Communists from taking over South Vietnam by force, directed and supported from the north.

At the present time, there seem to be two main alternatives to the President's policy: First, the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam, leaving the way clear for a Communist takeover; and, second, an escalation of the war, with the intention of winning a military victory over communism in the Far East. I believe both these alternatives are wholly unacceptable.

Under present circumstances, I do not see any way in which our immediate objectives can be secured by reliance on the United Nations. The United Nations, however, might well have an important role to play in the arrangement for and conduct of negotiations, if such appear to be possible, and in effectively policing any settlement that is arrived at. This is the type of U.N. involvement which Secretary General U Thant has from time to time suggested.

The United Nations would also presumably be deeply involved in the kind of regional development program which the President outlined in his Johns Hopkins address.

I do not understand the vote today on the resolution before us has any bearing on the situation with regard to the Dominican Republic. Both the President's message and the resolution refer solely to Vietnam, and make no mention of the situation in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Chairman, for many weeks now I have referred to irresponsible voices of dissent emanating from Washington. I have referred to a few Members of the House and a few Members of the Senate who have, in my view, by their constant and vocal criticism of the President in his conduct of foreign affairs, particularly with respect to Vietnam, begun to undermine the faith of the American people in their President and in his unrelenting search for peace.

I know that these dissenters are sincere, for many of them are my friends. I know them to be dedicated to the American ideals of freedom and self-determination. It is, in fact, their long and proven dedication to these ideals which gives their voices such weight—weight which, in this situation, is totally unjustified by the facts.

Today, by what I know will be an overwhelming vote, this body will reject unfounded criticism of President Johnson. We will announce for all the world to hear—and hear it will within minutes of the vote—that the Representatives of the American people in Congress assembled, rededicate themselves to preserving the integrity of free people everywhere, and that these same Representatives reaffirm their support of President Johnson's policy of exercising moderation in the use of power in his unrelenting search for peace.

Mr. Chairman, as you and my colleagues will remember, on August 7, last, this body voted on a resolution supporting the action of President Johnson in response to the unprovoked attack on the U.S.S. *Turner Joy* in the Gulf of Tonkin. At that time the vote was 417 to 0 in support of the President. I would hope that we could reflect that same unanimity today.

At the time of the Tonkin attack I said:

> The President acted with the dignity and determination appropriate to the leader of the free world's strongest nation, and he necessary in the critical period ahead. Presizens in any further action which becomes necessary in the crtical period ahead. President Johnson proved himself to be a Commander in Chief who is calm under pressure, courageous when challenged, and clear thinking when faced with a complex international crisis.

Today I reaffirm what I said then—the President deserves the unwavering support of all citizens in any further action which becomes necessary in the critical period ahead.

The dissenters, Mr. Chairman, speak of the anachronism of using force in the quest for peace. They accuse our President of waging war against a civilian population, and they review the history of the last 10 years in a light favorable only to their view. After developing this position they then turn to a resolution of the conflict and invariably offer as their only recourse—the United Nations.

Let me briefly answer the illogic of this rationale point by point.

The United States, as the undisputed leader and power in the free world, has a multiplicity of defense treaty commitments—treaties both multilateral and bilateral—treaties entered into since 1945, each of which was ratified by the Senate with little or no dissent—multilateral treaties such as NATO and SEATO and ANZIA—individual treaties with most of the countries of Western Europe, Latin America, and Asia.

At the consumation of these treaties no one questioned that their intent was to protect the sovereignty of each of the signators. These are treaties of defense and they were entered into with the anticipation that at some future date it might be necessary to fight to protect the integrity of the signators.

The United States for more than a decade has spent nearly half of its national income on defense. It has been hoped by all that this great expenditure, this great arsenal, would become such a deterrent that no one would question the intent of the American people to live up to their treaty obligations.

But this is not the case.

Red China, since the death of Stalin, has challenged repeatedly and continually the resolve of the American commitment. For nearly a decade it has referred to America as a paper tiger, and during most of this time our answer has merely been to turn the other cheek.

Has not our lack of action in the past encouraged Red China to greater and greater aggressive adventure?

Has not our action of the last few years been similar to the handwringing in this country when Japan in 1931 marched on Manchuria, when Italy in 1934 marched on Ethiopia, and when Germany in 1938 marched on Czechoslovakia?

Has not this record of U.S. inaction encouraged piecemeal adventure by would-be aggressors?

In my view, the answer to these questions is "Yes."

It is obviously not an anachronism to use force in the quest for peace when that force is used in moderation, and for the purpose of demonstrating the dedicated resolve of the American people to abide by their mutual defense treaties—to protect the sovereignty of nations from external aggression.

And what of war against civilian populations? In the recent past South Vietnam has seen nearly 1,400 of its civilian village officials executed in the night. It has seen its motion-picture theaters and swimming pools and night clubs and soccer stadiums blown up, killing thousands of civilians. We have seen the American bachelor officers quarters and the American Embassy shattered by bombings with the resultant death of many civilians. These are all acts of terror and aggression against the civilian population of South Vietnam.

The entire strategy from the north is not to engage in warfare with the South Vietnamese Army. The strategy from the north is to terrorize and murder the civilian population and through this technique so intimidate the people as to guarantee their submission as the price for survival.

It is clearly China and North Vietnam who are fighting and killing civilians. U.S. bombings have all been directed against truly military targets—inanimate objects—bridges, ammunition depots, supply trains, dams, and radar installations.

We are conducting sorties against brick and steel. The Communists are conducting sorties against women and children.

Who is waging war against civilians? Surely, those who say it is the United States are not speaking the truth.

The sincerity with which many persons advocate a U.N. resolution of the Vietnam crisis is encouraging only in the sense that it reflects great confidence in the organization. It is discouraging in that it reveals how little real understanding of the U.N.'s strengths and weaknesses there is.

In 1945, just as in 1919, all free peoples were looking for a way to guarantee that there would never again be a world conflagration and at both times an international organization was established with this thought in mind. As we all know, because of the opposition of Senator Cabot Lodge, the United States did not become an official member of the League of Nations, though over the years we did lend the organization lipservice.

In retrospect it can be seen that the die was cast for its doom by the failure of the United States to join. However, at the time of the Manchurian and Ethiopian wars which I have mentioned, it attempted to serve as an arbitrator, a keeper of the peace. When it was not successful all faith by all peoples in the concept of the League of Nations was destroyed.

To saddle the United Nations with the problems of southeast Asia would guarantee the same fate for this embryo organization—the organization which

President Kennedy called man's last best hope for peace.

It should be obvious to all that the U.N. has never really been successful in a major peacekeeping role because one nation—which has a veto power under the charter—does not want peace. In fact that nation, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, is a silent combatant in Asia against both the interests of the free world and of Red China.

To give Russia veto power over the sovereignty of South Vietnam would be to place a hangman's noose on that valiant country—and to place an identical noose on the U.N. Children's Relief Fund, the World Health Organization, and several dozen other worthwhile multilateral functions which the U.N. conducts. These functions have and will continue to bring persons and nations of differing cultures and views closer together.

And hopefully, in time, they may possibly provide to the U.N. the strength that the American people willed to it in 1945.

We cannot, we must not, let the U.N. and that will expire in the strife-torn jungles of South Vietnam.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, the Member from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], who has just spoken, has expressed ably and succinctly the views which I had planned to present on the appropriation before us today.

I compliment him and endorse his statement and suggestions.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this resolution because the President has requested us to present a united front to the world on our involvement in Vietnam. An overwhelmingly favorable vote is requested also, and is important as an expression of our support to the American servicemen who are engaged in the Vietnam conflict.

My vote, however, is not to be construed as an approval of the administration's whole policy in Vietnam; nor does it imply the endorsement of a blank check for the unexamined spending of more and more millions, the unilateral commitment of more and more of our Armed Forces and the expansion of the ground and air conflict into a major war, without allies and without the exercise of great diplomacy.

I hope the President will recognize that many of us who vote in favor of this resolution do so in the hope that it will contribute, not to the widening of an unwanted war, but to the pursuit of an honorable peace.

Finally, I think it unfortunate that this resolution comes to us in the absence of any consideration by the House Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees. We have been involved in Vietnam for more than a decade, and it seems not unreasonable to suggest that the Congress should devote a few days to deliberations upon a matter of such critical international importance as our commitment in Vietnam.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution providing additional funds to the Department of Defense for funds for military activities in southeast Asia.

I am not an expert in world affairs. I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs or Armed Services Committee, and therefore am not privileged to review classified reports relating to our national security and international relations. About all I know is what I read in the papers and through conversations I have had with friends who are in the military and whose judgment I respect.

We are in this one to the end—like it or not. Appeasement on our part will leave us no choice. It may delay, but eventually we must either fight or surrender.

Make no mistake, the goals of international communism have not changed. The Communists may speak of coexistence, but their objective of world domination remains the same.

I support the President's position. Certainly there is a risk in the course we follow, but the greater risk in my judgment lies in appeasement and accommodation.

All of us want peace—but peace with honor. We all want to live and let live, but are we willing to purchase life and peace at any price? If nothing in life is worth fighting for, then perhaps the farmers who stood at Concord Bridge should have laid down their guns and refused to fire the shot heard around the world.

I do want to say that I think the time has come when we should level with the American people. The real issue is not whether the Vietnamese should be free, but who will control southeast Asia. The real struggle is not between North and South Vietnam but between the United States—the free world—and Red China. For if Vietnam falls then what happens to all of southeast Asia, Japan, Australia, and the Philippines?

Make no mistake—there will be more Vietnams, more Cubas, more Dominican Republics, and more Panamas down the rocky road we travel. If we are to maintain our position of world leadership, if we are to protect ourselves from threats from without, then we must maintain a defense position second to none. We can only do this if we remain economically sound at home. If we continue this wild spending binge we have embarked upon at home—money being spent on every conceivable boondoggle that the mind of man can conceive, we may well destroy the economic fabric upon which our national security depends.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who, because of my membership on the House Armed Services Committee, had the privilege to be invited to the White House yesterday morning, May 4, on a matter of national urgency. There in the East Room we listened to the request of President Johnson for an appropriation of $700 million to be made forthwith to support the increased activities of our armed services in South Vietnam.

In his remarks, President Johnson emphasized that this was not a routine appropriation but that it was needed to persist in our efforts to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Our President made it plain that we had an irrevocable commitment in Vietnam and that our friends in the South had been attacked by those in the North. He pointed out we were giving aid because of our commitments to the Vietnamese people, because of our principles, and because of the demands of national interest. He also made it plain that the appropriation was necessary to meet present military requirements.

As I sat with fellow members of the six committees representing both Houses of Congress, I noticed that the President enjoyed the rapt attention of every member present. We were all highly aware of the serious international situation which made his request necessary.

President Johnson was careful to state that he did not expect Congress to approve every proposal or action of the executive branch, but in his concluding remarks he did call for an overwhelming vote of approval for this appropriation. Such a vote of approval, he said, would strengthen our country in the eyes of the world and would amount to a showing of national unity.

The unity for which the President asked was shown by the immediate and almost electric response of those present. The minute the President had concluded his remarks the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee proposed to call a meeting of his committee forthwith. This was followed just a few seconds later by a similar announcement from the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Then as Members filed out of the East Room into the main hall of the White House, every one of them enthusiastically pledged support as he shook the hand of the President.

Yesterday afternoon there was a meeting of the House Armed Services Committee to hear an additional briefing by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. All parliamentary redtape was quickly cut by unanimous agreement of the committee after we had listened to his presentation of the need for these funds. Even the matter of passing a preliminary authorization bill was dispensed with through adoption of the unusual procedure of waiving all rules so that the appropriation could be enacted in only 1 day's time. The House Committee on Armed Services knew it had the power to hold up this appropriation, awaiting an authorization. But in compliance with the request of the President of the United States, the committee waived such procedural steps, at the same time hastening to emphasize that such action does not constitute a precedent for future deliberations.

This prompt response to the request of our Commander in Chief should make it clear to all of our enemies, in the only kind of language they understand, that we mean business. It should serve to pass the word along to Ho Chi Minh that there is no dissension in the United States on matters of national security, and that nothing will stand in the way of our determination to continue on in southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I was

proud of the action we took yesterday. Even if I were not a Member of the Congress, I would be grateful to that committee as a citizen of this country. Our action was tangible evidence that we stood united with our President before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam must be preserved, and that we would not, even for a matter of hours, delay our full support of those brave men in the armed services who are risking their lives in Vietnam.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I very regretfully must vote against this appropriation. My colleagues can well appreciate the difficulty of this decision since one does not casually oppose a request of the President.

However, I must oppose this appropriation, regardless of how few will join me, not only because I have grave doubts about our present policy in Vietnam, but because of the way this resolution has been brought before us.

My colleagues, let us make it very clear what is involved here. This is not an appropriation to cover a sudden emergency requirement for funds. The President has stated he already has the funds available since he can reallocate current Defense Department funds to support the war in Vietnam. In fact, only $200 million of the total request of $700 million will even be spent during the remainder of this fiscal year. This resolution is not an emergency request for funds, but rather a way of securing a vote of confidence for our policy in Vietnam. The President has stated that he did not want to just reallocate current funds, because he wanted to have the Congress demonstrate to the world that it is in complete support of his Vietnam policy.

Mr. Chairman, as the President has stated, a "yes" vote means support of the Vietnam policy. I cannot vote "yes" because I do not support the present policy in Vietnam.

INCORRECT BASIS OF OUR POLICY

I question the very basis of our new policy in Vietnam which states that we are dealing not with a civil war, but with aggression by one country against another. Let me emphasize that we are dealing with a new policy in Vietnam, since the extension of the war to North Vietnam was a very critical change in our policy. All the evidence that has been made available to me indicates that the only realistic appraisal of the situation is that we are participating on one side of a civil war in a particular country. Our participation has also failed to win the support of a majority of the citizens of South Vietnam. There is very definitely involvement from outside that country, though we seem to be much more heavily committed there than are the North Vietnamese.

AGREE WITH KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION VIEW: CIVIL WAR, NOT AGGRESSION

Throughout the Kennedy administration our policy was to confine our activities to South Vietnam because that was where the problem was located. President Kennedy repeatedly stated that though there was a significant supply of men and supplies to the Vietcong from the North Vietnamese, the essence of the problem was the situation in South Vietnam. Our involvement in South Vietnam was based on the fact that we were asked for assistance by the Government there for help in dealing with a revolution. We agreed to support that Government with funds, equipment, and military advisers because we felt that it was consistent with our national self-interest to assist in the defeat of the Vietcong rebels. Our entire policy was based on the famous report made by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, now our Ambassador in South Vietnam, after his inspection trip to South Vietnam during 1961. I must point out that a very crucial part of the Taylor report was the statement that the civil war could only be won if the proper social and political reforms were quickly implemented in South Vietnam. We felt that without those reforms that the South Vietnam Government would never gain the support and confidence of its own population and that without that support no amount of military aid would ever be successful in defeating the Vietcong. Our recent policy seems to completely ignore the obvious fact that social and political reforms are a necessary part of any Vietnam policy.

Recent pronouncements of our Government have not convinced me that the basic analysis and policy of the Kennedy administration is incorrect. The recent white paper on Vietnam which attempted to prove that the conflict was an example of aggression and not civil war was, for the most part, not based on recent events. The white paper was primarily based on the same events and facts on which the Kennedy administration based its view that Vietnam was essentially a civil war.

BOMBINGS: UNSUCCESSFUL MEANS OF ACHIEVING NEGOTIATIONS

I would like to comment on not only the analytical basis of our new policy, but also on the new policy itself of escalating the war by expanding it to North Vietnam. In February we began to bomb North Vietnam in specific acts of retaliations for incidents in South Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense explicitly stated that "we seek no wider war." Then we shifted to saying that we were bombing North Vietnam because they were the real enemy and that our bombings would not be restricted to retaliation. Now we seem to be saying that we are bombing North Vietnam in order to convince the North Vietnamese that they should negotiate. Let me quote from the President's message of yesterday:

> The bombing is not an end in itself. Its purpose is to bring us closer to the day of peace. And whenever it will serve the interest of peace to do so, we will end it.

The President also made the point that bombing is not a military tactic, but instead a political and diplomatic tactic:

> For in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement.

But also according to the President, bombing does not seem to have been at all successful in convincing our opponent to come to the negotiation table:

> All our intelligence is unanimous in this one point, that they see no need for negotiations. They think they are winning and they have won and why should they sit down and give us something and settle with us.

Based on the President's own statements, a very good case can be made for the view that our current policy is unsuccessful. We need a different approach in Vietnam.

SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Chairman, our current Vietnam policy is based on an incorrect analysis of the situation and for that reason, it is not working. We need to explore other methods of achieving our goals in southeast Asia.

Let me frankly say that I do not have any easy or quick solutions to the Vietnam problem. Foreign policy is outside my normal area of involvement. I am taking this position because I feel so deeply that we are quite wrong in Vietnam. So let me emphasize that the following are only suggestions or possible alternatives.

First, the Vietnamese problem is surely one in which the United Nations could play a constructive role. The neutral and respected offices of the United Nations might be helpful in arranging negotiations. Further, the U.N. could serve a useful role at the time when a neutral police force may be needed to police any given agreement that might result from negotiations.

Since our policy of bombing has not been successful in moving us closer to negotiations, we should consider carefully Canadian Prime Minister Pearson's suggestions that we cease the bombings so as to provide an atmosphere in which the other side would be more likely to agree to negotiations. There are few historical precedents of nations involved in military conflict commencing negotiations without some kind of limited cease-fire arrangement.

FULL PUBLIC DEBATE

I fully agree with the President that his policy can only be successful if the world believes it is supported by American public opinion. This is the real reason for this $700 million request. There is no emergency need of funds, but there does seem to be some emergency to demonstrate to the world that the American people actually support the President's policies in Vietnam. In fact, the procedures we are following today in considering this resolution tend to subvert that very purpose. Instead of following normal procedures, where the issues involved in any congressional action are first discussed by the appropriate committees of the Congress and then fully debated on the floor, this resolution is being forced through the Congress in an unprecedented manner. The resolution is scheduled to be voted on after only 1 hour of debate. Let me stress again that there is no emergency need for these funds, so why is this resolution being forced through without full consideration? Only when there is full consideration of an issue, does a vote indicate true support of a particular position. This resolution does not even serve the elementary purpose of airing the issues involved so that the American people may reach their own conclusions. Only after full discussion can public

opinion be developed which can serve as a reliable support and basis for any given policy in such difficult times. A "forced consensus" can be easily disrupted by even a relatively slight turn of events. All current public opinion polls seem to indicate that, though the American people are following their normal instincts by following their President, there nevertheless exist grave doubts among a large number of concerned Americans about our policy in Vietnam. If the President is to have durable support for his policy, there must be full and unhampered discussion of the issues.

I therefore call upon the House Foreign Affairs Committee to schedule extensive public hearings on our policy in Vietnam so that the entire country, in the finest American tradition, may have an opportunity to explore these issues. Let us have open hearings where the best informed people on all sides of the issue may testify and have their views closely questioned by our expert colleagues on the committee. After such a full and fair examination of the facts both the Congress and the people might, then have a basis for supporting our Government's policy. We have a great need for such full public discussion. Our news media representatives in Vietnam have been protesting for weeks that they have not been allowed to report the full story to the American people, even when questions of security are not involved. Surely this is a severe accusation which must be fully investigated.

THE APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION ITSELF

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some comments about the specifics of the resolution. We are being asked for $700 million that the President admits he does not need. As my colleagues know, I feel that there is a drastic need in our country for the expenditure of public funds: millions of Americans live in ghettos and slums; children are not receiving the education they so vitally need; millions of Americans are without jobs; the water we drink and the air we breathe is polluted; our rural areas are suffering with severe economic problems; and whole regions of our country, such as Appalachia and the Upper Great Lakes, are suffering chronic economic deprivation; and chronic unemployment has become a way of life for millions of Americans. The list of our unmet needs is a very long one and I could go on much longer. I really do not need to itemize this list of unmet needs or comment on it since President Johnson has spoken so eloquently of America's needs in his call for the building of the Great Society which would fulfill the American dream.

I greatly fear that if we continue to expand our role and if we intervene in every place on earth where activities occur that we disapprove, we may soon have to commit our entire economy to accomplishing this one end. Our vital interests and our national security, of course, must be protected. But I fear that in our strenuous efforts to secure the promise of political stability for other nations, we will leave our own great Nation in a desperate plight.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, though it disturbs me greatly to have to vote against my own Administration, I am compelled to do so. This request of funds is not "a routine appropriation" as the President so correctly stated. It is a vote on our policy in Vietnam. I do not approve of that policy because I feel it is based on an incorrect analysis of the situation and because it is patently unsuccessful.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this appropriations bill. Our Armed Forces are engaged in battle in Vietnam and these funds are necessary to support that commitment. But, Mr. Chairman, I must say in all candor that I have serious reservations about that policy, and I do not intend that my vote be taken as approval to escalate our intervention.

I do not agree with those who insist that an affirmative vote for this bill represents an all-out endorsement of the President's policy in Vietnam. As the President's majority leader in another body said about the vote on this bill, according to this morning's press:

Language by one person does not make that language binding on the other person to whom it is addressed.

An appropriations bill is not the proper instrument for testing an important and complex foreign policy question such as Vietnam, particularly when only a minimum time of 1 hour was assigned for debate. If the policy is to be tested in the Congress, provision should be made for adequate consideration and debate.

Mr. Chairman, I have not taken open issue with our Vietnam policy because I believe it deserves an opportunity for hoped-for-results and negotiations for a peaceful settlement. I think Mr. Johnson is trying sincerely to extricate this Nation from a confused and difficult situation in which we found ourselves when he took office. It was an existing fact and he is trying to discover the best way out.

The President has said that he favors negotiations looking to a settlement of the controversy—"unconditional negotiations." He would talk any time, anywhere. Unfortunately, there has been no disposition on the part of the other side to negotiate. It is hoped that a way will be found shortly to bring the parties to the conference table to negotiate a fair settlement. And, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I do not believe that escalation of the conflict will serve to stimulate negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, I thought the debate took an unfortunate turn with the assertion of several gentlemen in the minority that dissent and disagreement should be curtailed. Free expression and debate are the glory of a democracy and a demand for conformity is the essence of a totalitarian regime rather than a government such as ours. That is why I disagree with the gentlemen who took issue with the so-called "teach-ins." Americans, and this includes professors, have a right to express their views.

I would remind the gentlemen of the minority of the statements of two illustrious former members of their party in the other body. In a letter to a constituent dated January 5, 1950, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg said:

Every foreign policy must be totally debated and the "loyal opposition" is under special obligation to see that this occurs.

On January 5, 1951, in a speech in the Senate, the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio said this:

During recent years a theory has developed that there shall be no criticism of the foreign policy of the administration, that any such criticism is an attack on the unity of the Nation, that it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and that it sabotages any idea of a bipartisan foreign policy for the national benefit. I venture to state that this proposition is a fallacy and a very dangerous fallacy threatening the very existence of the Nation. As I see it, Members of Congress, and particularly Members of the Senate, have a constitutional obligation to reexamine constantly and discuss the foreign policy of the United States. If we permit appeals to unity to bring an end to that criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of the country, but even its future existence.

Mr. Chairman, the best safeguard against error in our foreign policy lies in continuous discussions to find the truth and to develop the best policy. So let us have an end to the criticism that those who take an opposite view from the majority are undermining the security of our Nation.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had the opportunity of attending the White House meeting at which time the President made his request for the appropriation of $700 million now before us.

While I believe that a policy of firmness and decisive action is essential to our form of government, I also feel that all the ramifications of the legislative action before us cannot be adequately discussed in the short time of 1 hour given this body.

I realize that, even with the latest information made available to Members of Congress, it is hardly possible to reach complete agreement on an approach to a highly complex situation. I have always been reluctant to take hasty action on any measure of such far-reaching import, but have been convinced by the President's appeal that the urgency of this expenditure involves a show of national unity to shorten the war by making early negotiations possible.

I, therefore, find it most difficult to make an honest and personal evaluation of the tremendous significance of the resolution before us, and must rely on the President's statements of his desire for a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese conflict.

I am sure that Congress will fully support this measure. In some cases, because Members are in agreement with its implicit policy; in others, because of the possibility of being placed in the position of denying the funds necessary to supply our fighting men with the essential implements to lighten their burden and shorten the time before they can return to their loved ones at home.

The President stated in his message to Congress and the American people:

I do not ask complete approval for every phase and action of your Government. I do

ask for prompt support of our basic course: resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power, and a constant search for peace.

In light of this it must be made clear that my vote should not be construed as an unqualified endorsement of our policy in Vietnam, nor as a blank approval of present and future action in this hemisphere or any place else in the world.

It is, however, in the interest of our constant search for peace that I cast my vote with the majority in the hope that a show of unity and determination on the part of the American people may open the way for a quick settlement of the conflict in southeast Asia, giving the Vietnamese people the right of self-determination without external interference, and the freedom of living in peace.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in support of the President's request.

It is an historical fact that the American people, when called upon to defend the principles of democracy and freedom, have always stood united in their determination to preserve these principles. Now, once again, the American people are being called upon by the President to prove to the world that we will not tolerate any situation that poses a threat to these very principles and to world peace.

The President is asking for a supplemental appropriation of $700 million to meet increasing military requirements in South Vietnam. These additional funds are necessary to continue our assistance to this unhappy land that has been fighting so desperately to keep from falling victim to Communist control.

I stand behind the President in his request, for the maintenance of world peace is a matter of universal concern. I know all Americans, too, will once again unite to defend the cause of freedom. Congress acts today to unite the Nation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, the 5th of May 1965, undoubtedly will be a day that I shall long remember for the mental and emotional experience I just endured. The President, concerned that the people of the United States did not support his policies in Vietnam, called upon the Congress in an extraordinary move to gain approval of his program by asking for $700 million to the end of June 30, 1965. The President by this request asked for a vote of confidence in his leadership. It was readily acknowledged that these funds were not needed for the furtherance of his policies in Vietnam, for he has the authority to use general funds of the Defense Department, but that he chose this means of asking for a vote of confidence in his leadership to carry this to his avowed ends of peace through negotiations without conditions.

I do not need to state my commitment to peace, and my belief that peace can come to Vietnam only through the conference table. And herein lies the conflict that I faced in this vote. While I do not agree with any policy of escalation of the war in Vietnam, it has consistently been denied by the President and all concerned that this is in fact the policy of the Government of the United States. Rather, the President has repeated several times in recent weeks that the policy of the United States is to seek an unconditional negotiation for the peace and stability of Vietnam, and further that the strategy now being pursued by this Government is to seek this just end to hostilities. With this statement I cannot but heartily agree. Our disagreement then, comes in not knowing what the peace is which we want to secure, nor how the conflict can be stabilized to the end that the right of self-determination can be assured, and finally in the matter of the strategy to accomplish these ends in the fastest, most expeditious manner. And it is here at this point that I find myself in utter confusion. Without the facts and the full explanation of the strategy involved, which for obvious reasons cannot be revealed if the strategy is to work, I cannot disagree with the President purely on the assumption that my analysis is superior to his judgment. Facing this dilemma, I am asked by the President to express my confidence that the ways in which he seeks to end this conflict by negotiation can best be achieved by the methods and plans that he has laid.

Had the President never stated that he was pursuing a course which he personally believed would permit the earliest possible convening of negotiations, I would have no choice but to vote against his actions thus far. But in the context of his avowed purposes, I believed that he was entitled to pursue his course with the support of the people of the State of Hawaii, as cast by my vote as one of its Representatives.

Further the President has stated to the Congress that without its overwhelming vote of confidence, his actions are subject to the interpretation by the Government of North Vietnam as not having the full support of the American people. He has explained that his hand would be weakened in his efforts to bring the parties to the conference table. His case is irrefutable. Any leader without the support of his people cannot display the resolution and conviction that this kind of crisis demands.

And so, though I am first and foremost committed to the cause of peace, I cast my vote in support of the President; that I do in fact believe his intent to seek a negotiated peace in Vietnam. As an elected representative of the people of Hawaii I could not let my feelings as an individual outweigh my responsibilities at this point, and so I had to say to the President that we of Hawaii do have confidence in his integrity and sincerity to achieve the ends of peace by means of negotiations.

The President said to the Congress in his May 4 message:

> For, in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution.

This was the basis of my vote of confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 447

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Emergency Fund, Southeast Asia

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, upon determination by the President that such action is necessary in connection with military activities in southeast Asia, to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred, $700,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That transfers under this authority may be made, and funds utilized, without regard to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 412 of Public Law 86-149, as amended, 10 U.S.C. 4774(d), 10 U.S.C. 9774(d), and 41 U.S.C. 12.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my grave doubts about the rightness of what we propose to do here today. I do not say this lightly and without having weighed it long in my heart. But I know, as all of you know, and as the President knows, that what we are approving here is not merely a routine request for $700 million to meet the temporary needs of the Defense Department. What we are being asked to do is to approve the policy and the actions of the administration in waging war in Vietnam, in the name of the American people.

This I cannot do.

I understand the problem which faces the President of the United States. I know that he seeks peace in Vietnam and in all the world as sincerely as any man in our Nation. I know that he did not create the problem which he faces there—but that he must create the solution for it. And I pray for his success in finding that solution, as every American should pray for it.

But in all good conscience, I must say to him: Mr. President, you are on the wrong path. You are gambling the welfare—yes, even the existence—of the United States on an illusion—the illusion that liberty, democracy, and the peace of mankind can be won by the slaughter of peasants in Vietnam—the illusion that communism can be defeated by the power of military force alone, regardless of the conditions and circumstances under which that force operates.

Because the conscience of the American people demands that we fight only just wars, the facts with regard to the situation in Vietnam, and our role in that situation, have been systematically twisted to show only that which justifies our actions. It is clear that in 1954 neither the Government nor the people of what is now South Vietnam wanted a divided country. It is clear that the Geneva Conference of 1954 provided for the establishment of a reunited country by means of free elections to be held in

1956, elections to be held under international supervision, to insure that they would be devoid of terror and coercion. It is clear that the United States, Britain, and France recommended the carrying out of such elections to South Vietnam a year after the Geneva Conference, in July of 1955, and that this recommendation was rejected by Premier Ngo Dinh Diem. And it was Diem's rubberstamp Assembly, in March of 1956, which notified the SEATO Council that it did not consider the Geneva Indochina armistice terms binding on South Vietnam.

This unilateral abrogation of the Geneva agreements by South Vietnam, an abrogation not supported by the United States or by any Western Power, yet an abrogation which was allowed to stand almost without comment, and certainly without effort to correct, is at the root of the problem which faces the President today. There was no Vietcong terrorism at that time—there was no threat of invasion. The fact is that North Vietnam had just announced the demobilization of another 30,000 men, bringing its forces to 80,000 less than were under arms in 1954. The North was as anxious as South Vietnam to rebuild from the ravages wrought by 15 years of war.

There can be little doubt the United States and President Eisenhower accepted the Geneva agreements in good faith, despite vocal critics from both political parties. There is no doubt that it was the view of the President then that the 2-year waiting period, prior to the reunification election, and the provision for international supervision, provided at least a fighting chance to reunite Vietnam as a democratic country. And the President defended his action in supporting that fighting chance as the best arrangement that could be made under the circumstances.

The policy of the United States was clear then, as it is now. It was expressed in a declaration made in Washington on June 29, 1954, as follows:

> In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.

And a year later Eisenhower said, with regard to Germany,

> The division of Germany cannot be supported by any argument based on boundaries or language or racial origin. The domination of captive countries cannot longer be justified by any claim that this is needed for purposes of security.

And yet today the President is forced to defend a policy of maintaining a separate South Vietnamese state on exactly that claim—the claim that it is needed for our security.

There is no information available to me to indicate that the people of South Vietnam regard themselves as a separate nation, or desire to be a separate nation. There is no information available to me which would indicate that the small clique which claims to be the Government of South Vietnam is in fact the choice of the people of South Vietnam. It is abundantly clear that this small group, from Ngo Dinh Diem down to Dr. Phan Huy Quat and the collection of generals who currently run the country, have been hand-picked favorites of a foreign power, from Japan, to France, to the United States and that for the past dozen years or more they have been constituted an elite class from the largesse of the American taxpayer and his AID dollars.

And so the President says that we are there "because we have a promise to keep." And I say that we are there because of a promise that was not kept—a promise of peace from the enforcement of the Geneva agreements.

I will not dwell on the many other phases of this problem where our course has been painted all white—with no black or gray—where our policies have been uniformly presented as placing the United States on the side of the angels.

I am not convinced that this is the case.

I am not convinced that we are in truth strengthening democracy in the world, or weakening the spread of communism by our action in Vietnam. I am, in fact, afraid that just the opposite may be happening. I am afraid that the small countries of Asia, and of the world, whose will to resist we are supposed to be strengthening by our resolve in Vietnam, may not well feel that they would be better off without the United States. This has happened already in more than one country.

But I can say to the President that he has my wholehearted support in his search for "the path of peaceful settlement." It is, as he says, "the only path for reasonable men." So I would like to say a few words about the nature of such a settlement.

The President has already stated:

> Peace in southeast Asia demands an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country. These are the essentials of any final settlement.

And in truth they are. So, Mr. President, I say, let us explore what we mean by such a settlement, explore it for all the people of this country to discuss, build support for this peace in the same way, and with the same superlative skill, that you have built support for this request for $700 million to carry on the war.

Let us begin by pledging ourselves unequivocally to support the basic propositions of democracy in a Vietnam at last free from war. Let us spell it out in simple terms.

First. The people of South Vietnam shall control their own government.

Second. Every qualified citizen shall be allowed to participate freely in elections, and in government office.

Third. The Government shall not permit any individual or collective reprisals against persons who have collaborated in any way with one of the parties during the war, or against members of such persons' families.

Fourth. A basic constitutional form of government shall be adopted within a reasonable time, subject to approval of the people.

Fifth. Elections shall be held, in accordance with the Constitution, at the earliest possible date.

Since none of these basic ingredients of democracy are likely to exist in the near future without secure guarantees, as the President has said, let us unequivocally spell out the guarantees also. Let us pledge ourselves to support a major international peacekeeping force, under U.N. auspices, mandated to uphold order and the constitutional rights of the Vietnamese people. And let us make clear our complete willingness to withdraw all U.S. forces as the international peacekeeping force takes its place.

Let us stir the hope and the imagination of the world by our willingness to consider new and promising methods of peacekeeping, as we have tried new and promising methods of warmaking. Certainly let us suggest a peacekeeping force largely of Asiatics, and including both Communist and non-Communist nations. At this period of crisis in the peacekeeping role of the U.N., it is vitally important to create and use every opportunity to expand and strengthen this essential function. And the circumstances in Vietnam hold promise that the U.S.S.R. might see her participation in a broad peacekeeping operation as a way out of a very difficult situation that she now finds herself in with regard to China and North Vietnam. If such is the case, her participation might provide the necessary assurances to the Vietcong and North Vietnam that their interests would be protected, and allow them, as well as us, some face saving in a difficult situation.

Let us suggest that this peacekeeping force police the boundaries of North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and use this mechanism as a means of providing for Cambodia's often sought guarantees of neutralization, and for the effective implementation of the 1962 Convention on the Neutralization of Laos. Both of these propositions have had the support of the U.S.S.R. in the past, as a means of counteracting the spreading influence of Communist China. If we are truly successful in such peacekeeping we will have opened the door to the demilitarization of all of Indochina, to the creation of a true "zone of peace" in the world, one in which the work of reconstruction and economic development can move forward without the psychological burden of fear, and without the economic burden of large standing armies and military expenditures.

The success of such an experiment would bring to the world a ray of hope never before visible, the hope that gradually out of this world burdened by the threats and pressures of war some small islands of peace could be created, and as this hope proved justified, other troubled areas of the world, in Africa, the Middle East, and South America, would look with favor on a similar pattern.

The personnel of a peacekeeping force could do much to win acceptance of their presence by engaging in large-scale reconstruction and the repair of the damage wrought by war—they could, in truth, constitute an international peace corps. The peacekeeping force could

help supply trained personnel to expedite the more rapid development of the Mekong River project, a project already widely accepted by the various nations of the area as their most important development project, and one which the President has already pledged himself to support.

I say to the President that all these things and more are possible, if only we devote ourselves to the true implementation of the secure guarantees that he has called for, with the same energy we devote to the bombing of North Vietnam.

Mr. President, you have said that you want a South Vietnam "able to shape its own relationships to all others." Let us likewise spell that out. Let us make clear that South Vietnam may reunite with North Vietnam if its citizens freely choose to do so. Let us not say one thing at one time and for one country, and another thing at another time and for another country. We weaken America in the eyes of the world when we do this.

And certainly, during such time as there are two Vietnams, let us make clear the right of the two to engage in such trade and commerce as are in their own economic self-interest.

And if you truly mean that South Vietnam should be "free from outside interference; tied to no allowance; a military base for no other country," let us make that clear also. Let us pledge ourselves that our economic assistance program will be administered on a multinational basis, or through the World Bank, not on a bilateral basis. We only delude ourselves if we think that our almost complete support of the budget of South Vietnam on a bilateral basis does not constitute "outside interference." Let us recognize that the protocol status of South Vietnam under the SEATO Treaty ties her to an alliance, and that those ties should be cut. Let us pledge the removal of those military bases we have maintained over the years, possibly offering to convert them to hospitals or universities at the same time as we depart.

The President has dropped the hint that perhaps the situation is changing for the better in Vietnam—that perhaps he will be able to find a spirit of negotiation in those whom we now fight.

I say to the President, cultivate that spirit with all your great power; spell out the type of program I have been discussing, for all the world to hear; order a halt to the bombing of Vietnam for a limited period of time; indicate your willingness to accept a "cease-fire" arrangement; provide some honorable basis on which the Vietcong may participate in the discussions leading to peace in that war-torn land.

Mr. President, you have said that you "will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement in Vietnam." I beg you to consider what I am saying here, for I know that with your vision and desire for peace you can do far more than what I am supporting. And when you come to the Congress with a request for $700 million for such a program, a program that points toward the goal of a world free from war, you will find me fighting for it.

If you are not successful, Mr. President, in your search for a peaceful settlement on Vietnam, then our future is indeed bleak. The Vietnamese people, oppressed by 25 years of bloodshed, will suffer even more for the foreseeable future.

Even worse, if the attitudes of the great nations—the attitudes which have produced this war—are not radically altered, then we face no peace in the lifetime of anyone now living. Small wars around the fringes of the Asian Continent, and in other places, will continue. Massive land wars on the Asian Continent will be an increasing possibility. Nuclear exchanges in a world of nuclear proliferation will be inevitable under these circumstances. Stability will be enforced by totalitarian methods in a world of the "garrison state." Years of hopeless frustration by the peoples on both sides will lead to increased pressure for a "final victory" over the other. And this "final victory" may be the end of civilized life on earth.

This must not happen, Mr. President.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is recognized for approximately 2 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer just a few thoughts as to where I think this debate has gone and should go. I think it is regrettable that in the past months we have had very little opportunity for full-fledged debate on foreign affairs and the world interests of the United States. I think it is unfortunate that today's debate included no members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs other than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I think we all, both in the Congress and the American public, have been guilty of a conspiracy of silence on this subject. On the other hand, I think the fact that the President has sought this resolution because he feels that there had to be notice given to the world that the American people supported his conduct in the Executive Office, warrants our support and, therefore, I shall vote for this resolution. However, I would like it to be understood that I think the time has come for full-fledged debate on this subject. I think that the President deserves the support of the American people and that the American people themselves deserve an opportunity to hear their representatives, not in an hour's debate, but a debate of many hours, many days, and many nights, so that all of these issues can be decided.

In lieu of that there seems to me to be no alternative other than to support the President's position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as one who has recently returned from Vietnam, to respond to the gentleman from California. His indictment of the U.S. policy in Vietnam was, if not wholly irresponsible, then certainly inaccurate.

He mentioned that the United States is conducting a slaughter of civilians in Vietnam. Our committee has full access as to what is going on in Vietnam. Let me unequivocally state that the gentleman is incorrect.

Any war is a dreadful business, but I think never in our Nation's history, has the President of the United States and his Government ever been more concerned about targets and casualties. It is the expressed policy of this Government that the targets selected for our strikes are not inhabited by civilians, and we go to great length to insure against unnecessary casualties. I might add that I heard no mention of the atrocities inflicted on helpless civilians by the Communists.

The factual conclusion that must be drawn is that in Vietnam today we are not trying to slaughter civilians as the gentleman from California would have us believe. What we are trying to prevent is the slaughter of freedom not only in Vietnam but also in the Caribbean area. And that is the very basis of this resolution and appropriation request.

And so the best way to prevent the slaughter of freedom is to support this resolution. I strongly hope that this is what the House will do and do so unanimously.

I regret that I do not have enough allowed time to give a more detailed reply, but it seems to me that this is a time to have confidence in our President and faith in our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. 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 gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, cloaked in the disguise of a military appropriation bill, this House was asked to approve, and did approve, this Government's policy of escalating the war in southeast Asia. Six of my colleagues and I dissented.

Since it is conceded by everyone, including the President, that the $700 million was not the issue at hand, then at a minimum, surely, in this body which the Speaker refers to as the greatest deliberative body in the world, there should be full discussion of what this resolution

does mean while there is still time, hopefully, to resolve these tragic affairs before we bring down upon our heads the wrath of the world and shatter the frail edifice of world peace.

To my colleagues and my constituents I want to say that for many, many months now I have searched for every possible excuse to support my Government in the policies it is pursuing in Vietnam—and I have supported it. In spite of the shaky logic of the "domino" theory, I have done my very best to believe in it; in spite of the fact that the people of South Vietnam have been subjected to one unpopular and unstable dictatorship after another, I have done my best to believe we are defending their freedom; in spite of the fact that we have violated the Geneva accords, I have done my best to believe this was justified because the North Vietnamese did also, even though I know that two wrongs do not make a right; in spite of one humiliating military defeat after another, I have done by best to believe all the optimistic reports about our really winning the war over there; in spite of all the evidence of internal discord and revolt against the governments we maintain in power, I have done my best to believe this is what the Vietnamese people really want us to do—but, my fellow Americans, there is a point beyond which credibility simply will not stretch—and it is that somehow by waging a wider war we pursue a policy of peace.

This vote represented, in my opinion, a vote for that delusion. It could not have been a vote for $700 million, for the President himself said this was available in any case. It could not have been a vote to show our united determination to halt Communist aggression, for if more than a decade of effort, more than 400 American lives, more than $3 billion expended does not show this, then how can $700 million demonstrate it?

One of the things the vote could mean, though, is what in fact everyone knows it will be interpreted to mean, and that is congressional approval for the continued bombings of North Vietnam and commitment of thousands and thousands of American troops to a war the justice and wisdom of which has been questioned inside and outside this Nation by citizens and friends of unimpeachable loyalty. I think it also clearly means the relinquishment by Congress of its constitutional authority to declare war, for if the President can direct bombing raids on North Vietnam by simple Executive fiat, why can he not direct similar action against any other nation at any other time? Why bother to ask? Once the bomb is dropped, it can always be pointed out that rightly or wrongly—legally or illegally—we are in a war and that American lives are at stake and that it would be disloyal to not approve funds for the war.

I cannot in good conscience lend myself to that kind of usurpation of congressional power, and for the purpose of continuing a course of action which I believe will only reap at best, decades of hostility, enemy, and distrust of my countrymen by the peoples of Asia or, at worst, utter catastrophe for my Nation and the world.

Yet but an hour and a half debate was allotted for discussion of a measure which profoundly affects the future of our country and the world, and less than 15 minutes of that time was given to those who might have reservations, who might have questions, who might disagree. I find it impossible to understand why an admittedly unnecessary appropriation request need be mantled in a cloak of urgency and secret meaning, with full, free, and frank discussion of its merits denied.

The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues who, in one breath, demanded withdrawal of Government funds to an educational project, because some of the participants criticized administration policy in Vietnam and then, in the next breath, he admiringly quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that:

> Every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs.

And this in the context of demanding for himself and others of the minority party a voice in foreign policy decisions. His exact quote is:

> These teach-ins are a protest against the national policy of our country. It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as leaders in these groups, that it is not in the best interests of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financing projects in which these same people play a prominent role.

I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow the advice of the gentleman from Wisconsin, making certain we do not subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

And yet, I wonder if any policy, domestic or foreign, which its supporters here in this House are unwilling to risk to the judgment of free and inquiring minds can prove anything except on the part of its advocates, an abysmal lack of confidence in its strength. Surely a policy in which one believes deeply can stand examination and discussion.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the resolution before the House makes a supplemental appropriation of $700 million to the Department of Defense for military activities in southeast Asia.

It is clear from the committee report and from the debate that this appropriation is not necessary for the support of our Armed Forces.

The report states:

> Sections 512 and 536 of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1965, contain language which has been carried in the bill for several years making certain additional funding immediately available without further action by the Congress.
>
> The authorities in existing law could have been utilized in lieu of the proposed appropriation.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], said earlier that within the framework of present authorities "it wasn't absolutely necessary for this action" and that the President "could have transferred funds and taken other actions necessary."

The New York Times also reported today that the administration could have obtained the money by transferring funds within the Defense Department. Although the request is for $700 million for the 2 remaining months in this fiscal year, the administration contemplates using but $200 million. Why then should the request be for $700 million?

This resolution is not a typical appropriation. Clearly the money is not the question.

The basic issue is U.S. policy in Vietnam. The resolution in effect seeks congressional approval of the new policy which is a departure from the previous policy of aiding the South Vietnamese to fight their own war. The United States is now fighting the war for the South Vietnamese. We are not only fighting in South Vietnam but have carried the war to North Vietnam. Let us make no mistake about the fact that today we are in a war in southeast Asia. We are in a war without a declaration of war. Under the Constitution Congress has the power to declare war. If war were declared by Congress, the situation might be different.

The resolution of last August did not contemplate the new policy in South Vietnam. Before that resolution was adopted in the House and the Senate, the Senate debate made it clear that the resolution was an affirmation of the then existing policy.

Senator FULBRIGHT, in making the legislative history of that resolution, had the following exchange with Senator McGOVERN:

> Senator McGOVERN. Does the Senator think there is any danger in this resolution that we may be surrendering to General Khanh's position as to where the war should be fought? (General Khanh had advocated attacking North Vietnam.)
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT. I do not think there is any danger of that. * * * I do not think the policy that the war be confined to South Vietnam has changed. I think it is still the policy. I think it is the correct one.

Later in the debate, Senator BREWSTER asked:

> So my question is whether there is anything in the resolution which would authorize or recommend or approve the landing of large American armies in Vietnam or in China.

Senator FULBRIGHT replied:

> There is nothing in the resolution, as I read it, that contemplates it.

Senator FULBRIGHT during the debate also said:

> I personally feel it would be very unwise under any circumstances to put a large land Army on the Asian Continent.

Mr. Chairman, in my view the new policy pursued in Vietnam was not contemplated by the resolution of last August. Congress is now being asked to approve of the new policy. Continued escalation of the war may well lead to a Korea-type involvement.

The situation in South Vietnam is not simply a case of aggression from North Vietnam. There is no doubt that North Vietnam is aiding the guerrillas in the south. This fight, however, is also an internal struggle which has been created

in part because of the social and political conditions within South Vietnam. In short, it is a political as well as a military effort. The response to the threat in Vietnam has been overwhelmingly military as was the response of the French in Indochina and Algeria. The population in the countryside does not support the Government of South Vietnam; and it is not a stable government. We cannot bomb people into democracy, nor can we bomb people into negotiations.

The situation in Vietnam must be brought to the conference table. Plans should be formulated for the entire southeast Asia region in order to achieve for that underdeveloped area a decent standard of living. I spelled out possible approaches in my speeches on the floor of the House on February 24, 1965, and June 10, 1964. We must confront the real issues—poverty, hunger, disease—in southeast Asia.

The United States is the most powerful nation in the world. Our power should be exercised for the benefit of underdeveloped peoples. It is naive and inhumane to suggest that the United States withdraw from the world. Neoisolationism is not the answer. But neither is military might.

Mr. Chairman, the way in which the United States relates to the underdeveloped world and the social, political, and military revolutions in that world is the real question. Escalation of the war in Vietnam increases our reliance on military might instead of international cooperation and economic development. It is time to reassess our policy and to start a real effort to negotiate an honorable, diplomatic resolution of the problem in southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, I hope very much that this resolution is unanimously supported. I might add that it disturbs me to see in some areas of our country, on some occasions, some well intentioned people, I assume, carrying placards, "Why Die for Vietnam?" This, I think, could lead to a miscalculation by the enemy of the firmness of our policy and the unanimity of our people. It brings back, perhaps, the memories of those placard carriers in the 1930's who carried placards reading, "Why Die for Danzig?" "Why Die for the Sudetenland?"

The people who carried those placards 30 years ago planted the seeds of Buchenwald and Belsen. And so I say to you that we should caution those who dissent from the policy of the President: "Do not do in 1965 what some did in the late 1930's to encourage the enemy and mislead him to miscalculate where we stand in this crisis."

I would hope that we can be unanimous. I hope our citizens throughout the country will join with us. If not we should caution those who dissent, to be responsible in their dissent from whatever the policy of the Commander in Chief might be. Any irresponsible dissent could be serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the House is faced today with a grave responsibility for we have been requested by the President of the United States to appropriate $700 million when it is perfectly clear that no crisis exists which requires emergency action. The only reason advanced by anyone for this precipitous action is that the administration wants approval for its policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. No one has suggested that there is any need to vote these funds or that slower and more deliberate action would not serve the ostensible purpose.

Indeed this effort to force this appropriation through Congress without adequate committee or floor consideration acts to prevent any real dialog on the pressing foreign policy questions before this Nation.

Serious questions have been raised. Are we doing all that can be done to end the war in Vietnam?

Did we act properly in the Dominican Republic?

Have we used to the fullest extent the Organization of American States and the United Nations?

These are the questions that face this Nation and which must be resolved. I suggest that until there has been full debate we should not approve this appropriation bill. What is needed is a full, complete committee study of our Vietnam and Dominican Republic problems. Then if a need for an appropriation exists we can vote it. No need now appears that requires emergency action. Let us not take any course that commits this Nation to blind acceptance of the present course.

I urge that this be referred back to committee for a full study. This is the reasonable and democratic course.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation. Much has been said and written of late about the nature of the struggle now taking place in Vietnam. Few of the commentators, however, have pointed out what I believe to be the heart of the matter: The Communist aggression now taking place against the Republic of South Vietnam is nothing more nor less than the latest version of a centuries' old effort to subvert the freedom of a brave and independent people.

The recorded political history of Vietnam—by which I mean the territory encompassing both the Communist-held area in the north, and the Republic of Vietnam in the south—goes back to 213 B.C. In that year, the forces of the Chinese Empire invaded the area and began its subjugation. It took China until A.D. 186 to complete that conquest. They called the country Annam, which means the "pacified south."

The Chinese were able to maintain their conquest for several centuries, but they discovered that the south was far from pacified. It took the Vietnamese until A.D. 950 to develop enough strength to rid themselves of the Chinese occupation, but they did so. Kubla Khan tried to reoccupy the country in the 15th century but was thrown out. From then until well after our own Civil War, the Vietnamese people enjoyed virtual freedom and independence. The French first attacked the Vietnamese in 1856, and the final blow took place in 1884, which was the year when the French took complete control of the whole of Indochina. This occupation was never peaceful. The French had to suppress many revolts, the most important of which occurred in 1885–88, 1893–95, 1899–1913, and again in 1930. The Vietnamese were and are, as I have said, a people mightily jealous of their independence.

Following the fall of France in 1940, the Vichy French regime acceded to the occupation of French Indochina by the Japanese, an occupation which continued until 1945. During those 5 years of Japanese occupation, the so-called Vietminh evolved as a major opposition group and developed a popular following as the champion of Vietnamese nationalist aspirations.

Immediately after the Japanese occupation, the Vietminh, headed by Ho Chi Minh, took power in the country. The people, unwise to the ways of the Communists, accepted the Vietminh as defenders of Vietnamese independence and supported the seizure of power by Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi on August 19, 1945. Subsequently, the Emperor Bao Dai, basking in the warmth of the French Riviera, abdicated, and the Vietminh government proclaimed the establishment of the democratic Republic of Vietnam. All-out war with the French broke out in Vietnam on December 19, 1946.

The war against the French lasted for 6 years, until the fall of Dienbienphu in May 1954. This brought about the total collapse of the French Expeditionary Force in Vietnam and the war was finally terminated by the Geneva cease fire agreement on July 21, 1954.

At the conference in Geneva which followed, were representatives of Cambodia, the Vietminh, France, Laos, Communist China, non-Communist Vietnam, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Dissension between the Vietnamese and a power struggle among some of the participants to the conference resulted in a compromise under which Vietnam was partitioned, with all the territory north of the 17th parallel to be occupied by a pro-Communist Vietminh government and until such time as the restoration of peace and order would permit the Vietnamese people to decide their own future.

The delegation from the non-Communist occupied South Vietnam refused to sign the agreement. They proposed, instead, that the whole territory and population be placed under the control of the United Nations until free general elections were held. The delegation from the United States supported this action; stating, however, that it would honor the truce and that it would view with grave concern any violent breach

of it. It is too often forgotten that during the first 5 years following the Geneva agreement, South Vietnam made considerable progress. By the end of that period, 140,000 landless peasant families had been given land under an agrarian reform program; the transportation system had been almost entirely rebuilt; rice production had reached the prewar annual average of 3½ million metric tons—and leaped to over 5 million in 1960; rubber production had exceeded prewar totals; and construction was underway on several medium sized manufacturing plants, thus beginning the development for a base of industrial growth.

All this was in marked contrast to development in North Vietnam. Despite the vastly larger industrial plant inherited by Hanoi when Vietnam was partitioned, the gross national product in the north was only about $70 compared with $110 per person in the south, and where per capita food production was going up in the south, in the north, it continued to fall.

The contrast between what was happening in the south and what was happening in the Communist north was as intolerable to the Communists as the contrast between West Berlin and East Berlin in Europe. In Vietnam they responded far more violently. Beginning in 1959, the leaders in Hanoi launched a deliberate and flagrant aggression against the people in the south, infiltrating thousands of trained guerrilla terrorists to first create anarchy and confusion, and then to exploit that turmoil and impose a Communist regime on South Vietnam. In 1960 Communist terrorists assassinated or kidnapped over 3,000 South Vietnamese. In 1962 there were more than 3,500 separate acts of terrorism and sabotage. In 1964, 436 local officials were murdered and over 1,100 others taken by kidnapping. More than 13,000 other civilians were murdered and another 8,400 kidnapped by the Vietcong; over 11,000 innocent human beings murdered or dragged away from their families to captivity, forced labor, or worse.

This bleeding and intimidation of the people and the local government in South Vietnam has gone on for 8 years increasing in its horror and ferocity with every passing month. The irony and the tragedy of it is that the main inspiration and source of support comes from that very power against which the Vietnamese people have struggled for so many centuries.

In the name of anti-imperialism, and in the name of freedom, the Communists in Hanoi have turned brother against brother, and family against family in a campaign of terror which can have as its only goal satisfying the ambitions and gorging the appetite of their traditional enemies. The Vietnamese are not deluded about this.

More than 50,000 soldiers of South Vietnam have been killed or wounded in battle for their country since 1960. Last year alone the South Vietnamese Army suffered 25 percent more battle casualties proportionately than we incurred in the entire 3 years of the Korean war. And still they fight on.

Last month, President Johnson said:

> Over this war—and all Asia—is another reality: the deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, which has attacked India and has been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. The contest in Vietnam is part of a wider pattern of aggressive purposes.

If that pattern of aggression is to be broken, we must stand beside our national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence. Around the world are people whose will to resist and whose hope for the future depends on their faith in our commitments. To leave Vietnam to its fate would be an act both dishonorable and senseless. For the result could only be still larger aggression and even wider war. To withdraw from this battlefield today would only mean preparing to fight on some other battlefield tomorrow. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied. The only way to stop aggression and achieve lasting peace is to prove to the aggressor that he cannot profit from his actions. We are proving it now, to Peiping and Hanoi alike, in Vietnam.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this resolution only because I believe the international situation as it exists today demands a demonstration of unity.

I have serious misgivings about the necessity for appropriating $700 million and I regret the President would use a critical psychological situation for the purpose of obtaining this huge fund.

Nor is it any credit to the President or those who rammed this resolution through the House of Representatives that it was accomplished in a matter of a few hours from the time it was proposed at the White House, and with only 1 hour of general debate on the House floor.

Those in charge of the resolution gave no justification for the full amount of $700 million. Certain expenditures of lesser amounts were alluded to but without any detail. The impression given was that the figure was picked out of thin air.

It has been interesting to listen to the speeches of those who today insist the situation calls for resolution and determination. Aggression in Vietnam did not start today, yesterday, last month, or last year.

What did some of those speaking today in behalf of this action have to say last fall when a candidate for the presidency was calling for resolution and determination to halt aggression in Vietnam? That candidate was denounced as a "war-monger" and "trigger happy" for insisting that the necessary forces be employed to carry the war to the aggressor in his own territory. If this resolution has any meaning it is in support of an escalated war—an effort to win—an action for which another advocate was crucified last fall.

And it would have been heartening to have heard in April 1961, some of the speeches that have been made today. After training and equipping a Cuban invasion force at a cost of millions of dollars it was a sad and sorry day in the history of this Nation when for lack of resolution and determination the Bay of Pigs fiasco was permitted to take place.

We are still paying a heavy price, as demonstrated in the Dominican Republic, for the lack of resolution and determination in that tragic failure of 1961.

Enactment of this joint resolution by Congress means that it is now up to the executive branch of government to put an end to the bungling that has marked foreign policy. As far as Congress is concerned the position of this Government is clear. It is now the duty and the responsibility of President Johnson and his subordinates to forthwith obtain the support of our so-called allies in fighting to a successful conclusion the war in Vietnam.

In this hemisphere, it is President Johnson's duty and responsibility to immediately obtain the help of the Organization of American States in bringing order out of chaos in the Dominican Republic.

No longer should Congress or the citizens of this country, having made the tools available, tolerate further bungling in the conduct of foreign affairs.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the resolution and the appropriation today because I believe that the troops we have committed in southeast Asia deserve the support—the supplies, the equipment, and the facilities—which the President has told us they need. That is what my vote today covers. It is not a vote for enlarging the present conflict in South Vietnam, or a vote of satisfaction with things as they are.

I hope that we will work vigorously to rehabilitate the United Nations, and then try to obtain a United Nations presence in Vietnam to protect and pacify the area.

I hope that we will make clear our determination that the people of South Vietnam will then have an opportunity for democratic elections to determine their own future.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, yield to me at this point?

Mr. MAHON. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 447.

I believe it is imperative that the Congress reflect the determination of the American people to resist Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Those of us who stand behind actions by the President aimed at strengthening our position in South Vietnam are convinced that only by firmness can the Communists be persuaded of our true intentions. And

these intentions are nothing less than to maintain and preserve the cause of freedom and Western civilization. But if we falter—if we begin looking for excuses to run out on commitments made to the people of South Vietnam, or West Berlin, or Latin America—then the Communists will certainly interpret our action as a green light for their own aggressive plans.

True, South Vietnam is a distant land and Saigon is a distant capital. And we hear many voices today asking the question: Why should American lives and resources be committed to the defense of a distant land and foreign culture?

Yet, can we sell out our commitment in Saigon with any greater national honor or moral rectitude than the Chamberlain government and the French sold out Austria and Czechoslovakia in the 1930's? And if we did pursue this callow course, does not history teach that though we avoid the struggle for the easy course today, the aggressor will be back tomorrow with even greater demands—and that, ultimately, the final battle will be fought not in distant territories, but in our own country?

Do not misunderstand; the course of resistance in South Vietnam is risky, but the current debate regarding our policy in South Vietnam is not between warmongers and peacemakers. No one wants a war and the great debate concerns best how to prevent it.

However, in South Vietnam, as in West Berlin, as in Latin America, the risks of our inaction are far greater than the risks of taking firm action to make our intentions known. No aggressor would knowingly launch a major war today, because of our country's ability to retaliate with overpowering force. But an aggressor who misunderstood or came to underestimate our will to fight might overstep his bounds—and thereby bring about the war nobody wants.

Therefore, our continued firmness in South Vietnam—and our willingness to take the necessary risks to maintain our commitment there—is in the long-range interests not only of southeast Asia but of our own national security and the cause of peace and freedom everywhere. We must assume the risk made necessary by the aggressive actions of our enemies—always remembering Gen. Douglas MacArthur's counsel that there is no security on this earth, only opportunity.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOW. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, it is with profound regret that I question a proposal of our respected President whom we have quite regularly supported in this Congress.

The time available for reading this momentous message of the President for increased spending for the combat in Vietnam has been very short. This proposal has been known to us for less than a day. We must vote only an hour after the bill's presentation. This is not a trivial measure. This appropriation, Mr. Speaker, may prove to be among the most fatal decisions in American history.

This bill is equivalent to a declaration of war with little warning to show it does mean that.

This bill commits us to endless violence—the very thing our people in 1952 voted to stop in Korea.

This bill will be passed, not after adequate debate, but it will be passed on a demand for faith in our President. We have faith in our President in many respects. But this Congress, this major arm of Government, should not be asked to carry faith so far as to abandon nearly all consideration by the people. We owe it to our people in our districts to subject this fateful measure to the fullest debate, in public and before the congressional committees.

Why call this measure fateful?

I submit that this warfare that our Nation carries on in Vietnam has little support in the opinion of the world. None of our historic allies, the great nations like England, France, Italy, or Canada, have sent troops to aid us, as they did in three wars of this century. Certainly nobody can show where our actions are popular in Asia, among the millions of people there.

The United Nations, which was set up to solve these conflicts, has been left out and it plays no role. Everyone once thought it was the place where differences among nations would be settled. But we will by this appropriation carry our course of action into an area of danger where no United Nations can help to resolve the conflict. And we will be doing this by the single action of one heavily armed nation that has little or no meaningful support from any other nation.

Our action is fateful because it reveals our one Nation attempting to say, "I am the law"—attempting to be the judge and executioner of another nation.

There are two sides to every question, and there are two sides in the Vietnam conflict. While we hold that the Vietcong uprising is a Communist plot, others hold that it is a rebellion of the people against the rulers. Now there may be places in this world where we should oppose communism—perhaps in Russia or in China. But let us not attempt to do it in those areas where we may be interfering with a revolt of people against oppression. For, if we do this too often, it will be known all over the globe that the common people cannot right their wrongs without U.S. opposition. And the people will say that the United States does not go to the courts; she does not sit down and parley; she does not go to the United Nations. Men will say that the United States imposes its own justice by force. They will say we do this, not always close to our own shores, but also on the opposite side of the globe, in distant lands, punishing faraway people whom we are not equipped to understand.

Now the argument is offered that terrible atrocities are being committed in Vietnam by the Communists there. Undoubtedly this is so. But they are the same race and breed as our Vietnam allies. Frankly, do you not wonder if the level of humanity is very different on one side from another? Do you not know, too, that the United States has dropped burning oil upon Vietnam in this sad conflict.

The argument is offered in our defense that North Vietnam has committed aggression upon South Vietnam. Now as you know these were two parts of the same country not long ago. They were divided at a conference in 1954 that was made up mainly of foreigners who chose to say: These are two countries.

It should not surprise us if many hundreds of the men in North Vietnam have come down into South Vietnam to reunite their country. You can call it aggression if you want to, but it is not something you can blame them much for—attempting to reunite the land.

When Germany invaded Belgium in 1914, all the world knew and could see it was aggression against a foreign people. And the nations joined to repel it.

When Germany invaded Poland in 1939, all the world knew and could see it was aggression against a foreign people. And the nations joined to repel it.

But when men in North Vietnam came down the jungle trails to South Vietnam, the world was not so sure it was aggression. Only one major nation came to repel it; that was the United States. We came in to bomb North Vietnam with no sanction from the community of nations, and no mandate from any court or alliance.

Others will say: "You are talking appeasement." The answer is this: "That the tag 'appeasement' is used now for every situation." One should never change his course or shift his field of action I suppose. I suppose there are some who would smash their heads against a stone wall so that they do not appease it.

If, now, this Nation is in the Vietnam conflict to right some wrongs done by one group of people to another group of people, the purpose is commendable. But the wrongs of Vietnam are not all the wrongs of this world. There are wrongs and cruelties in South Africa, in west Africa, in Burma, in Bolivia, in Brazil, in Russia and in China, even in the United States. Why shall we swoop down with all our might on this one particular place that we hardly know, so far away, asking for no judge except our own strength?

Should you of the opposite opinion ask me for a solution to our problem in Vietnam, I could answer you this way: Whatever you do, do not choose the worst solution of all—represented by this ill-advised bill. It contains too much of hostility and belligerence to be the glowing charter of our cause. I recommend any other course you care to select, and I will help you work it out.

Still the final argument remains: It is said we must stop communism. I hope we can. But can we stop it by fighting the people we want to win for our side? Can we stop it amongst the billions of Asiatics when they think we are bringing colonialism back by means of atomic

weapons, which they hate with a bitter hate.

Are we fighting in Vietnam out of fear that it will fall to China? Is fear a good basis for going to war?

Does Communist China have the power to occupy and dominate any number of southeast Asia nations that are fighting now so desperately for their independence? This is the age of little nations. They have grown from 50 to 100 in a few years. Let us not have fear, but faith that they will all come out independent.

And so in this swift and tragic moment, the United States is to veer from democratic deliberation into a swift decision—when there is no crisis calling for swiftness.

In this tragic moment we are to relinquish a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, and use our great might to do violence against a small people as it suits our choice.

In this tragic moment we are to brush aside the countless questions and anxieties of our own people, telling them they do not know the facts. It is true nobody knows all the facts, and most of us know only a few. So let us read the signs. Let us take note that our traditional allies are not joining us in Vietnam. Let us take note that our side in Vietnam has been losing battles and territory in the country in spite of the heavier arms we give them.

Let us take note that all through the years of Vietnam fighting, it has never been clear whether the Vietnam people wanted to be saved more from communism than they did from war. Let us take note that Vietnam recently ejected one nation of white men from its shores. Why should they like us any better?

Let us take note that the government of Vietnam has been changed five times in a major way in the past 2 years. That is the measure of stability and resolution in the side we espouse. All these are signs that cast a doubt upon the rightness of our cause. Let us take note that hundreds of American clergymen and thinkers have counseled against our course.

In this tragic moment we will proceed to delude ourselves that unanimity on the floor of this body means unanimity the world over—for its does not. In this tragic moment we surrender our individuality as legislators, capitulate to a mechanism, and close our eyes to the possibility that we may be committing a crime upon other men.

Please believe that I am not saying these words in any way as personal criticism of the individual actions of others. I do not believe I am an agitator. I represent no group. I have no desire to stir up factions or foster uprisings in these legislative halls or anywhere else. I am noting this to the best of my conviction.

When this sad choice, not of my choosing, is placed here before this Congressman, he has to follow what is inside of him. My vote will go against the appropriation, and it will go with a heavy heart though still with an expression of respect for our President. For while I believe he is gravely wrong, I also believe that he has struggled mightily with this problem.

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, this resolution and this $700 million is an opportunity for Congress to help prevent another disastrous world war. This resolution is an opportunity for Congress to take positive action to solve the No. 1 issue facing the American people and the free peoples of the world—the constant threat of Communist domination of the world. At the moment, this Communist threat is manifested through infiltration and sabotage of free peoples by Communist agents. In recent years, we have seen the Communists gobble up nation after nation in Europe, in Asia, and even in this hemisphere. South Vietnam and Santo Domingo are only another step in the Communist plan to subvert and conquer the entire free world.

The President's decision to stand firm in South Vietnam and to forestall a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo is in the interest of freedom and the security of free peoples. The forthright action of the President is calculated to avert a general war and, therefore, is definitely in the interest of peace.

This resolution will eliminate the possibility of Communist miscalculation, which contributed to their open attack on the South Korean Republic in 1950, thus precipitating a general war. This resolution will prevent any dictator from misjudging the American will to resist.

Mr. Chairman, our own country could possibly have averted World War I and World War II had the dictators been put on notice by a resolution such as this one before the House today. The Communist world has been lead to believe, as Hitler was led to believe, that we do not have the will to resist aggression. The Communist propaganda mill has frequently referred to the United States as a paper tiger, lacking the will or ability to defend our allies.

This resolution today is the greatest single step this Congress can take for peace and to prevent a world conflict—a world war which would bring destruction to the cities of the world and to countless millions of innocent civilians.

The President has been the target of abuse, tirades, and ridicule from Moscow, Peiping, Hanoi, and Havana. I am shocked and distressed to see some in our own country lend comfort to those who have called the President an imperialist gangster and who seek to discredit our Commander in Chief before the peoples of the world. I believe the American people now realize and the Members here realize that speeches and articles attacking the President and his foreign policy are reproduced by the Communists and distributed as Communist propaganda in an effort to prove we are not a united nation.

This resolution is designed to let the Communists know in no uncertain terms that we will stand firm in South Vietnam and in Santo Domingo, in Berlin, and throughout the world. It will notify the Communists that we will fight in the defense of our friends and allies. This resolution will make it crystal clear to the aggressors that we will fight open aggression, we will oppose infiltration of free nations by foreign agents and that we will fight Communist subversion and sabotage.

This resolution is for peace and it will encourage the free peoples of the world to stand firm. I urge that this resolution be adopted by an overwhelming vote in order that the enemies of freedom will know now where we stand.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the joint resolution do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 447 making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the joint resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the joint resolution do pass.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 408, nays 7, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—408

Abbitt	Bingham	Clausen, Don H.
Abernethy	Boggs	Clawson, Del
Adair	Boland	Cleveland
Adams	Bolling	Clevenger
Addabbo	Bolton	Cohelan
Albert	Bonner	Collier
Anderson, Ill.	Bow	Colmer
Anderson, Tenn.	Brademas	Conable
Andrews, George W.	Bray	Conte
Andrews, Glenn	Brock	Cooley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brooks	Corbett
Annunzio	Broomfield	Corman
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Craley
Ashbrook	Broyhill, N.C.	Cramer
Ashley	Broyhill, Va.	Culver
Ashmore	Buchanan	Cunningham
Aspinall	Burke	Curtin
Ayres	Burleson	Daddario
Baldwin	Burton, Utah	Dague
Bandstra	Byrne, Pa.	Daniels
Baring	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Cabell	Davis, Wis.
Bates	Callan	Dawson
Battin	Callaway	de la Garza
Beckworth	Cameron	Delaney
Belcher	Carey	Dent
Bell	Carter	Denton
Bennett	Casey	Derwinski
Berry	Cederberg	Devine
Betts	Celler	Dickinson
	Chamberlain	Diggs
	Chelf	Dingell
	Clancy	Dole
	Clark	

Donohue	Keith	Reinecke
Dorn	Kelly	Reuss
Dowdy	Keogh	Rhodes, Ariz.
Downing	King, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Dulski	King, N.Y.	Rivers, Alaska
Duncan, Oreg.	King, Utah	Rivers, S.C.
Duncan, Tenn.	Kirwan	Roberts
Dwyer	Kluczynski	Robison
Dyal	Kornegay	Rogers, Colo.
Edmondson	Krebs	Rogers, Fla.
Edwards, Ala.	Kunkel	Rogers, Tex.
Ellsworth	Laird	Ronan
Erlenborn	Landrum	Roncalio
Evans, Colo.	Langen	Rooney, N.Y.
Everett	Latta	Rooney, Pa.
Evins, Tenn.	Leggett	Roosevelt
Fallon	Lennon	Rosenthal
Farbstein	Lindsay	Rostenkowski
Farnsley	Lipscomb	Roudebush
Farnum	Long, La.	Roush
Fascell	Long, Md.	Roybal
Feighan	Love	Rumsfeld
Findley	McCarthy	Satterfield
Fino	McClory	St Germain
Fisher	McCulloch	St. Onge
Flood	McDade	Saylor
Flynt	McDowell	Scheuer
Fogarty	McEwen	Schisler
Foley	McFall	Schmidhauser
Ford, Gerald R.	McGrath	Schneebeli
Ford, William D.	McMillan	Schweiker
	McVicker	Scott
Fountain	Macdonald	Secrest
Fraser	Machen	Selden
Frelinghuysen	Mackay	Shipley
Friedel	Mackie	Shriver
Fulton, Pa.	Madden	Sickles
Fulton, Tenn.	Mahon	Sikes
Fuqua	Mailliard	Sisk
Gallagher	Marsh	Skubitz
Garmatz	Martin, Ala.	Slack
Gathings	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Gettys	Martin, Nebr.	Smith, Iowa
Gibbons	Matsunaga	Smith, N.Y.
Gilbert	Matthews	Smith, Va.
Gilligan	May	Springer
Gonzalez	Meeds	Stafford
Goodell	Michel	Staggers
Grabowski	Miller	Stalbaum
Gray	Mills	Stanton
Green, Pa.	Minish	Steed
Greigg	Mink	Stephens
Grider	Minshall	Stratton
Griffin	Mize	Stubblefield
Gross	Moeller	Sullivan
Grover	Monagan	Sweeney
Gubser	Moore	Talcott
Gurney	Moorhead	Taylor
Hagan, Ga.	Morgan	Teague, Calif.
Hagen, Calif.	Morris	Teague, Tex.
Haley	Morrison	Tenzer
Hall	Morse	Thomas
Halpern	Morton	Thompson, La.
Hamilton	Mosher	Thompson, N.J.
Hanley	Moss	Thompson, Tex.
Hanna	Multer	Thomson, Wis.
Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, Ill.	Todd
Hansen, Iowa	Murphy, N.Y.	Trimble
Hansen, Wash.	Murray	Tuck
Hardy	Natcher	Tunney
Harris	Nedzi	Tupper
Harsha	Nelsen	Tuten
Harvey, Ind.	Nix	Udall
Harvey, Mich.	O'Brien	Ullman
Hathaway	O'Hara, Ill.	Utt
Hawkins	O'Hara, Mich.	Van Deerlin
Hébert	O'Konski	Vanik
Hechler	Olsen, Mont.	Vigorito
Henderson	Olson, Minn.	Vivian
Herlong	O'Neal, Ga.	Waggonner
Hicks	O'Neill, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Holifield	Ottinger	Walker, N. Mex.
Holland	Passman	Watkins
Horton	Patman	Watts
Hosmer	Patten	Weltner
Howard	Pelly	Whalley
Hull	Pepper	White, Idaho
Hungate	Perkins	White, Tex.
Huot	Philbin	Whitener
Hutchinson	Pickle	Whitten
Ichord	Pike	Widnall
Irwin	Pirnie	Willis
Jacobs	Poage	Wilson, Bob
Jarman	Poff	Wilson, Charles H.
Jennings	Pool	
Joelson	Price	Wolff
Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski	Wright
Johnson, Okla.	Purcell	Wyatt
Johnson, Pa.	Quie	Wydler
Jonas	Quillen	Yates
Jones, Ala.	Race	Young
Karsten	Randall	Younger
Karth	Reid, Ill.	Zablocki
Kastenmeier	Reid, N.Y.	
Kee	Reifel	

NAYS—7

Brown, Calif.	Dow	Green, Oreg.
Burton, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	Ryan
Conyers		

NOT VOTING—18

Blatnik	Hays	Redlin
Cahill	Helstoski	Resnick
Curtis	Jones, Mo.	Rodino
Giaimo	MacGregor	Senner
Griffiths	Mathias	Toll
Halleck	Powell	Williams

So the House joint resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Griffiths with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Senner.

Mr. BROCK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 366, Rept. No. 292), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 366

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. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, 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 Science and Astronautics, 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.

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 365 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 365

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. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 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 four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Serivces, 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.

That after the passage of H.R. 7657, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 800; that it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7657 as passed.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. 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. 93]

Blatnik	Grover	Resnick
Cahill	Halleck	Rodino
Cleveland	Hawkins	Senner
Curtis	Hays	Smith, Calif.
Diggs	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Dow	Kirwan	Steed
Flynt	MacGregor	Talcott
Fraser	Mathias	Teague, Tex.
Fuqua	Moorhead	Toll
Giaimo	Powell	Williams
Griffiths	Reid, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

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

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 92, I was in the Capitol but unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule with not to exceed 4 hours of debate and makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7657, the military procurement bill from the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first major piece of legislation that has been brought to this House since the departure of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the long-time chairman of this distinguished committee, by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. Mr. RIVERS has served on this committee for many years. He has demonstrated in those years, during this valuable service on the Committee on Armed Services, his ability to take over and run this committee. As a matter of fact, he has had very fine training under his predecessor, the very affable and effective gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Vinson.

He has demonstrated in the brief time he has been chairman of this committee that he has the qualities of leadership that will permit him to do a good job. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have been impressed with by this new chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is the fact that the gentleman from South Carolina has a mind of his own, that he is a man of conviction and he will not blindly follow demands made by others regardless of position and rank.

I admire this quality in any Member of Congress who is willing to stand up and fight for what he thinks is right and is for the best interests of his country. And I predict for this able, effective, and courageous gentleman from South Carolina, the new Chairman, a very brilliant and effective career in this very important committee.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the expenditure of some $15 billion-plus for the procurement of the necessary hardware for the management and conduct of our military affairs. I endorse this bill, as I am sure most Members will.

Specifically, under H.R. 7657 the Army would procure 1,118 aircraft this year, which is 164 less than that authorized for fiscal year 1965.

The Navy and Marine Corps would procure 659 aircraft, which is 75 more than authorized for fiscal year 1965.

The Air Force would procure 517 aircraft, which is 372 less than authorized for fiscal year 1965.

This is 461 aircraft less than was authorized for fiscal 1965 for all three services.

The Army would procure 32,318 missiles this year as against 13,998 authorized last year.

The Navy and Marine Corps would procure 4,463 as against 11,605 authorized last year.

The Air Force would procure 1,509 as against 9,795 authorized last year.

The bill would authorize 62 new ships and 12 conversions. Of the 62 new ships, 46 are combatant ships and 10 of the conversions are combatant types.

The bill authorizes a total of $15,303,400,000—$2,004,600,000 for the Army; $5,383,600,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps; $7,420,200,000 for the Air Force, and $495 million for Defense agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all find ourselves very much in the position when we consider these astronomical figures of authorization for national defense that since we are not ourselves experts in this field we must rely largely upon the Committee on Armed Services, who spend many hours, as do their able staff, in working these things out. And we have to take it more or less on faith, just as we did a few moments ago here on an appropriation for some $700 million for the Vietnam crisis.

However, we as individual Members, when we have a conviction and some thought of what is to the best interest of our common country, have a duty to speak our piece. And in that connection, Mr. Speaker, there is one section of this bill that I do not approve, and that is section 303 of the bill which would delete from the law the present provision for allocation of repair work for our naval vessels which has heretofore been authorized. I think that the present arrangement we have is a very good one. I say that as one who believes in the free enterprise system, although I recognize the necessity for having Navy shipyards where emergency repairs can be made and made effectively.

I believe, however, in the long run and generally speaking it has been demonstrated that under the private enterprise system it could be done just as effectively and certainly more economically.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be in the position of having to decide between two committees of this House. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, which also studies these problems, has repeatedly provided for the present formula of 65–35 in the operation and the repair of these ships.

I have a very high regard for the distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services. Likewise, I have a very high regard for the distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations.

But it seems to me that we are now being asked to choose between the judgments of the two. I refer to section 303 in the pending defense authorization bill, H.R. 7657.

For 3 consecutive years—in connection with the Defense Appropriations Acts for fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965—the Committee on Appropriations has asked us to approve, and we have approved, the distribution of naval ship conversion, alteration and repair—CAR—work on the basis of 65 percent for the Navy shipyards and 35 percent for the private shipyards. Of course, this action was not unanimous, and the supporters of the naval yards have never hesitated to register their objections.

It has seemed to me that the actions of the Committee on Appropriations were prompted by five fundamental objectives: to strengthen the competitive enterprise system; to reduce the costs of national defense where practicable; to save money for the Public Treasury because of lower costs in the private yards; to take advantage of the demonstrated savings which result from competitive bidding; and to strengthen the total shipyard complex—both private and naval facilities—that supports the U.S. Navy Fleet. No matter what else might be argued by those who do not now support the 35–65 principle, it cannot be said that these objectives were not achieved.

Now, the Committee on Armed Services would, to quote from House Report No. 271, page 13, "preclude by specific language—that, section 303, H.R. 7657—the insertion of such limiting language—that is, such as 35–65—in any future legislation." The net effect of that single move on the part of the Committee on Armed Services is to question the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations—three times rendered.

I do not endorse section 303 in H.R. 7657. I cannot accept it without voicing my protest. No doubt, there are many of my colleagues who share the same reaction. I, for one, believe that the Congress and the executive agencies should work toward measures which will reinforce the competitive enterprise system and place greater emphasis on Government procurements from commercial sources. Removal of 35–65 does the exact opposite by moving the Government deeper and deeper into activities which duplicate those available in private industry.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend and chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me read to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi how private enterprise is faring today in the shipbuilding business.

There are 148 ships authorized and funded but which are not yet completed. This represents $7.1 billion. One hundred and twenty-six of these ships are in private yards and only 22 in the naval yards. This is new construction and there is no law requiring this to be done. We are giving them 126 out of 148 ships and no law requires it.

Conversions authorized and funded but not yet completed represents 34 ships. This represents $538 million. Eighteen of these conversions will be converted in private shipyards and 16 in naval shipyards.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like to me, if anyone has a real advantage, it is the private yards. I do not know what else they could want.

I just wanted to call this to the gentleman's attention because private enterprise is getting just about everything we have.

Now, there are 81 ships being built today, representing $4.8 billion. Sixty-six

go to private shipyards and only 15 to the naval shipyards. There is a law requiring this, a law requiring one for one. Yet we have agreed not to follow the Vinson-Trammell Act. There are 18 conversions, and 10 of these are in private yards. Only eight are in the naval shipyards.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what else one could want.

I know the gentleman from Mississippi would like to have those figures and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COLMER. I, of course, am not surprised at the fact that the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, differs with me on this matter. I am sure that he will probably address himself further to the subject later on. I just wanted to say my little piece.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield further to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me hasten to say this, Mr. Speaker: We are going to continue to insist upon the retention of these great private yards. We need them, and by all means we plan to do it. There is not any intention to get rid of these great private yards. We have got to have them and we are going to keep them. However, we cannot abolish our naval shipyards in the process.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure that the gentleman from South Carolina is sincere, as usual, in his statement and I am sure that he recognizes the necessity for keeping these yards, just as I recognized a moment ago the necessity for maintaining the Navy yards. But we are talking about two different things. I was speaking about the allocation formula for repairs.

The gentleman is speaking about new construction. Why do the gentleman from South Carolina and I agree upon the necessity for the majority of this work, and the great majority of this work, being done by private enterprise? Because someone down the line has got to furnish the taxes, the money, to pay for these ships, and if we build them all in Navy yards we would not have the revenue to keep the wheels grinding. That is the principal point I am interested in.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, with the world situation as it is, we are forced to spend more money than some of us would like to see spent. But wherever possible the money should be expended via the private enterprise system.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mississippi explained, this rule makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7657. It provides 4 hours of general debate, after which the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule.

It is a measure that will authorize the expenditure of some $15,303,400,000 for the procurement of planes, ships, aircraft, naval vessels, and various equipment that our Armed Forces need, in addition to research and development funds.

The measure is divided into two main parts; first, the authorization and appropriation for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, in the total amount of $8,858 million; second, that portion of the bill which deals with appropriations for research, development, tests, and evaluation, totaling some $6,444,500,000.

As the gentleman from Mississippi has explained, the bill has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services of the House under the leadership of its new chairman, a man well trained under the tutelage of our former colleague, Chairman Vinson of that great committee, who served longer in the House than any other Member.

Following the precept of his predecessor, the gentleman from South Carolina brings in a bill that has the unanimous support of every member of the committee. He has explained it fully, and I am sure can explain to the House, the various contents of the bill, and it is a complicated measure, covering many expenditures in the field of military procurement. There is no opposition to the rule or to the bill.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. For the three administrations that I have been here we have been called upon to make certain commitments and appropriations for the country regarding trouble spots in the world.

I recall one of the first votes I was asked to cast was during the Eisenhower administration when the Formosan Strait situation was facing the Congress and facing the United States. The President, then President Eisenhower, called on the Congress to pass a resolution endorsing his actions.

Again in the Kennedy administration we had the occasion to act quickly and responsibly in the Cuban crisis.

Then again today we were called upon by the Johnson administration to act responsibly in the Vietnam and the Dominican Republic situations.

We were called upon today to appropriate $700 million. Now we are being called upon to appropriate a large, vast sum of money for the defense posture of our country. I subscribe to the reasons and the theories of those who supported the resolution that we just passed for the $700 million and certainly I support the resolution. But on the other side of this which involves our fully and responsibly meeting this situation, I happen to serve on the committee that has the responsibility of levying taxes for the purpose of getting the moneys that we spend for these necessary expenditures, and I want to point out to my colleagues that we must act just as firmly and responsibly here.

The President of the United States in his budget message to the Congress stated that he was going to call on the Congress to make a reduction in the excise taxes of $1,750 million. Since that time, practically every industry and every individual who might possibly be affected by such action has written to or called upon the various Members of the Congress—such industries as automobile, telephone, women's apparel, handbags, cosmetics, and practically every other one that you can think of—pointing out the justification from their point of view for reducing or repealing the excise taxes on their particular product or commodity.

I am satisfied if we should follow completely the urgings of all of the advocates of reducing or repealing these excise taxes we would be facing a revenue loss of upward to $15 billion.

Like any citizen in this country, the Government has only two sources of income on which to exist. First is income revenues from our various taxes, and second is credit—borrowed money—which becomes a part of our public debt. This is exactly how most of us as individuals meet our financial obligations.

In my opinion, our action today calls for a realistic appraisal of fiscal responsibility. In any case, anyone can conclude that in January none of us—including the President—anticipated having to appropriate the $700 million which the President yesterday requested. As the old experienced Congressman advised the young Congressman, the popular thing to do is to vote against all taxes and vote for all appropriations. This obviously would be a happy situation for all of us if it were at the same time a fiscally responsible position for us to take. But unfortunately, all too often the facts of life are such that realism and responsibility call upon us to do what in the short run may appear to be the unpopular thing.

The situation facing us today is simply a repeat of the situation facing the Congress in 1950, although it does differ in the matter of degree. In 1950, the Committee on Ways and Means reported a bill, the Revenue Act of 1950, which would have reduced excise taxes just over a billion dollars. After that bill passed the House and before it was considered in the Senate, the Korean war developed and the House-passed bill was changed from a tax reduction bill to a tax increase bill. The opening statement in the report of the Senate Finance Committee read as follows:

> Military action in Korea coupled with substantial increases in defense and related expenditures has made it necessary to convert the excise tax reduction bill passed by the House in June of this year into a bill to raise revenues.

The Congress then, just as I am sure it will now, took a responsible and realistic position. I think we are only fooling ourselves and certainly we are fooling the American people if we unqualifiedly, in the situation as it exists at the present time, indicate to them that we can reduce excise taxes but appropriate additional moneys for our military effort at one and the same time. Certainly I would be as happy as anyone if such were the situation. But we cannot have it both ways. I do not at the moment know just what the President's attitude

now may be as to his budget recommendation on excise tax cuts.

We all would hope that the situation in the world was such that we could considerably reduce our military expenditures overall. But none of us, I am certain, would agree that in the foreseeable future this will be possible. As a matter of fact we might soon be called upon to appropriate more.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the income tax reduction bill in the last Congress because I believed as firmly as anyone that it was the responsible thing to do. I believe that the facts since that time have borne out the wisdom of the Congress in providing that tax reduction. We did it, in my opinion, in a fiscally responsible manner. Today all I am saying is that we must approach the President's recommendations and our action on excise tax reductions and repeals in the same fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. Speaker, as every Member knows and as has been reported in the press, the pressures on the Congress and particularly on members of our committee have been about as strong for excise tax repeals in all categories as anyone could imagine. As a matter of fact, the pressures have got so strong that Secretary of the Treasury Fowler has seen fit to publicly urge that the cuts in excise taxes be kept to a reasonable and acceptable size.

None of us, certainly, are critical of the interested industries making every effort to get their tax repealed. This is understandable. It is the right of petition to the Congress, and it is no more than we expect. But here again I think that the industry representatives themselves must realize that we cannot repeal all excise taxes. It is interesting to note that certain groups collectively over the years have complained that we get too low a percentage of total revenues from excise taxes, but individually these very same industries are in here urging us, as you would expect, that whoever else's excise tax we may repeal, we at least should repeal their own.

This really puts it up to our committee, in particular, and to the Congress to keep in mind our overall situation. If the Congress is not fiscally responsible, certainly the affairs of our Government are going to suffer. We must have the revenues for responsible financing of reasonable Government expenditures, including our military efforts. We cannot take the easy way out without suffering the consequences. We all know this.

We do not know how much more we are going to be called upon to do in order to repel communism and of course I certainly agree that we should repel communism wherever we are confronted with it. My point is that I think the President of the United States and the Members of the Congress could well take another look at the excise tax reduction proposals and to see if again, as we did in 1950, we now face an entirely different fiscal situation than we did a few months ago. We might determine that instead of reducing certain excise taxes we should extend them. Certainly we should act responsibly and in a manner that will not jeopardize the present budget and will not jeopardize the present and future defense of our country.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I wonder, relative to the extending of these excise taxes, if the gentleman might consider favorably the restriction, or at least not the addition, of some of the proposed spending programs on items that might not seem quite as urgent as defending ourselves against encroachments of communism around the world?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes, I certainly think we should take into consideration both of those things and perhaps in this conflict that we are confronted with in communism we will have to do something about both.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentleman.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. 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. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7657, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI 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 South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 2 hours. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The House has before it today the largest single authorization bill which is presented to the House each year. I refer to the bill authorizing the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and research and development for the Department of Defense.

In order that the House may have a full understanding of this bill, it is necessary that I recite some facts and figures which are somewhat dry and prosaic. This is one of the necessary duties of a chairman. These facts must be made known to the House in order that the Members can have an understanding of the magnitude and importance of the bill and also in order to make proper judgments with respect to it.

In my remarks I will refer frequently to the committee report which is rather voluminous but which is clearly indexed on its last page. The report describes every weapons system which is proposed for procurement by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Research and development is gone into in considerable detail and all in all, I feel that a reading of the report will be a rewarding experience.

In the first place, the bill totals $15,303,400,000 which is $6,200,000 more than as submitted to the committee.

The $15.3 billion total is divided into $8,858,900,000 for procurement and $6,444,500,000 for research and development.

The procurement portion of the bill is $120,500,000 more than as submitted to the committee and the research and development portion of the bill is $114,300,000 less than as submitted to the committee.

Of considerable importance, I think, is the fact that the bill which you have before you is $1.67 billion less than last year.

To explain this dramatic drop in the size of the bill in the period of only 1 year, and to place last year's program and this year's program in some perspective, I will draw the Committee's attention to these facts:

The Army request this year was almost $100 million less in aircraft;

The Navy's missile request was almost $300 million less than last year;

The request for naval vessels this year was about $465 million less;

The Air Force contributes the largest part of the difference from last year in that the request for aircraft was $100 million less and the missile request was almost a billion less.

I think this very large—almost $1 billion—decrease in the Air Force's missile request should be explained in some detail.

For one thing, the planned Minuteman force was reduced from a total of 1,200 to 1,000 operational missiles. Second, the Bullpup–A missiles used for training are this year being bought in a very much less expensive version with what are called inert center sections. Also, the Air Force is buying no Sparrow III–B missiles this year and using excess Navy missiles instead. Last, certain modifications for the Minuteman II program were reduced considerably because of a rescheduling of certain modifications that are planned for these ICBM's.

So, this bill is, then, $1.67 billion less than that of last year.

I would now like to describe generally what this bill will do. But before doing that I will point out that the bill is essentially the same as it has been in previous years. There is really little that is new

or startling about it. The particular designation of an aircraft to be procured, for example, will be perhaps different but it is stilll an aircraft. So, as I say, you will hear, at least to a very great extent, much the same information as you have heard before, at least so far as procurement and research and development are concerned.

PROCUREMENT—ARMY

First, I will speak of the Army. The Army program is the smallest of the three military programs; it totals $2,004,600,000. Of this, $344,500,000 is for aircraft; $253,700,000 is for missiles; and $1,406,400,000 for research and development.

The bill will permit the Army to procure 1,118 aircraft and 32,218 missiles. In the whole Army procurement program, there is only one item which could be considered new and that is the Chaparral missile.

This Chaparral missile will be a new term to most Members of the House. Actually the Chaparral is nothing more than a cluster of Sidewinder missiles. Today the Sidewinder is, of course, used by one airplane against another. The Army will use it as a ground-to-air missile to knock down airplanes in the battlefield area.

Although not new, I think I should mention that the first quantity buy of the light observation helicopter and the Shillelagh antitank missile are requested in the bill this year. Both of these items were procured in relatively small numbers last year for the first time.

All of the other aircraft and missiles for the Army have been procured before and are familiar to the House. A list of them appears on page 17 of the report and descriptive material relating to each of them follows that listing.

PROCUREMENT—NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Navy and Marine Corps program is the second largest of the three military services and totals $5,383,600,000. Of this amount, $1,915,800,000 is for aircraft; $377 million is for missiles; $1,651,600,000 for naval vessels; and $1,439,200,000 for research and development.

The bill will permit the procurement of 659 aircraft and 4,463 missiles.

There are 62 new ships and 12 conversions in the bill. Of the 62 new ships, 46 are combatant ships and 10 of the conversions are combatant types.

The Navy program, like that of the Army, is substantally the same as in previous years. But it, too, has a few new items of procurement and I will describe these to the House.

First, there is the F–111B aircraft. This year's program will initiate the procurement of the Navy version of this new long-range, high-performance, supersonic fighter aircraft which has been developed to counter the potential enemy threat in the 1970's. You will recall that this aircraft was once called the TFX and has wings which extend and retract—or what the technicians call "variable geometry wings." The Air Force, of course, has its version of this same airplane.

In the missile area, there is also one new item and that is what is called the Standard missile. This missile is the follow-on to the Tartar and Terrier missiles which are aboard our ships today. It comes in two versions—the MR, or medium range, and the ER, or extended range.

As to ships, you will see in the program this year for the first time two ships which have not appeared in the Navy program before.

The first of these is the FDL or the fast deployment logistic ship. There are four of them in this year's program. These ships will operate as deployed units in a forward area. Loaded aboard them will be military vehicles and cargo ready to be moved from the particular oversea area to another area at a moment's notice. The wisdom of having a capability of this kind is obvious, but is made even more obvious by today's situation in southeast Asia.

Also for the first time the program contains a ship designated as the PGH. This is a gunboat, but a gunboat with a difference. It operates on hydrofoils. This means that these gunboats can operate at high speed in special warfare operations. All previous Navy hydrofoil craft have been experimental in nature. These can travel faster than a PT boat and are particularly valuable in rough seas.

I now come to the one procurement addition made by the committee in the bill; this is a DLGN, or nuclear-powered guided missile frigate.

This ship was added by the committee and is the only item added in procurement. The ship will cost approximately $150 million. It would be the third of its class. As you know, the *Bainbridge* is deployed with the fleet today; and the *Truxtun* is under construction now at the New York Shipbuilding Corp. in Camden, N.J. It will be completed by January 1966.

There is a very extended discussion of this ship on pages 7 through 10 of the committee report.

I will say with respect to it that the Navy requested this ship but the request was turned down by the Secretary of Defense. The ship would constitute an extremely important addition to our capabilities and its justification could very well rest on that single fact alone. However, as the committee report indicates—on pages 7 to 10—it is important from an entirely different standpoint, also.

The committee feels that the Department of Defense has been extremely dilatory in pushing nuclear power for surface ships. It is true that we do have three nuclear-powered surface ships today but this is quite literally a drop in the bucket when viewed in the light of the ships which are still conventionally powered.

The addition by the committee of this guided missile frigate will at the one time express the will of Congress that greater and more rapid progress be made in the field of nuclear-powered surface ships and help to break the logjam of disinterest—if that is what it can be called—in the Pentagon with respect to nuclear power.

This is just one manifestation of the intention of the Armed Services Committee to place itself in the forefront of military determinations in direct accordance with the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], will deal in greater detail with respect to nuclear power for surface ships and I believe also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] will also deal with this subject. Again, referring to the report you will see an extended discussion of this very important matter beginning on page 40.

And I draw your attention to the subheading of this statement on nuclear power which is a remark made by John Paul Jones to Robert Morris in 1776. John Paul Jones said, and I quote:

Without a respectable Navy—Alas, America.

How true, how very true this is.

To my mind, and I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman, and all Members of the House, will agree with me, Congress has been shunted aside by the Pentagon over the past several years in determining our defensive and offensive military structure.

We have been invited to sit at the table but we have not been invited to join in the meal, so to speak. This time is over. We are going to carve the roast ourselves from now on.

The rest of the ships in the Navy are much the same as in previous years.

I will point out that a listing and description of all of the naval aircraft, missiles, and ships begins on page 20 of the report.

PROCUREMENT—AIR FORCE

The Air Force program is the largest of the three services and totals $7,420,200,000. Of this amount, $3,545,200,000 is for aircraft; $771,100,000 is for missiles; and $3,103,900,000 is for research and development.

The bill will permit the procurement of 517 aircraft and 1,509 missiles.

The Air Force has only one really new item in its program and that is the SR–71. There has been considerable confusion with respect to the designation of this airplane but much of this can be removed if one keeps in mind that this is a version of the A–11 which the President unveiled February 29, 1964.

It flies three times the speed of sound, or over 2,000 miles an hour, and represents a major advance in reconnaissance aircraft. It had its first flight in December 1964 and met all objectives during that flight.

Again, the remainder of the Air Force program is more of the same as in previous years and a listing and description of each of the Air Force missiles and aircraft will be found beginning on page 28 of the report.

Incidentally, I want to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, to the latter part of the report under the heading "Areas and Items of Special Interest" which begins on page 40. There is a wealth of important background information on a variety of subjects such as nuclear power for surface warships—an interesting discussion of the very large C–5A aircraft which will be the largest aircraft in the world when built—the SR–71 which I just mentioned—the new Poseidon

missile for the Polaris—and a number of other matters. I recommend this part of the report to you as a help toward a broader understanding of our military situation today.

Now, I would like to discuss a problem which is not directly related to the bill you have before you but which is of such collateral importance as to make this bill pointless unless it is solved in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, it is my deeply felt belief that the procurement of sophisticated weapons systems is in a very real sense an exercise in futility if we cannot at the same time insure the retention in the services of men of sufficient skill to use the systems. Dedication is not enough.

We all know that the military world is no longer symbolized by the saber or the Gatling gun. I sat in committee and listened to testimony this year—and as I have for many years now—that described in detail weapons of the greatest sophistication and complexity that man could imagine. And I am not talking about some exotic weapons of the future. I am talking about items which are in the hands of our military people today. I am speaking of radars, all kinds of electronic devices, airplanes that travel three times the speed of sound, missiles with intricate guidance systems which can hit a target 6,000 miles away.

If we cannot retain the highly intelligent and carefully and expensively trained people to operate these weapons systems, we might as well give up any thought of buying or developing advanced weapons systems.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly about this. Our military people today are second-class citizens so far as pay is concerned. I do not for 1 minute blame these young men for leaving the service to take fine jobs in private industry. And I do not blame young men for not coming into the service when they can do so much better on the outside. This is a problem that we have got to solve. It is the most important single problem in our military structure today.

Let me quote what the Secretary of the Navy said during our hearings in response to a question as to whether he would accept a reduction in hardware in order to get an increase in pay. Mr. Nitze responded as follows, and I quote:

> If that increase in pay would be the difference between meeting our retention rate, or our retention objectives, and if this were the key and the correctly designed key, certainly I would be prepared to accept a reduction in hardware in order to meet that problem which I consider to be the outstanding problem.

I will not say any more about the personnel problem at this time. But I have a strong feeling that you may well have me before your committee on another occasion during this session with just that very problem on my mind.

That is the procurement picture.

Now, I would like to go to research and development and tell you what this bill contains in that area.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For research, development, test, and evaluation the bill includes $6,444,500,000. This is a reduction of $114.3 million from the amount requested by the Department of Defense. However, the sum is $81 million more than was authorized by the Congress last year and is $121 million more than was appropriated last year.

ARMY

The Army's portion is $1,406,400,000, which is $31.6 million less than the amount requested but is $61 million above the amount authorized last year.

Almost 30 percent of the Army's R.D.T. & E. budget will be spent on the development of the ballistic missile defense system known as Nike X. This system includes the Nike-Zeus missile and a newer high acceleration missile known as Sprint, which recently had a very successful test flight at White Sands.

Other missiles still in the development stage are the Lance, a division support missile to replace the Honest John and possibly Little John and an extended range Pershing, which will fill the gap between our short-range missiles and the ICBM's.

A new program in this year's Army budget is the advanced aerial fire support system—AAFSS—which is a completely integrated armed helicoperlike system to replace the present improvised armed helicopters, such as the HU–1B—Iroquois—now being used in Vietnam. This new vehicle would have advanced fire control and avionics systems and would be designed to use such weapons as a new high-rate-of-fire machinegun and the Tow and Shillelagh antitank missiles.

Another major program is the joint development effort with the Federal Republic of Germany for a new improved main battle tank for introduction into the forces in the early 1970's. This tank will be lighter and more maneuverable in cross-country operations than the current M–60 and will also have a lower profile, greater firepower and a much higher first-round "kill" capability. The development cost for this tank will be divided equally between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany.

NAVY

The bill includes $1,439,200,000 for the Navy's research and development programs. This is $33.4 milion less than the amount requested and is $61 million greater than the amount authorized last year.

The largest Navy program is in antisubmarine warfare, which claims over 26 percent of the Navy R.D.T. & E. budget and reflects an increase of $73 million over last year. The bulk of this increase will go toward improving the sonar capability to detect submarines.

Another major increase in funds is for the Mark 48 torpedo, which is being developed on a high priority basis to provide a torpedo capable of destroying very deep and fast enemy submarines. This weapon may be launched either by submarines or surface ships.

Another major development program is the new reactor propulsion system for nuclear ships. Two of these reactors would provide the propulsion system for a new aircraft carrier that will be in the bill for fiscal year 1967.

Another program of great interest is the deep-submergence program to locate and rescue submerged submarines in distress. The need for such a system was highlighted by the loss of the *Thresher* off the coast of New England.

In the missile area are two new ones, the Condor, an air-to-surface missile, and the Poseidon, a surface-to-surface missile. I am sure that you are familiar with this latter missile which has received a great deal of publicity. Its total payload, weight and volume will be twice that of the Polaris A–3 at the same range. In addition, the new missile will incorporate improved accuracy.

AIR FORCE

The bill includes $3,103,900,000 for Air Force research and development programs. This is $43.9 million less than the amount requested and is $8 million below the amount appropriated last year.

Two new projects are included in this year's budget, the C–5A, a heavy logistics airplane, and the short-range attack missile—SRAM.

The Sram will complement the Hound Dog missile presently carried on the B–52 and will also become a weapons system for the F–111 tactical fighter and the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA—when it is developed.

The currently planned C–5A will be the largest airplane in the world. Its size and capability is dramatically illustrated by the fact that if it had been in use in the Berlin airlift, only five C–5A's would have been needed to do the job that was provided by 142 C–54's. The C–5A concept is backed up by more studies and engineering verification work than any past Air Force aircraft. Even though it will be the largest aircraft ever built, technology is well in hand.

As you recall, Mr. Chairman, last year the Congress added $47 million above the amount requested for the follow-on bomber to the B–52, now known as AMSA. The Department of Defense chose to use only about half of the add-on; however, since the funds were earmarked for that program only, the remaining $24 million is available and will be applied to the program during the coming year. The Department requested an additional $15 million in this bill. Testimony before the committee revealed that the Air Force had requested a substantial amount greater than that, but was denied the funds by the Department of Defense. The commanding general of the Air Force Systems Command told the committee that in his opinion the Air Force "would be prepared to go into a program definition phase this summer" with a go-ahead on a weapons system next year which would lead to an aircraft capability sometime in 1972 or 1973. On the basis of his testimony and our knowledge that the B–52 fleet is accumulating fatigue damage at a greater rate than was previously calculated, it creates a grave major risk to continue reliance upon the B–52 through the early 1970's as the major aeronautical weapons system of a strategic deterrent force. The committee added $7 million to the bill, which would allow the Air Force to initiate the program definition phase during the next

fiscal year rather than wait until the following year.

You will recall that Secretary McNamara announced in December 1963 the initiation of a military space program known as the manned orbiting laboratory—MOL. It had the primary objective of determining man's capability to perform useful operations in space. This program has been very slow in getting off the ground during the last calendar year. However, it now appears to be making some progress and the bill includes the requested $150 million for the coming year. The committee strongly supports this program and its objectives and has urged the Department to proceed more vigorously. To make sure the funds authorized are not transferred out of this high priority program, the bill has specifically earmarked the funds for that program.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

The bill includes $495 million for the Defense agencies, which is $5.4 million below the amount requested by the Department.

Included under Defense agencies is the work of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, in ballistic missile defense—Defender—nuclear test detection—Vela—and remote area conflict—Agile. Also included is the funding of research for the Defense Communications Agency, the Defense Supply Agency, and the Defense Intelligence Agency.

The committee reduced this portion of the bill because of the transfer of several projects to the Army which are now funded by the Army.

TITLE III

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly about the nonmonetary part of this bill.

This is the first time that you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, have seen any change in the basic 412 procurement and research and development law other than internal changes as 412 was modified to add Research and Development, for example.

This year, we are using this bill—and in my opinion, quite appropriately—as a vehicle to take some actions which have been sorely needed for many years. I am now referring to title III of the bill which begins on page 3. You will note that six new sections are contained under this title. I might say at the outset that each of these sections is dealt with in detail in the committee report beginning on page 11, but I do think that I should describe them to you and tell you what they will do.

First, section 301 repeals outstanding Navy ship tonnage balances. Ever since 1934 when the Vinson-Trammell Act was enacted, the Navy has been accumulating tonnage—originally through the Vinson-Trammell Act itself—and in succeeding years by other shipbuilding Acts which granted ship tonnage that was never used. In addition to these sources, every time a ship is stricken from the Naval Register, the tonnage equivalent of that ship went into the tonnage "pot."

For years, now, the Navy has been maintaining a tonnage exceeding 3 million tons. It is almost exactly 3,300,000 tons at this time, I believe. This tonnage is meaningless—partly because it is so large and particularly because since the enactment of section 412, no ships can be built in any event without the authorization of the Congress. And tonnages today are authorized only in the exact amounts needed as, for example, in the bill you have before you today.

You might say, "Well, what harm is it doing to just let them stay as they are?" The answer is a very simple one. To maintain the records of this tonnage is, surprisingly enough, quite expensive according to the Navy and it certainly is a completely useless expense. So, the committee felt that since the tonnage is meaningless, and the maintenance of bookkeeping on it involves some expense, it was an opportunity to achieve at least a minor economy.

In section 302, you see the reenactment of one of the important portions of the original Vinson-Trammell Act.

It provides that warship construction be alternated, ship by ship, between private shipyards and naval shipyards. You will note that the proviso at the end permits this practice to be avoided if "inconsistent with the public interests in any year."

The reason for the reenactment of this old law is that the repeal of the outstanding tonnages by section 301 had the effect of repealing this law. So its reenactment was necessary.

The committee made one minor change in the old law when reenacting it in that it changed "warships" to "warships and escort vessels." The reason for this is simply that the Vinson-Trammell Act did not have a category called "escort vessels" and these vessels now have become a very important and expensive part of our program each year.

Section 303 is perhaps the most important of the new sections under this title. It deals with what has become known as the 65–35 distribution of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair. As you, Mr. Chairman and other Members of the House know, this has been a matter of controversy for the last few years. I will return to this section in just a moment.

Section 304 does only one thing. It adds "tracked combat vehicles" to the 412 authorization requirement. Today authorization is required for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and for research and development. Combat tracked vehicles—and here I am talking about tanks, armored reconnaissance vehicles, self-propelled howitzers, mortar carriers and many other such vehicles—will, in the same fashion, require authorization for appropriations before they can be procured.

Section 305 relates to an emergency fund generally for research and development.

Each year the Appropriations Committee grants the Secretary of Defense an emergency fund which normally approximates $150 million. This appropriation is based on no specific authorization. The Armed Services Committee thinks there should be authorization for this emergency fund and that is all that section 305 does: require authorization prior to appropriation.

Section 306. Everyone on this committee knows that the Military Air Transport Service is one of the more important arms of our offensive and defensive capability. Of this there can be no doubt. Strategic Air Command depends on MATS—and every other element of the military service in one way or another depends on MATS from time to time.

To call this important military force a service is not only misleading as to its function but a kind of disparagement of the force itself. The committee wants it called the Military Airlift Command, a name with true descriptive quality and a name with dignity.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to return to section 303 of the bill.

As you all know, commencing with the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1963, provisions have been included which require that at least 35 percent of the funds made available for ship repair, alteration, and conversion work be spent in private shipyards. The principal basis for inclusion of these restrictive provisions in appropriation bills has been cost savings. It is true that until now the administration has not objected to the provisions. However, and this must be clearly understood, the former chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the honorable and beloved Carl Vinson, recognized the detrimental effects of these provisions, for he clearly understood that the allocation of repair work is only a part of a larger problem and a larger responsibility; specifically, the proper support of our Navy ships and men, in times of peace and war.

Until now, the administration has not formally objected to these provisions. Although acquiescent, Secretary McNamara, in a letter to Congressman MAHON, stated, and I quote:

> The private and public shipyard capacity in this country today is far in excess of the Nation's needs for national defense. We are in the process of determining the amount and location of this excess capacity, and the actions which should be taken to eliminate it.
>
> When this determination is made, I then believe that economy and fleet-readiness considerations should be the basic guidelines for distribution of ship construction, repair, alteration, and conversion rather than a statutory assignment ratio.

As you know, the Secretary of Defense has now taken action to eliminate excess Navy yard capacity.

Section 303 of the fiscal year 1966 authorization bill was drafted to reflect the facts that have been constantly apparent to the Armed Services Committee and which the Department of Defense now acknowledges.

With your forbearance, I intend to recount the most pertinent facts bearing on this many-faceted problem in order to show why the assignment of work should be made on the basis of economic and military consideration, not restrictive and deleterious ratios. In doing this, it should become apparent that actions such as the 65–35 proviso do not solve the problem of proper utilization of this

country's naval and private shipyard facilities.

I will start with some basic facts on the distribution of Navy work to the naval and private shipyards.

First, it was the Navy's policy to assign alteration and repair work to the private yards, even before enactment of the 65–35 proviso. In fact, from 1953 to 1962 nearly 20 percent of the Navy's alteration and repair work was accomplished by private yards. Of course, from 1963 the proviso has been followed with respect to work assigned to private yards.

While the Vinson-Trammell Act calls for the assignment of about 50 percent of the Navy's warship construction to naval shipyards, the Navy has regularly exercised the act's exception clause in order to help maintain the private yards—and we in the Congress—the Armed Services Committee—have permitted this, again in recognition of the needs of the private yards. The result is that from 1963 and 1964 over 80 percent of this work has been placed with private yards.

It is true that in recent years new ship construction cost differentials have been a factor in shipbuilding assignments. Still, who is to say what the cost differentials would be if the naval yards were more fully utilized—possibly in the 120,000- to 130,000-employment range of the mid-1950's as compared to today's level of roughly 80,000.

In summary, the facts are that:

First. The Navy, of its own volition, allocated neary 20 percent of its repair and alteration work to private yards for many years prior to enactment of the 65–35 proviso.

Second. The Navy has allocated increasing amounts of its construction work to private yards, exercising the exception provision of the Vinson-Trammell Act.

Third. The net effect of the 65–35 proviso and the migration of new construction work has resulted in the private yards acquiring more than 68 percent of the total shipbuilding, conversion, repair, and alteration dollars for the 3 years, 1963–65, as compared to about 54 percent for the period 1953–62. In the period June 1962 to July–September 1964, while naval shipyard employment dropped from 98,600 to 83,500, average private shipyard employment increased from 115,600 to 123,800.

In view of these facts, we can honestly state that the Navy shipyards have not been supported at the expense of the private yards. Rather, in my view as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the opposite has been true. This becomes even more apparent on looking at the state of the private shipbuilding and repair industry.

The shipbuilding and ship repair industries in this country have, since 1940, become heavily dependent on Government business. The pressures for Navy work are a direct reflection of the impossible world competitive situation. Merchant ships which are not eligible for building or operating subsidies, such as bulk carriers and tankers, are being bought and repaired out of country and operated under flags of convenience. The hard facts are that there is no relief in sight, for the volume is so low that there is no opportunity to apply the American genius for mass production. Of course, plant improvements made in U.S. shipyards improve the domestic competitive position, but are insignificant in the world market. The foreign shipyards are not standing still and wage differentials make it evident that no change for the better can be anticipated. The rising subsidy rate—from 45 to 55 percent—confirms this conclusion.

Yes, the private yards, which have served this country so valiantly, pose a problem of which we are all aware, and which we must resolve. But does the solution rest in hobbling a military capability in being? I submit that there must be a better answer.

A great deal has been said about the relative cost of naval and private shipyard work and, I am afraid, much of what has been said has been inaccurate or unfounded. There has been confusion between new construction cost differentials as opposed to conversion, alteration and repair differentials; there has been confusion between the studies prepared by two reputable accounting firms, the Ernst & Ernst findings for the Shipbuilders' Council of America and the Arthur Andersen findings developed for the Navy; and there has been some confusion as to the applicability of incremental costs. I will review the Ernst & Ernst and the Arthur Andersen findings first.

It must be recognized that Ernst & Ernst was not called upon to develop painstakingly the relative cost of comparable items of work. Arthur Andersen was paid to make this effort and this explains the substantial difference in the fees paid the two firms. Actually, the Ernst & Ernst starting point was testimony given to the Congress by a former Chief of the Bureau of Ships, which, after the statements were clarified, was to the effect that private yard costs to the Navy for new construction work ranged from 8 to 15 percent below naval shipyard costs.

On the other hand, Arthur Andersen studied the work performed on a job-by-job basis and developed separate cost differentials for new construction, conversion, alteration, and repair work. I emphasize they did not start with a preconceived differential, but actually examined each job in detail. The new construction differentials thus developed, in terms of cost to the Department of Defense, ranged from 10 to 22.7 percent in favor of private yards; the conversion differential was 1.2 percent in favor of private yards; repairs—3.4 percent in favor of private yards and alterations—1.2 percent in favor of naval shipyards. Even these differentials, although painstakingly developed, have their limitations arising from the limited amount of comparable work that could be found for comparison, the differences in the several shipyards accounting systems, and perhaps most importantly the fact that only past history—water over the dam—could be measured. There is no assurance that the cost differentials found will apply in future years.

While the Arthur Andersen and the Ernst & Ernst starting points were different, it is to be noted that the two firms were in general agreement with regard to the handling of costs for items such as contract administration, military pay, depreciation, and taxes. Also, it is very important to note that Ernst & Ernst, as well as Arthur Andersen, referred to the incremental costing principle, a principle recognized by the General Accounting Office.

What are incremental costs? In our context, incremental costs are the net costs of the additional work that can be assigned to a naval shipyard that must remain in operation as a military requirement. Simply stated, we must have both private and naval shipyards. But let there be no doubt as the absolute essentiality of our naval shipyards. They have, of course, fixed operating costs. And these costs must be paid whether we give the yards a small or a reasonable amount of work. But, these fixed costs do not have to be paid more than once and this is why the Department of Defense was able to calculate that a savings of from $10 to $15 million annually would be realized if the amount of conversion, alteration and repair work performed in the naval shipyards were to be increased.

To summarize with regard to costs, there is no question but that the Arthur Andersen cost differential data are the best that are available to us in our deliberations as to the relative cost of work. Also, however, there is no question but that the principle of incremental costs has its place in these deliberations, particularly as we give consideration to the burden the taxpayer is asked to bear.

While economic considerations are certainly important, I believe we can agree that military considerations are paramount. Here, I am talking about the kind of responsive shipyard support a warship needs and the varied kinds of support her men both require and richly deserve.

Private repair yard deficiencies fall in two categories: lack of skilled personnel, equipment, and facilities for accomplishing repairs to complex ships in an efficient and timely manner; and inability to provide the facilities for support of ship's force normally needed while ships are in naval shipyards.

I am sure that you know the operation of the typical private repair yard with its small nucleus work force and its limited facilities. More importantly, do you know of the results obtained? The recent experiences of 113 Pacific fleet auxiliary and amphibious ships demonstrate this lack of industrial capability more clearly than plant statistics. Forty-five percent of the ships repaired in private yards missed their completion dates as compared to 18 percent for the naval shipyards. Similarly, 31 percent of the private yard ships required an additional availability to correct defects as compared to 18 percent for the naval shipyards—and I emphasize—these were relatively simple ships. Certainly, the naval shipyards would have shown up even better if the comparison had included the more complicated warships in

which they specialize. Now let me turn to the men who man these ships—and to their requirements.

When in a private repair yard, how do they get the work space they require; and how do they get the facilities for training, the supply and communications support they need to use their time efficiently; and what about the personal services, medical, dental, berthing and messing? I could go on at length but the answer is the same. In a private yard they get these necessities "the hard way" by enduring myriad inconveniences. We could turn our back to this fact, and the 65–35 proviso has had this effect, but I do not think that we had better. We want to increase—not decrease—the number of reenlistments; decrease—not increase—the costs of training replacements; and increase the proficiency of the men at sea.

In concluding, I must set the record straight for I have strongly emphasized the role of the naval shipyard. It goes without saying that the private yards have a vital role as well, and they should be utilized for some of the work for which they are best suited.

I stress again that it is necessary to weigh all of the facets of the work assignment problem before reaching a decision—and this we have done as a prerequisite to including section 303 in the authorization bill. I am glad to see that the official position of the Department of Defense as stated by the Deputy Secretary of Defense is in agreement with that of the Armed Services Committee.

Adoption of section 303 will insure an efficient operation within the Navy with due recognition to both economic and military considerations. If the Navy is to do its best it must have the authority to manage its work. In this, the Navy must recognize, as it has in the past, that it is in the national interest to direct a portion of its work to private yards in order to help maintain a competitive industrial base. And paramount to all other considerations must be a recognition of the requirements of the ships at sea.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, that is the bill. As I said at the beginning, it varies in no essential respect from any of the previous bills which you have passed upon over the years—at least so far as the procurement and research and developments portions of it are concerned.

It is smaller than last year by $1.6 billion. It has received the closest possible scrutiny during hearings which extended from February 2 through March 22 with other individual hearings to consider elements of the program. Everyone on the committee had his say, including the 13 new members whom we welcome this year.

We examined and reexamined many of the items in the bill. We studied and restudied every element of it and as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I bring this bill to the floor today with what I hope is a pardonable sense of pride.

We have gone over it with a fine tooth comb. It contains no element which at this late date I would change, excepting perhaps to add some items which I think were not given sufficient weight by the Department of Defense.

But I, and the other Members of the committee, have taken a conservative view toward modification of the bill and after numerous conferences with Mr. McNamara, Mr. Vance, Dr. Brown—the head of R. & D.—each of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I think we have arrived at a bill which is sound, well balanced, and wholly deserving of the support of the House.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is that ship going to be built in a private yard or in a Navy shipyard?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If we follow the practice of the past I would estimate that it will be built in a private yard, and we have got a lot of good ones and we are going to keep them.

As the gentleman from Iowa knows—and I am sure the gentleman knows this—the private yards receive over 80 percent of all new construction and they are doing a magnificent job, simply magnificent.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield further to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How is this bill with respect to the budget requests? Aside from the missile frigate, how is this bill with respect to the budget estimate?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We exceed the budget estimate by a net of $6.2 million because of the addition of this ship.

Mr. GROSS. But this follows the budget estimate, with the exception of this $150 million?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Very closely, very closely.

Mr. GROSS. Above or below?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We came below the budget estimate by some $114.3 million in R. & D. We exceeded the budget in procurement by $120.5 million, a net increase, as I said, of $6.2 million.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, announces that he will bring a bill to the House very shortly, perhaps under unanimous consent, to replace seventeen 82-foot Coast Guard cutters.

Am I to understand that the Navy had to draw on the Coast Guard and deplete this type of Navy craft—Coast Guard craft but still a Navy-type craft—and deplete the number of those available for use for other purposes along our coasts, including the watching of Russian fishing trawlers, or alleged fishing trawlers, off the coast of Florida in order to take care of this sampan warfare off the coast of Vietnam?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am not familiar with that, but if that is a fact, I think we should do something about it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the question is—and perhaps the gentleman cannot answer it—the question occurs to me that apparently the Navy was not prepared to fight the kind of a war being waged close to the coast of Vietnam, and throughout southeast Asian countries.

There is no money in this bill for the purpose of replacing those ships, is there?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. There is no money in here to replace anything of any other service.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised that the Navy does not have enough of this type of vessel, in view of the fact that we have been engaged in this conflict in South Vietnam—some say since 1954. I am a little bit surprised that the Navy did not make provision for this type of vessel.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Well, you can be sure the Navy is now taking care of this situation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina a question or two, since the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] brought up the subject of naval shipyards.

I note at page 14 of the gentleman's committee Report No. 271 the following:

> The recommendations of the Shipyards Policy Board resulted in a decision to phase down and close two naval shipyards.

I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, if any inference can be drawn from this sentence that the Committee on Armed Services has approved the closing of these two naval shipyards, to wit, the Brooklyn Navy Yard and the Portsmouth, N.H., Navy Yard?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The answer is "No."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman and have one further question. Is there any money included in this pending authorization bill for the dismantling of the New York Naval Shipyard?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The answer is "No." I would also like to say that the Department of Defense has been extremely dilatory in pushing nuclear-powered surface ships. I am talking about this DLGN which we added. It is true that we have three nuclear-powered surface ships today, but can you imagine only having three nuclear-powered surface ships in a navy of our size, and with nuclear technology what it is today?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, of course if a young man can get as much as $1.40 an hour to learn a job on a job training program,

you are going to have quite a time meeting the competition to get young men to learn electronics in the Navy.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman is absolutely right.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. When we come to July or August of this year when our distinguished Speaker brings this session to a close and we have some time to either go home or take a junket to some foreign country, if this name prevails in the other body—this new designation of MATS—it will be called "Military Airlift Command?" In other words, the people who travel abroad will be calling on MAC for transportation, is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I see your point. We will call on MAC.

Mr. GROSS. If the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee decides to send a delegation to "Ugadugudu" to look over the operations, whatever they may be there, and he asked MATS, or under the new name MAC, to transport the delegation, MAC will transport the delegation?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They had better transport the delegation.

Mr. GROSS. You can be dead sure of that.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes, you can be dead sure of that.

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

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

Mr. MILLER. I think the record will show that there is less private work on the west coast than there has ever been on the east coast, that could be done there.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think the move you refer to was ridiculous. I do think the Navy should be given the discretion to move ships on an economic and military basis rather than on the basis of a mandatory law which says they have to move ships to meet some imposed ratio. It is not realistic, it is expensive, and I hope the gentleman will join us in getting section 303 enacted into law.

Mr. MILLER. May I say for the record the gentleman is not going to join you.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am not surprised. It is the first time the gentleman has been wrong. But I am for him just the same. We are going to get along as we always have. We all make mistakes, and I do not mean to be facetious with the gentleman. But, really, this restriction is not needed, and we are going to insist that these important Navy Yards be used and kept open. And we are going to insist that the private yards get their share of work, but on a sound basis.

Mr. MILLER. How can the gentleman give us any assurance? We have heard this, you and I have heard this for years, they are going to take care of them, but they do not take care of them. The work goes back to the Navy Yards, and the others get the crumbs until you need the others.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have figures to substantiate my position.

Mr. MILLER. Unfortunately I have not any figures right here with me on the floor.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have figures from the Navy, and I will be glad to give them to the gentleman. I will put them in the record. I will be glad to give them to the gentleman under the 5-minute rule.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOWNING. I would compliment the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of this great committee, and the membership of the committee on their excellent report and on the very thorough analysis given by the chairman. I note that the report referred to the committee's views on nuclear power, which I was pleased to read; and also on the need for attack aircraft carriers. I have two questions. The first is: Did the committee consider the construction of a new aircraft carrier for this fiscal year?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Very, very fully. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will go into that more fully. But we considered and found it would not be wise to change what has already been done with regard to the *Kennedy*. But next year we have every confidence a new attack carrier will be forthcoming, and we have the propulsion plant—the nuclear power capable for it—and we feel confident that it will be coming next year.

Mr. DOWNING. Referring to section 302 with reference to the reestablishment of the Vinson-Trammell Act, does that still contain the proviso permitting avoidance of the alternate ship requirement if the President deems it in the best interests of the United States?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes, it does. And it should. The President should have the authority to vary the alternate ship provision.

Mr. DOWNING. I thank the gentleman and congratulate him in that connection.

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

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7657. I wish to commend the distinguished chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee for the excellent work they have done in reporting out this bill. I am especially pleased at the bold and most sensible action the committee has taken in section 303 to eliminate the so-called 65-35 formula applied in the assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects to naval or private shipyards.

The 65-35 formula has constituted an unreasonable restriction upon the freedom of action of the Navy in executing its ship conversion, alteration, and repair program, and both the Navy and the Department of Defense have indicated their opposition to the restrictive formula.

It is an accepted fact that the repair and maintenance, as well as the building, of naval ships and crafts demand the work of specialists to a greater extent than the repair, maintenance, or building of commercial ships. Weaponry, for example, poses a problem for the real specialist. Obsolescence also is a constant problem with the Navy. Furthermore, much of the plans and specifications for such work are classified and security can be better maintained in a naval shipyard of security-cleared workers than in a private shipyard.

It cannot be disputed that the Navy is an emergency arm which exists principally to meet exigencies which arise out of armed conflicts, limited or otherwise, and to deter other nations from hostile acts. To serve its purpose the Navy's ships must be maintained in such operable condition that they may be dispatched to any part of the world without delay. This has been done in the past by work forces in naval shipyards throughout the country. Pearl Harbor, in my own State of Hawaii, is one such shipyard.

Pearl Harbor is the westernmost shipyard maintained by our Navy for the repair and maintenance of its ships which sail the Pacific and help to deter hostilities in and around Asia. Pearl Harbor's strategic location has served to great advantage and will continue to do so. There is no other shipyard, private or Government owned, within 2,000 miles of it.

It is highly essential, therefore, that we continue to maintain Pearl Harbor at a high level of operation to enable the Navy to meet any emergency.

The existence of the 65–35 formula constitutes a continuous threat to our Nation's Government-operated shipyards, including Pearl Harbor. It has been estimated that its application has already resulted directly or indirectly in the reduction of about 14,000 employees in Government-operated shipyards. The application of the 65–35 formula to Pearl Harbor will prove especially disastrous, for it will surely mean the reduction of its work force. Because there are no large shipyards other than that at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii, skilled workers when discharged leave Hawaii for the mainland United States or go into other fields of employment and become unavailable for rehiring at Pearl Harbor. This could certainly develop into a costly situation in an emergency, as it did on December 7, 1941, and the months that followed.

Speed is of the greatest essence in naval repair work. It is only by keeping a skilled work force readily available that we can be assured of this required speed in an emergency. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that by increasing speed in our repair work we have been able to increase our operational strength without increasing our total number of ships. The Army and Air Force too have found this to be true and are engaged in a program of increasing the number of equipment in actual use, without any additional purchases, by merely reducing the time during which such equipment is tied up in repairs.

Highly trained and experienced work crews at Pearl Harbor have repeatedly demonstrated that they can repair naval vessels at greater speed and more efficiently than any private shipyard. The same has been true at other naval shipyards. This greater speed in repairs has resulted in reduced costs to the Government by reduction in the need for total equipment purchases.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Ships has shown by an analysis of the Andersen report that ships repaired and overhauled by naval shipyards can operate for a period of 21.3 months before having to be repaired and overhauled again, as compared to 20.1 months for ships repaired and overhauled in private shipyards. On an overall basis, this would mean that the cost factor would be about 5 percent less when the work is done in naval shipyards, for their services extend over a longer period. This is a point which needs to be borne in mind, for the biggest argument of the proponents of the 65–35 formula is that it costs less to have the work done in private shipyards.

In this connection, it is worthy of note that the Bureau of Ships by its analysis of the Andersen report has cast some doubt on whether the Federal Government actually saves money by giving work to private shipyards. Specifications given for private yard work differ from those given to naval shipyards. For one thing, while the former are merely required to produce a minimum acceptable level of work, the latter is required to "restore to new condition." This perhaps accounts for better quality of work done in the naval shipyards and the longer period of operability mentioned earlier.

A Shipyards Policy Board established last year to study naval requirements for shipyard capacity, found that:

First. Cost studies show that there is no economy in contracting out conversion, alteration, and repair work to private yards. In fact, annual savings can be achieved under present cost differentials by increasing the amount of conversion, alteration, and repair work assigned to naval shipyards. If all factors involved in these assignments were to permit an increase from the current statutory level of 65 percent to a somewhat higher level, it is estimated that an annual saving of several million dollars could be achieved. This results from the fact that the naval shipyards, which must be maintained for strategic and operational reasons, have a high, fixed overhead cost which continues regardless of workload assigned.

Second. The naval shipyard complex has been developed and equipped to provide complete facilities and services for the overhaul and repair of all naval vessels, and has capabilities for maintaining complex ordnance and electronic equipment. These capabilities are found in very few of the private shipyards and these yards concentrate on new construction rather than overhaul and repair.

Third. Private shipyards are generally less acceptable to fleet customers and place an additional burden upon ships' crews of duties not required of them in naval shipyards, thus reducing time available for training and ship maintenance.

The Soviet Union is placing more and more emphasis on the development of its naval strength and upon the importance of a maritime strategy. Under such circumstances, it is folly for us to take any action which would lessen the effectiveness of our naval forces. The continuation of the 65–35 formula is definitely of questionable value in its strongest factor of economy and it ought to be discontinued on the basis of the overriding consideration of defense. The termination of the 65–35 formula will return to the Navy a flexibility tending toward improving its operational condition in maintaining our national defense. The rigid 65–35 formula should be terminated, and the proposal of the committee certainly deserves the support of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 7657.

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

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the Chairman will allow me, I would like to express my deep commendation and appreciation for the work you have done on this bill, not only in its entirety but particularly in the field of interest which is so dear to my own heart, the field of atomic propulsion for nuclear weapons. I have read the report very carefully and I subscribe to every principle involved in this report.

I know I do not need to add my words to those of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], who are also members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but I do wish to say I am glad the chairman is enunciating this policy in the report.

I feel it is a real loss to the Nation that this great aircraft carrier, the *Kennedy*, was too far along for us to change the plan and put in nuclear propulsion.

The gentleman is aware, of course, of the report which we put out after an intensive study in which we completely refuted the dollar figures of the Defense Department in their analysis of the extra cost of the equipment on the *Kennedy* carrier, as between nuclear propulsion and conventional propulsion.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am quite aware of that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And the strong stand which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy took unanimously that the *Kennedy* should have been a nuclear carrier.

We know now that that probably cannot be changed at this time, but the hope which you extend for the next aircraft carrier is certainly pleasing to me. I believe it is a wise choice. I do not say that from the standpoint of my own personal interest in the matter; I make the observation from the standpoint of many hours and days of studying this problem. I appreciate the action which the committee has taken.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman. I know of the gentleman's dedication and I know what he has done in this area. Of course, we all realize nothing can be done now.

I understand from a reliable source, with which the gentleman is much more familiar than I, that we can look forward to smaller and more compact nuclear units.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have that assurance on the word of no other than Admiral Rickover, who knows more about this subject than any other man in the world.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I might say that he has the backing of the Joint Committee on his responsibility for making the nuclear submarine fleet today the most invulnerable launching base in the world.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. There is no question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has consumed 60 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is the first major bill to come from the Committee on Armed Services since our distinguished colleague and my dear and valued friend has been its chairman. It is a real tribute to the Committee on Armed Services, under the able and courageous leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of that great committee. It augurs well for the people of our country and for the people of all other nations of the world to know that we have a continuation in the chairmanship of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of outstanding and courageous leadership. We know that the committee approaches these important questions of our defense from a bipartisan and unified standpoint.

I wish to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] for the outstanding job which he and his committee has done on this bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank my Speaker very much. I should like to say that we have had the advantage of the training of the greatest teacher on earth, the Honorable Carl Vinson, but, more than that, we have had the sympathy and understanding and help of the greatest Speaker ever to preside over this House; added to this there has been the dedication of the finest group of men with whom I have ever been associated or with whom I have ever worked.

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

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

Mr. LEGGETT. As 1 of the 13 new members of the Committee on Armed Services, I should like to congratulate

the chairman on his splendid leadership both on the floor and in the committee on this particular bill and on many other matters.

There has been one statement made to the effect that perhaps the Navy Department did not exercise its discretion in favor of private yards as often as it should have. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, is it not a fact that under the Vinson-Trammell Act, since World War II the Department of the Navy has asked for 58 exceptions to this act to build in private yards vis-a-vis public yards? Also, is it not a fact that we have built a total of 148 warships in private yards as opposed to 48 warships in naval shipyards and have spent $11.1 billion in private yards as opposed to $3.7 billion in public yards?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It is not only a fact, but I called it to the attention of the House a while ago. I think we should have the alternate ship authority. We must retain our private yards, but it does not follow that we should destroy our public yards. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the colloquy just engaged in by the chairman of the committee and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], I would like to say that I, too, regret that the new aircraft carrier *John F. Kennedy* is not nuclear propelled. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], has done great work in the field of atomic energy and to a large degree the progress which has been made in the field of atomic energy in this Congress has been through the efforts of the gentleman from California. I know of no man who has devoted more time or effort or who is a more prodigious worker than the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to support the remarks of the distinguished and able Chairman of our Committee on Armed Services in presenting the authorization bill for the fiscal year 1966 appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and research, development, test and evaluation.

In his first year as the chairman of the committee, the knowledgeable gentleman from South Carolina demonstrated the leadership, in providing for the military security of the Nation, which all of us who have known him, admired him, and worked with him over the years, have come to expect.

In this bill, the first major legislation of the Armed Services Committee in this session, the chairman has left his mark for not only thorough and responsible committee consideration but for independent judgment and dedication to the needs of the country.

The committee has a long and proud tradition of conducting itself as a working arm of this great body in legislating for and overseeing the armed services of the United States without injecting any political partisanship which could jeopardize the defense of the Nation. The hearings, the investigations, the briefings, the markups, the reports—and all the other business of this committee—are done with one objective test in mind, what will best satisfy the military needs of our country.

We are not so much members of a political party in the Armed Services Committee, as we are the collective legislative representatives of the people and of this body in providing for the national defense.

As the ranking minority member of your Armed Services Committee, therefore, I have attempted to continue the devotion to duty that my predecessors have exhibited and, of course, without any regard for the fact that I—and we—sit at the left hand of our distinguished chairman. You can expect, as you came to rely upon in the past, that the legislation recommended by this committee will bear the imprint of the two great political parties acting in concert, and not the dominance of either. The 1966 defense procurement and research and development bill before you is no exception. It has my support and the support of all of my distinguished colleagues who sit to my own left in committee.

The bill, H.R. 7657, is the product of one of the most careful legislative examinations that any bill has ever had. The full Armed Services Committee heard an eminent panel of witnesses for 26 days of actual hearings, beginning on February 2 of this year. Our own individual inquiries and the staff work underlying many of the issues started even earlier.

Many of us received supplementary briefings and detailed studies and reports outside of the regular committee hearings in order to familiarize ourselves better with the facts on which the various military programs are based. Thirty-seven principal witnesses testified before your committee on this bill. Their competence to inform the committee of the recommended roles of the armed services in the world security situation can be illustrated by their titles—the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the three military departments; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chiefs of each of the four military services; and the various chiefs of procurement and of research, development, test, and evaluation of the individual military services and the Department of Defense.

Each of these gentlemen, capable in his own right, was backed up by a host of civilian and military experts who were prepared to testify in explanation of any facet of their vast range of programs.

I am personally satisfied that the committee has been thoroughly painstaking in its scrutiny of the proposals which have been incorporated in this bill.

In addition to taking the testimony of these well qualified witnesses, which amounted to 1,556 pages in the printed public volume of the hearings on your desks, the committee met several additional times to carefully develop its own action. The problem of receiving information of the highest secrecy was met by meeting in executive session which also encouraged the candid disclosure of responsible views by both the members of the committee as well as by the witnesses.

The capable chairman of your Armed Services Committee has explained the purpose and provisions of the bill with clarity and persuasion so that it is needless for me to describe the bill again. It has been as fully considered in committee as time and the legislative process will permit. Certainly it reflects our dedicated effort and honest judgment. The amounts of the funds which the bill would authorize are not mere arbitrary dollar figures, but are the sums which represent the totality of many hundreds of subtotals for program, projects, and actions.

Let me make one point perfectly clear. This is not an economic proposal or simply a fiscal budget, it is an authorization for the development and procurement for all the major hardware—aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels—on which we believe the Defense Department must act in the forthcoming fiscal year. The nature and magnitude of these development and procurement actions are conveniently presented in the committee's report on the bill which I hope that each of you will read in detail.

This is a complicated business and those exposed to our committee for the first time might well wonder if the dialogs there are emanating from a course in mythology, a Berlitz language course, or whether it attests to obvious incoherence. For instance, the topics might well cover the following weapons: AADS–70, Asms, Alfa, antisatellite weapon, ARM–1, Asroc, Astor, Atlas, Able-Star, Agena D, Asset, Amsa or Samos, Satar, Secor, Start, Sergeant, Shillelagh, Shrike, Sidewinder, Sparrow, Sprint, Sram, Subroc, SS–10, SS–11, SS, SS(N), SSB(N), and SR–71—and this represents only two letters out of our 26-letter alphabet. Even those who follow these designations closely have a difficult time maintaining current knowledge of them.

When he appeared before our committee, Secretary of Defense McNamara stated that he was guided by two basic principles: First, development of the military force structure necessary to support our foreign policy without regard to arbitrary budget ceilings, and second, procure and operate this force at the lowest possible cost.

The 2,294 aircraft which are authorized at $5,805,500,000, the over 38,000 missiles which are authorized at $1,401,-800,000, and the 62 new ships and the 12 ships to be converted which are authorized at $1,651,600,000 will, in the judgment of your committee, adequately permit the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force to meet their needs within the criteria enunciated by the Secretary of Defense.

The authorization of $6,444,500,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, the Navy including the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Defense agencies is a precise figure which was arrived at after consideration of the many hundreds of R. & D. projects presented to the committee for approval.

In making our decisions, we not only took into account the expressed necessity for the research and development in order to obtain the weapons systems of tomorrow, but the state of the art of the various technologies encompassed. In other words, we demanded assurances that the goals had a reasonable feasibility of being attained.

I have, over the years, expressed deep concern over our research and development program and particularly with respect to the vast sums which have been invested in projects which were later abandoned. I realize that some of this is unavoidable. Research and development by its very nature does not lend itself to precision. Many a project is undertaken without a really clear idea of what the result will ultimately be. Notwithstanding this fact, I feel that in the past many projects—many weapons systems—have been permitted to continue well beyond the point where good judgment would have dictated their abandonment. I will say no more about this at this time. However, I can assure the House and I can caution the Department of Defense that it is my firm intention to do my utmost to insure that this does not continue in the future.

Since the chairman has fully touched on all aspects of the bill in breadth, I would like to dwell in somewhat greater depth on a few programs which I have selected for their significance. This is not to imply that other parts of the bill which I will not touch upon are of any lesser importance. It is simply that I know that several other members of the committee, in addition to the chairman, will talk about other programs. Among us, you will have received a thorough exposition of what is contained in H.R. 7657.

As you will note, the bill authorizes $253.7 million for the procurement of missiles for the Army. The Army must possess a fighting force in this modern age which can defeat any military threat with which it may be confronted. This is merely axiomatic.

Our Army of today is a quite different force from what it was only a few years ago, and it is so vastly different from the Army of World War II as to be almost unrecognizable. Almost all of the change in our Army has come within the past few years through a vigorous, aggressive program to make it a modern fighting force. If our mind's-eye picture of today's Army is GI Joes of World War II, we could not be more wrong. The Army is a sophisticated, highly trained, mobile force as different from the old Army as the Pershing missile is from the Gatling gun. It is swift, sure of itself, sure of its weapons, and certain in its capability of meeting force with force. Our Army has kept pace with the changing world. However, it is essential to maintain a working use of proven historical methods for situations like Vietnam.

The availability of reliable missile systems in quantities essential for the proper support of both our offensive and defense combat troops, serves a major contribution in providing the firepower required for the successful accomplishment of the Army's mission. As with the other authorizations in this bill, it is the continuing purpose of the committee to see that appropriations authorized for missile procurement will satisfy firepower requirements at the lowest possible cost for our new Army.

Continuing procurement of the Pershing provides the long-range nuclear fire support for the field army. The Redeye, which, incidentally, is also being used by the Marine Corps, furnishes a forward area air defense for our frontline combat troops against low flying aircraft.

We are now ready to introduce the antitank missile Shillelagh. Its employment as an antitank missile on the armored-reconnaissance airborne assault vehicle and on the main battle tank enhances the Army's capability to defeat enemy tanks.

And in this connection, I would like to concur in my chairman's remark in his press release of April 29 in which he referred to Shillelagh as having "a simply fantastic kill capability." He went on to say that, "It is undoubtedly the best antitank weapon in the world today." To the very best of my knowledge, this is so and the Army is to be congratulated for this fine system.

It is interesting to note that this weapon utilizes a single-gun tube which can fire either the Shillelagh or 152-millimeter conventional ammunition. To the best of my knowledge this is the first time that there has been an accomplishment of this kind. Obviously it provides a significant advance in flexibility because gunners can engage various kinds of targets with only one mobile weapon system.

The missile program developed by the Army has considered the production implications which are associated with the introduction of all new items. Procurements are scheduled in such a way that industry can produce at orderly and economical rates. New items have likewise been planned for delivery to permit refinement of production techniques before procurement in major quantities is instituted. It can be said in this instance that the Army and its contractors have used the best business practices in both the development and manufacture of the Shillelagh.

I consider the authorization we are recommending for the procurement of missiles for the Army to be proper in quality and in quantity. Committee support of this item of authorization is in keeping with our steadfast objective of producing a totally modernized military fighting force that is superior to that of any other nation.

And now, let me turn to the Navy.

The expanding perimeter of worldwide naval operations in support of U.S. international interest for peace requires us to maintain, on a long continued basis, oversea deployment of naval strike forces, as a visible military presence in deterrence of limited war. Nuclear-powered forces deployed to trouble spots can supply the military presence without local bases, can be varied at will, and can be maintained for extended periods on a rotational basis. The goals of the Navy should therefore be designed to permit these long continued deployments in remote areas of the world in order to respond to demands for stabilizing military influences wherever needed.

I have had a long and deep interest in nuclear power. I have had the honor of serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as well as the Armed Services Committee. I think I bring to both positions an interest—and I hope a knowledge—which permits a broader view of the potentials of nuclear power because of this.

The Navy has steadfastly recommended a policy of installing nuclear propulsion in all warships for which this technology is feasible. I fear, however, that it has not found wholehearted agreement with its beliefs and recommendations and it is for this reason that the Committee on Armed Services has taken upon itself the task of assisting the Department in furthering its aims.

This goal is important to our Nation, committed as we are to a worldwide strategy which requires a worldwide logistic support network. The increased range and staying power, coupled with the reduced vulnerability provided by nuclear power in our surface warships, adds a new dimension to their versatility and effectiveness in war, and deterrence of war, and contributes to the strength and usefulness of naval forces as instruments of national policy and power.

I think that the advantages of nuclear propulsion in surface warships is not understood by the public and I fear even by many of those who are quite directly responsible for determinations as to the kind of propulsion which our surface ships will have.

I am, therefore, going to list—if you will bear with me—some of the advantages which so substantially increase military effectiveness both offensively and defensively. Forgive me if it sounds like a page from a training manual. These points are important enough to warrant specific recitation in the hope that the very great advantages of nuclear power can become more widely known.

Some of these advantages are:

First. Increased tactical flexibility and freedom for independent action.

Second. Ability to extend attack along a greater perimeter.

Third. Virtually unlimited endurance at high sustained speed.

Fourth. Reduced dependence upon mobile logistic support.

Fifth. Reduced vulnerability to submarine and guided missile attack through freedom from dependence upon replenishment of ship's fuel.

Sixth. Enhanced opportunity to use evasive routes.

Seventh. Improved capability to operate in bad weather or to avoid storms.

Eight. Feasibility of sealing the ship against atomic, biological, and chemical attack by elimination of the air intakes required for boilers. Certainly this, now, is not a consideration which would come to the mind of any but those most intimately connected with both nuclear and military matters. But the wars—if we have them—of the future could make this of almost unimaginable importance,

that is, the ability to seal a ship against fallout and against biological and chemical attack.

Ninth. Reduced concern for loss of fuel oil facilities.

Tenth. Ability, under severe threat to operate from distant bases, completely free of logistic dependence.

Eleventh. Shipboard electric power requirements, new higher power radars, sonars, and missile systems can be accommodated by nuclear reactors without reducing the range of the ship during operations.

Twelfth. Elimination of corrosive effect of stack gases on ship structures, radar antennas, and aircraft. This sounds like the drabbest kind of consideration but the number of dollars saved by the elimination of corrosion on ships, equipment, and aircraft is far from drab, I can assure you.

The difficulty of providing logistic support during war is due in part to the logistic support forces being more vulnerable to attack than our striking forces. One of the greatest threats to any ship in wartime is the fact that it may have to slow down. Conventional ships must slow down frequently to conserve fuel or to refuel. While the task force must eventually replenish, the nuclear powered ship does not have to slow down at any time because of fuel. Therefore the utilization of nuclear power in making our striking forces as inherently self-sufficient as possible can lead to more true military capability and a net saving of money.

The greatest advantages of nuclear propulsion are achieved when nuclear powered escorts accompany the nuclear powered carrier. The all-nuclear task group can steam any distance at high speed, sustain a maximum level of air operations for many days prior to committing forces to combat, and still have enough aviation fuel to employ its load of ammunition without replenishment in the combat area. This is a very simple concept. A nuclear powered ship simply does not have to carry oil for its propulsion; and for every gallon of oil not required to be carried, there is room for a gallon of aviation fuel. It is that simple.

While the greatest increase in effectiveness resulting from nuclear power can be demonstrated for the aircraft carrier, the nuclear powered escort also has impressive advantages. The nuclear screen is never broken by the requirement to fuel. The nuclear escort provides the force commander with greatly enhanced task force flexibility since he can dispatch units for independent action, trade forces, or take full advantage of the unlimited endurance to employ deceptive tactics. Finally, he can make use of the nuclear unit to trail an enemy submarine or surface ship long and far, and as fast as necessary without need to meet a refueling schedule or location.

The nuclear ship passage through the seas, unlike that of a conventionally powered warship, is not a "go-stop" proposition. It is "go" all the way.

Even with conventional escort, the nuclear carrier provides substantial increases in onboard aviation fuel and ammunition with consequent improvements in the ability of a mixed force to conduct sustained strikes without replenishment.

An aircraft carrier can stay in combat until its ordnance, aviation fuel and ship propulsion fuel are expended. The reduction in the requirement for propulsion fuel made possible by nuclear propulsion significantly increases the time a force can stay in combat without logistic support.

The nuclear powerplant being developed for use in an attack carrier will utilize a very high-power ship reactor together with a very long-life nuclear core. Two of these reactors can power an attack carrier, as compared with eight reactors in the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. It is important to note that the new two-reactor plant will be less expensive than the others, particularly with respect to operating costs. Furthermore, a carrier powered with the new cores would require refueling only once in the life of the ship.

There is no alternative to victory in war, regardless of cost; therefore weapons systems investment must be weighed against ever-increasing enemy capabilities. The Navy is convinced of the need for nuclear power in surface combat ships, yet it is not necessary to convert the entire fleet to nuclear powered ships in order to realize significant advantages from nuclear propulsion. In 25 years of operating life the two-reactor carrier plant would cost about $50 million less than a four-reactor plant. Whereas the initial costs, excluding aircraft, for a two-reactor carrier are somewhat higher than for a conventional carrier, the differential reduces to 20 percent after 25 years of operation.

However, the latest cost effectiveness study indicates that if the additional oilers and protection for the oilers are figured into the cost effectiveness analysis, the conventional carrier task force we are building today is more expensive over its lifetime than the task group with a nuclear carrier. This is borne out in a detailed classified analysis submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on January 13, 1965, by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles J. Hitch.

Now, these facts deserve the greatest consideration both from the standpoint of military capability and cost. And keep in mind that they are not extensions of a theoretical situation but hard, provable facts.

The nuclear carrier will have propulsion endurance measured in years of normal operation, as well as the inherent combat advantages in the increased account of aviation fuel and ordnance carried which further reduce logistic support requirements at sea. This is a most desirable enhancement of military power and worth, especially to assaulting naval forces striking for initial gains and a foothold in a new and critical effort. The unparalleled mobility and flexibility of nuclear powered forces were graphically demonstrated in the 30,000 miles "Sea Orbit" cruise around the world of the first nuclear powered task force. The cruise proved conclusively the feasibility of operating nuclear surface ships in all oceans of the world on a self-sustaining basis.

There is, of course, no doubt that today the Navy is preeminent in the field of nuclear propulsion. This, however, by no means establishes that such will continue to be true if we maintain the somewhat casual attitude which I am afraid has been shown toward nuclear power for surface ships on an overall basis. It was with this thought in mind—that is, that we should continue to press forward vigorously in the field of nuclear propulsion—that caused the committee to add to the bill a nuclear powered guided missile frigate. Undoubtedly this ship would have appeared in some future program. But I, for one, am unwilling to wait. I do not believe that we have the time or at least we can not say with certainty that we do have the time. The whole committee, it turned out, felt exactly as I do and there was not a dissenting vote or even, as I recall, a dissenting argument, to the addition of this ship.

And now I would like to turn to section 303 of this bill. The chairman has already mentioned that this bill is a little bit different this year than in the past. It does more than authorize procurement and research and development. It has several additional sections which in one way or another modify existing law.

The most important of these, to my mind, is section 303. The chairman has explained the basis for this section 303 but let me very briefly review it again for those few who may not be familiar with the background of this matter.

Very simply and briefly, the law today says that at least 35 percent of all ship conversion, alteration, and repair must be performed in private shipyards. The Armed Services Committee thinks this is unsound. I will attempt to establish why it is unsound. Others who speak today will deal with other aspects of this law and will try in their own way to explain why we should change the law.

First, what is the total distribution of Navy shipwork and employment between Navy and private yards?

The facts show that in the period from 1954 through 1964, 75.4 percent of the Navy's new construction program, with a total program value of $12.180 billion has been awarded to U.S. private industry. In the past 2 years—1963 and 1964—the private share has averaged over 80 percent. If conversions, alterations, and repairs are added to this 11-year total, the private share of the program during this period exceeds $13.7 billion, or 58.1 percent of the total funds appropriated for this purpose. Even considering only the period before the restriction in assignment of the latter type of work, the private fraction averaged 55.1 percent, over one-half of the total.

Private shipyard employment, with minor exceptions, remained essentially stable during the interval from 1954 through 1962, when the 65–35 proviso was enacted. At the end of this period, it stood at a level of 116,000. Since the 65–35 proviso has been in effect, the level

has increased to 126,000 at the end of December 1964.

In comparison, Navy yard employment showed a steady decline from 130,000 in 1954 to 99,000 at the end of 1962. Since enactment of the 65–35 restriction, Navy yard employment has further dropped. The level on March 1 of this year is 81,000, the lowest point since before World War II, except for 1 pre-Korean year.

Many factors are involved in employment levels. One fact stands out, however; the private yard employment had remained fairly steady before adoption of the 65–35 proviso, while the Navy yard level was declining. The 65–35 clause has accentuated this decline, and placed the Navy support capability in virtually a pre-Korean position at a time when our worldwide Navy commitments are the most pressing since World War II.

Now, the key point is this. Immediately after the cessation in Korean hostilities in 1954, the employment of both segments dropped to about 120,000. Gentlemen, in spite of decreasing merchant marine business since then, private yard employment has remained about the same. The Navy has taken good care of the private industry while its own level has been steadily dropping.

It has done this largely by giving the private yards the type of work they do best—new ship construction and repair of less complex ships. It has given them ship construction because it has been less costly to do so. There is no real cost advantage in conversion, alteration, and repair work.

I can find no valid basis in fact that the private yards are cheaper in the performance of the type of work which has been the subject of an arbitrary restriction for the purpose of aiding the private industry. The Secretary of Defense has reported that, as a result of its shipyard study, it concludes that assignment of more of this type of shipwork to Navy yards is economical. These Navy yards must be maintained for strategic and operational requirements, and with more productive work, their fixed operating costs can be spread over a larger base, resulting in decreased unit costs. This makes good economic sense to me.

So, as to costs, the policy which the Navy has followed in assigning new construction work has resulted in savings to the taxpayer. In fact, the Navy in order to achieve greater savings has deviated—in accord with the law, of course—to the advantage of private yards from the alternate warship provision of the Vinson-Trammell Act, which requires alternate assignment of new construction warships to naval shipyards.

In the past, the Navy has met this problem by the assignment of many less complex types of ship repairs to private yards; and by the assignment of the bulk of its new construction program to private shipbuilders. It has tried to retain in its own yards enough of the type of work needed to insure the maintenance of highly specialized trades, and the improvement of their skills to cope with the maintenance of increasingly complex ships and ship systems. It has endeavored to make economic use of its facilities which must be kept ready for a national emergency. The 65–35 proviso has only made this problem more difficult, and, I submit, has contributed substantially to the lack of shipyard readiness today. It is today very nearly at the lowest point since before World War II.

I am convinced that the Navy yards remaining after the closure actions of the Secretary of Defense last year are vital to our national military posture and must be assigned the necessary work to insure their effective utilization. I am confident that under the surveillance of interested Members of the Congress, the Navy officials will continue to use these yards economically and wisely, with full awareness of the importance of the private portion of the industry to our national interests.

In examining our national defense posture today, one of the most important and immediate questions we face is: "What part should manned military space systems play?" This is not a new question. It has been studied exhaustively since 1958, particularly by the Air Force. These studies indicate that man can live and operate effectively in space. Further, the Air Force believes that his intelligence, judgment, and dexterity will be indispensable in the performance of certain military tasks.

In December 1963, the Air Force began to prepare a plan for the development of just such a vehicle—the manned orbiting laboratory. The objective of the program was defined as the assessment and demonstration of the utility of man in performing military functions in space.

The Air Force, working with some 16 contractors, defined subsystems and experiments to meet the program objectives. From these studies and from in-house efforts, a list of primary experiments to assess man's capabilities was obtained. A number of secondary experiments of a scientific and engineering nature applicable to military tasks were defined, and an examination of the Nation's space programs was conducted to insure that much of MOL could be built using existing components.

In addition to these studies, a considerable amount of simulation of potential manned space missions was accomplished, on the ground and in aircraft. This has resulted in a much greater understanding of man's contribution to military space operations. Because of this, and the need to demonstrate how well man can perform these military functions, the objectives of the MOL program were redefined as:

First. Development of technology to improve capabilities for manned or unmanned operations of military significance. This may include intermediate steps toward operational systems.

Second. Development and demonstration of manned assembly and service of large structures in orbit with potential military applications.

Third. Experiments direct to the quantitative determination of man's military usefulness in space.

It is apparent that achievement of these primary objectives will yield information and experience of incalculable value to those planning the Nation's defense for the decades to come. For, not only will we have an understanding of our own manned military potential in space but, equally important, we will be able to assess far more accurately the threat that enemy space operations may pose to our Nation.

The Department of Defense also directed that those planning the MOL program consider, with NASA, broader objectives of scientific and general technological significance. Experiments to fulfill these objectives are to be defined. The data to be obtained from such experiments will add measurably to the base of knowledge upon which our technology, and our national power, rest.

The redirection in the MOL program necessitated further studies, which are presently being conducted by contractors. Their findings will be presented to the Air Force about the 15th of May. The Air Force will then make its recommendations concerning choice of contractors, vehicle configurations, and experiment packages.

The $150 million authorized for the Air Force for the manned orbiting laboratory is consistent with the program as directed by the Secretary of Defense and will provide for the timely and orderly execution which is essential to the future defense of this Nation.

These explanations of particular programs will serve to highlight the need for such programs. But again, let me emphasize, all of the provisions of the bill have been carefully constructed to present a balanced and judicious whole. Without reservation, and with my full personal support, I commend to you, Mr. Chairman, this bill to authorize procurement and research and development appropriations during fiscal year 1966 and I strongly recommend its adoption by this House.

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

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. On this question of research and development, I notice on page 2, under the Air Force, there is $150 million authorized for the manned orbiting laboratory.

It was my understanding that was to be $300 million.

Would the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is correct that the Department itself originally in its formative stage asked for $300 million. Later it was cut down to approximately $194 million, and in this particular bill we have authorized $150 million.

Mr. KEITH. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES. I would be pleased to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. KEITH. Do security regulations permit you to tell me and the other members of the committee something about this booster and capsule?

Mr. BATES. Well, it is simply a Titan 3–C booster with a Gemini B capsule that is going to be used on this vehicle.

Mr. KEITH. Can the gentleman tell me when we can expect its first test flight?

Mr. BATES. As I understand it, the first manned test flight will be in 1968.

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

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

Mr. KEITH. I notice on page 7 of the report to date only four surface ships with nuclear propulsion have been built. It goes on to list the ships. In the succeeding paragraph it says:

> There are 68 ships in the Navy today of types which would lend themselves to nuclear propulsion. Of these, only 25 ships have, or will have, nuclear power.

I do not quite understand the inconsistency of these two figures.

Mr. BATES. May I say to the gentleman he has a very discerning eye. It is true the only surface ships which we presently have are the *Enterprise*, the *Bainbridge*, the *Longbeach*, and *Truxtun*. We have many more submarines than the figure indicates here. When the figure of 25 was used, it was to indicate of the 68 ships presently in the Navy 25 could have been nuclear propelled. So the statement is actually in error in the report.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate both my distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member for the excellent presentations which they have made. From my experience with both of them I would expect nothing less. Their great background of knowledge and experience is invaluable to the work of the committee.

This year, as in the past, the Armed Services Committee has held long and detailed hearings on our military posture and as the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, we have made our own separate investigations and studies of specific aspects of the program.

We are not a partisan committee in any sense of the word. We have only one aim and one purpose; namely, to adequately provide for the defense of our Nation. The complete recognition of this objective by all members of the committee has created an atmosphere condusive to responsible legislation action. It causes us to be proud to be a member of the Armed Services Committee and to join with our fellow Members in the development of programs of overriding importance to this country and indeed to the whole of the Western World.

Always we seek to achieve a proper balance within the respective military services, keeping in mind the varying requirements of each. The result this year conforms substantially to the requests made by each service and represents a firm answer to the threats we face.

No one is more anxious than I to keep military expenditures within proper bounds. However, I have even greater concern that we do all that is necessary to counter the threat of the enemy whenever and wherever it may appear. It would be folly to do less than the present danger requires. Defense not dollars must come first.

I have followed closely the strength and capability of our Army for many years. I have served in the Army and maintain a strong interest in the Army, but I am confident that I have not permitted any partisanship to cloud my thinking respecting the needs of the Navy and the Air Force. It is basic to acknowledge that our defense is a combination of all of the services operating as a team.

One of the major elements in this bill is the emphasis on the SR–71. The chairman has touched on this aircraft and the report contains further detail with respect to it. However, I would like to emphasize the importance of this plane—this weapons system—to our Air Force and therefore, to our defensive and offensive capabilities.

It was rather baffling in committee to try to follow the various versions of this airplane. You all will recall that the first version displayed of this airplane was the A–11, which the President announced, as I recall it, last November. In the bill we have the SR–71; there is also the YF–12A, and I believe at least two other versions of this airplane. They are essentially the A–11 configured for various purposes. In the case of the SR–71, it is a long-range advanced strategic reconnaissance aircraft capable of worldwide reconnaissance military operations.

It will fly more than three times the speed of sound at altitudes in excess of 80,000 feet, or something on the order of 16 miles.

It is such an important airplane that I think it worthwhile to relate a little bit of its history. It was only last December that the first flight of the SR–71 was successfully accomplished. Additional testing is now underway at the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards Air Force Base in California. Ultimately this airplane will be assigned to the Strategic Air Command at Beale Air Force in California.

Perhaps a layman can better comprehend the speed of this airplane if he considers that if one of these airplanes had left New York City at 12 noon today, it would have arrived in San Francisco at 10:30 a.m., San Francisco time, or an hour and a half before it left. Pick more distant destinations around the world and you would have even more dramatic computations. Without a doubt it is one of the great advances in military science.

Only last week Col. Robert Stephens and Lt. Col. Daniel Andre flew the YF–12A version of this aircraft, proposed as an interceptor, at 2,062 miles an hour over Edwards Air Force Base, Calif. In this flight they bettered four records held by the Soviet Union and also set three other world marks.

And now I would like to turn a moment to the Navy and to one of the Navy's programs which to my mind may well become of as much importance as any program in our whole Military Establishment.

At the beginning of World War II Germany had 48—only 48—submarines while as of this date the Soviet Union is reported to have approximately 500 submarines. In light of this startling fact what could be more important to our defense than to be able to cope with this vast submarine fleet?

It is axiomatic in our free world strategy that we must control the seas, for it is over water that 95 percent of the world's commerce and goods are moved. Our Navy recognizes the tremendous threat which the Soviet submarine fleet poses to our shipping. Our Navy is well aware that these submarines have the capability of launching nuclear missiles against the heartland of our Nation. Your House Armed Services Committee has acted in support of this awareness and our bill gives all requested support to the Navy to develop its antisubmarine capabilities. The Navy's program, while still pressing for a further significant breakthrough in the underwater detection and destruction of submarines, is geared to provide steady progress in this difficult but all-important area of combat. I have paid particular attention to the sums included for antisubmarine warfare and the program encompasses a varied and intriguing response. It is more than ships, torpedoes, fixed-wing, and helicopter airplanes. The reason for this is found in the extensive and growing intensification of effort in the research and development field. The hearings disclosed that many items which on the surface appear to be quite remote from antisubmarine warfare itself, actually will, if successful, tie quite directly into this important capability. I feel that the overall commitment for this vital task is adequate.

Recent events have underscored the importance of our land forces, so let us take a look at the Army. In the words of General Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, the Army must have the capabilities, not only to fight by the most modern and effective means, but also to control land areas and people, during and after the fight.

An effective army in the troubled world of today must be trained and equipped to engage in combat under a very great variety of conditions. In Europe, armored mechanized army forces with sophisticated missile systems are vital. In Vietnam, we are faced with guerrilla warfare and the requirement for armored vehicles and sophisticated missiles is much less. However, this area has an equally important requirement for mobility, and this means helicopters and transport aircraft. The fighting in Vietnam is in close quarters; it is mean and dirty. In the final analysis we must depend upon the individual soldier with his hand-carried weapons so he must have the most modern equipment—for firepower and for mobility. The House Armed Services Committee, under the leadership of Chairman RIVERS, desires to meet this need promptly and completely.

The Army will continue to rely heavily on the use of aircraft to insure increased capabilities in the areas of mobility, reconnaissance, command control, and firepower. Speed of action requires that combat troops and critical supplies be

moved out by air. As demonstrated in Vietnam, the helicopter today provides the most effective means of conducting military operations against the Communist insurgents in this difficult environment. The Iroquois helicopter, for example, has proved invaluable in moving Vietnamese forces to the areas of action. In fiscal year 1966, 720 Iroquois helicopters are to be authorized.

A fighting force in this modern age which can defeat any military threat with which it may be confronted must be equipped with reliable missile systems in proper support of both our offensive and defensive combat troops. It is our continuing aim to see that the proposed missile procurement will satisfy these firepower requirements at the lowest cost possible.

As has been mentioned, continuing procurement of the Pershing will provide the field Army with long-range nuclear fire support. Sergeant missile procurement has been essentially completed, thus providing closer-in nuclear fire support for our tactical Army Corps.

Quantity procurement of the Redeye missile for the Army's inventory represents the first major step taken in several years to improve our forward area air defense posture. The Redeye can be carried anywhere a soldier can walk and will fill a large part of the low-altitude air defense void which now exists over our frontline troops.

Potential enemies of the free world enjoy a superiority in numbers of tanks and personnel. To counter this threat, the Army had developed a new weapon for tanks and armor-defeating vehicles. This system, the Shillelagh, will enable our forces to defeat any known enemy armor at extended ranges with a very high reliability.

Likewise, other areas important to the Army are not being neglected. For example, Nike X, our antimissile missile, will receive about one-third of the total research and development budget for the Army this year, indicating the great importance which both the Army and the Secretary of Defense attach to this program.

The Lance missile, forward area air defense, and the ground environment part of the military communications satellite program are also receiving appropriate attention.

May I again emphasize our hearings on this bill. We realize the difficulty of keeping abreast the rapid technological developments and the danger of neglecting any significant phase of our defense. Therefore we have proceeded with great care, weighing each item. As a result, only lesser deletions were made in the research and development portion of the bill and only two in the procurement portion of the bill. Two items were added, as you already are aware—a nuclear-powered, guided-missile frigate and $7 million additional for the advanced manned strategic aircraft.

The seriousness of the times gives special significance to our task today. It is important that we do what is right—that we do enough. I think this bill is a sensible and forceful answer and I am confident the House will agree.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to address that portion of this bill which deals with Navy research and development.

This bill requests authority for $1,439,200,000 for Navy R. & D. Of this amount $386.4 million or about 27 percent, are for exclusively ASW projects and the remaining 73 percent is for other warfare area developments for the Navy and for the Marine Corps. The basic function of Navy R. & D. is to provide the world's greatest Navy and Marine Corps with the weapons and other equipment which are vital for peformance of the numerous and varied tasks which our Navy and Marines are called upon to undertake in many widely separated areas of the world.

The broad scope of this research and development program ranges from basic research in natural sciences to the final development of major systems engineered for use in the fleet. I shall not attempt to describe all of the many projects which are involved, but will highlight important areas.

The committee has recommended approval of $180.1 million for the Navy's military sciences budget activity. This activity covers the functional areas of basic and applied research at Navy-owned laboratories and at civilian institutions under Navy contract, and is designed to fulfill the demands of advanceing technology. The products of Navy research provide fundamental knowledge relevant not only to the Navy, but to the scientific community at large.

Portions of the Navy's exploratory development projects are contained in the various budget activities. Exploratory development is primarily directed toward devices which will become components of weapons systems or other equipment for the fleet. A wide scope of such effort is a necessary prelude to more advanced stages of development when major systems are undertaken.

The committee recommends authorization for $191.1 million for Navy research and development in aircraft and related equipment. This activity finances development of airframes, powerplants, avionics, and other related equipment. A major program is the F–111B which is planned for use as an air superiority fighter plane. Other programs include the OV–10A light armed reconnaissance aircraft—LARA—for counter-insurgency warfare, a tactical electronic warfare suit for a follow-on version of the A–6 Intruder attack aircraft, and the X–22A vertical take-off and landing research vehicle. Funds requested in this activity are about $49 million less than fiscal 1965 due primarily to near completion of development work in the A–7A light attack aircraft.

The next budget activity, missiles and related equipment has an authorization request for $371.3 million. This activity includes air-launched and surface-launched missiles, and in the Navy budget contains the development costs for ballistic missiles launched from submarines. A major portion of this effort in fiscal year 1966 will be in further refinement of capabilities of operational Polaris missiles, and initial development of the Poseidon missile as logical follow-on to the Polaris family.

The Phoenix missile and control system is included as the primary air-to-air armament for the F–111B aircraft and will provide an important improvement in the air warfare capability of the fleet. Other air-launched missiles in this program are Shrike and Condor for attack on surface targets. All of these air-launched missiles can be fired from a stand-off distance and should improve the safety of our carrier-based and Marine strike forces.

Funds are also included in this activity for updating the characteristics of the ship-launched Terrier, Tartar, and Talos missiles, and for development of a standard missile compatible with either the Terrier or Tartar installations.

The Navy's share of funding the Pacific Missile Range is in this activity.

The committee supports the Navy's budget of $24.5 million in military astronautics. Navy research and development in this area is related to the performance of naval missions and is focused on such functions as sea surveillance, communications, and navigation using earth-orbiting satellites.

Budget activity five finances developments in ships, small craft, and related equipment, and the total Navy request for $330.5 million is supported by the committee. A large portion of this request is antisubmarine warfare systems for ships and submarines. Other major areas are in communications, intelligence, radar and electronic warfare systems, and ship and submarine propulsion plants including advanced nuclear plants for surface ships and submarines.

The Navy has requested $180.3 million for research and development in ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment. Included are rockets, projectiles, and lightweight gun mounts in order to increase the fleet's surface fire support capability in support of land operations. In addition to shipboard ordnance there are a number of advanced air-launched weapons, such as the Walleye guided bomb, to increase the accuracy and effectiveness of air attack while providing a higher degree of safety for the attack aircraft.

The Navy's request for $84.8 million in other equipment is about $18 million higher than last year due to emphasis in the deep submergence program. This project is directed toward providing capabilities to do useful things in the ocean depths, submarine rescue, salvage, and greatly extending man's capabilities to live and work in the deep ocean environment. Progress in this area should result in many future benefits to the security and economy of the United States. Also included in this budget activity are several Marine Corps projects.

Mr. Chairman, the amount which the committee recommends for Navy R. & D. in fiscal 1966 is essential to conduct the developments which modern seapower require.

In the 5 years I have had the privilege of being a Member of this House I have developed a deep interest in antisubmarine warfare, and considerable concern that past efforts to improve our posture in this vital aspect of our national defense were not advancing as rapidly as needed. I am pleased to report that the concern of the Congress, expressed during the recent years, has contributed to a significant change. Under Secretary Nitze, there is a new unity of purpose and a new sense of urgency in the Department of the Navy, which is reflected in the antisubmarine warfare portion of the R.D.T. & E. budget for fiscal year 1966.

The ASW R. & D. program, totaling $386 million, is of wide scope. Careful review of all aspects of antisubmarine warfare leads to the conclusion that a major breakthrough that would revolutionize ASW is unlikely. Therefore, this budget provides for a disciplined evolutionary integration of many aspects of technical progress. A program on a broad front is provided to insure that our antisubmarine ships, aircraft, and submarines will be provided in the future with those improved equipments necessary to keep them the best in the world.

Vice Admiral Martell has been given responsibility for all phases of antisubmarine warfare, and reports directly to the Chief of Naval Operations and the Secretary of the Navy. Under his direction, a series of comprehensive reviews have been conducted of the requirements and of the on-going projects. These reviews have resulted in the establishment of priorities and the focusing of effort. Management has been strengthened to insure that the equipments most urgently required reach the fleet in the shortest possible time, and with the quality essential to counter the growing capabilities of the submarine as a weapon of attack.

In order to concentrate effort on the most vital undertakings, the elements in the antisubmarine program have been carefully screened. Those not of direct or potential value in improving our antisubmarine posture have been eliminated or reclassified into other warfare areas.

This budget puts first things first. It provides full support for those things most urgently needed. It provides a balanced support for those projects upon which we must build in the future. It eliminates wasteful duplication and peripheral items. I am happy to report that emphasis over the past few years has culminated in a sound program representing 22 percent increase in effort over the present fiscal year. Most of the effort is concentrated under three major areas:

First. Airborne ASW projects.

Second. Surface ships and submarine projects.

Third. ASW weapons.

In particular, this emphasis has been placed on airborne sensors, sonars, and on torpedoes capable of combating submarines of the highest known performance.

We cannot be sure, of course, when our antisubmarine capability may be put to the test, and the capabilities of opposing submarines must be expected to improve as further technological advances are achieved. Therefore, the budget provides for continuing efforts to advance our antisubmarine technology at a rate which insures against surprise. I am happy to commend all aspects of this budget for your approval.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, recent statements from the Department of Defense reflect, in my opinion, an underestimate of the Soviet bomber threat against the United States. Not only do they tend to minimize the number of bombers that the Soviets would send to attack our cities and defense installations, but they conclude that the present manned interceptor force is larger than needed. Apparently these estimates have been the basis of earlier Department of Defense decisions to phase out SAGE air defense radars, and more recent decisions to phase out certain interceptor airplanes operated by our highly proficient National Guard forces.

No reasonable man will argue for spending money for defenses we do not require. I would be among the first to hail the day when we might safely divert funds, which we now find essential to the defense of our country, to peaceful endeavors. And the fact that such aspirations are natural to all human beings increases the likelihood that statements from highly placed Government officials could lull us into a false sense of security.

It is significant that the Secretary of Defense does not claim infallibility in his estimates of the world situation and the resulting decisions regarding our defense. While discussing the damage limiting problem recently, he admitted, in passing, that he was troubled by the strategic uncertainty which stems from the impossibility of predicting what our opponent or opponents will actually do, what sort of force they will actually build, what kind of attack they will actually launch, and how effective their weapons will actually be. He concludes that the efficiency of our defense planning depends upon the correctness of the assumptions we make about the size and probable character of enemy attacks.

Being forewarned that crucial questions, bearing on the future safety of our Nation, remain unanswered, should not we as prudent men, should not this Congress, have grave misgivings over adopting a policy that could lead to the degradation of that posture of great strength that has sustained us for two decades? I, for one, hold misgivings about claims of ever-increasing strength bought with an ever-decreasing budget.

When the Secretary of Defense claims the present manned interceptor force is larger than needed, I am inclined to agree. But I must point out the obvious—the effectiveness of a force is not necessarily in direct proportion to quantity. We have heard the Secretary of Defense, himself, on many occasions, justify curtailment of a program because of an increase in the capability or quality in that program.

Let us consider the status of our interceptor force. I fear we have a serious deficiency in our present, and more important, our future capability to counter the threat posed by Soviet manned aircraft. This threat has undergone a major change during the past few years. Essentially, the change was brought about by the introduction of ballistic missiles into the Soviet arsenal. The original threat changed from a surprise bomber attack, for which the Air Defense system was designed, to an ICBM attack followed closely by a bomber attack. This ballistic missile attack could, very possibly, deny the current interceptor fleet the close control required for effective employment against invading bombers. Furthermore, the addition of air-to-surface missiles to Soviet bombers enables them to attack our perimeter cities from a stand-off position, in comparative safety from attack by our short-range, out-dated interceptors. This deficiency exists because the No. 1 interceptor, the F–106, was designed more than 10 years ago and has been in service more than 7 years. During this time the aircraft industry has made great technological strides which we have failed to take advantage of in our defense forces.

During congressional hearings in 1962 and 1963 on the status of our air defense forces, one consistent recommendation was heard from military experts: a long-range, high-speed, improved manned interceptor is required to overcome grave deficiencies in our air defense system.

I do not think there is any question that we will soon see the day when our own supersonic transport airplanes and those of our NATO partners will be crossing continents, the oceans, and the solar ice caps on routine commercial flights. And there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the Soviet Union will be in the forefront in this activity.

What, then, will the United States do to defend the sovereignty of our airspace and our borders when an unidentified aircraft moving at supersonic speed appears on Air Defense radar scopes heading for Washington or New York? At present, the approach of unidentified potential targets at 500 or 600 miles per hour is not an uncommon occcurrence. When a target of this nature approaches our shores today, it is only a matter of a few minutes before the alarm is sounded for the alert crews of our armed interceptors. They take off, fly out, and intercept the unknown aircraft. These interceptors are prepared to shoot down the intruder if he turns out to be hostile. Today our interceptors can accomplish this necessary task because, to our knowledge, no nation yet has a high-performance supersonic bomber or transport in operation.

But what will be the situation with the advent of truly supersonic aircraft—bombers or transports? On our radar scopes bombers and transports look alike. We cannot determine whether an intruding aircraft is a threat to us until we have launched a fighter, climbed to high altitudes, and intercepted or inspected the intruder. If the speed of the intruder increases then it follows that the in-

terceptor speed must be increased by an even greater rate.

The airplanes we now have in our operational forces will not be able to perform this feat. They are obsolete or obsolescent.

There is one airplane in our inventory that can do the job! It is not just an aircraft of great promise. It is a fulfillment. It is flying.

The administration showed great wisdom and foresight several years ago in the decision to build the YF–12A and the SR–71, airplanes which clearly meet all the requirements specified by air defense commanders. The YF–12A embodies a complete weapon system including fire-control radars and long-range missiles.

As the President has announced, the F–12 will cruise at a speed of more than 2,000 miles per hour and can be launched swiftly to intercept invading targets anywhere on the North American Continent. For example, the flight from Los Angeles to New York will take but slightly more than an hour. The F–12's radar has a detection range three times greater than our best interceptor today. It will carry a multiple load of nuclear missiles which have a range 10 times that of our current air-to-air missiles.

It was most disturbing to me, therefore, when the Secretary of Defense was recently discussing the possibility of production and deployment of a new manned interceptor he did not express an appreciation of the vast superiority of the F–12. Instead he stated that it is not clear at this time that the F–12 would be preferable to an interceptor version of the F–111. To refresh your memories—the F–111 is the official designation for the still controversial TFX. The Secretary of Defense makes this amazing statement based on Department of Defense analyses which he says indicate the F–111 would have some substantial advantage over the F–12, which he cites as greater airborne endurance, ability to recycle on a greater number of airfields, and that greater numbers could be procured for any given investment. In making such a statement the Secretary of Defense would have us overlook the fact that the F–12 airplane is already flying—breaking records—while the contractors for the F–111 are still experiencing many serious problems in its development.

It is surprising that the Secretary would seize on two or three relatively insignificant and questionable factors in evaluating the relative merits of the two aircraft and inflate them out of all proportion to justify a decision.

Let us examine what the Secretary of Defense calls a substantial advantage of the F–111: greater endurance.

The F–111 may have greater endurance if flown at subsonic speeds. This may be an asset to a tactical fighter used against ground targets, but cannot be an advantage when the mission is interception of supersonic aircraft.

The Secretary of Defense is overlooking the obvious requirement for a truly high-performance interceptor—one that will have a substantial margin of superiority over Soviet fighters such as the MIG–21 and even faster planes which could come off Soviet production lines anytime in the near future.

Let us take a close look at this airplane that, for some reason, the Secretary of Defense considers the answer to all our air warfare requirements. The distinguished chairman of one of the most effective committees in the other body, the Subcommittee on Investigations, provides an interesting perspective on the aircraft in question. I quote from a recent report of that subcommittee:

TFX CONTRACT INVESTIGATION

The Subcommittee received information shortly before the beginning of the 88th Congress to the effect that the Department of Defense had awarded the largest single aviation procurement contract in history to the higher of two bidders. The contract was for the research and the ultimate production of a new type plane commonly known as TFX (tactical fighter experimental). It was alleged that the low bidder with the superior plane was the Boeing Co.; however, the contract was given to the General Dynamics Corp., at a higher price for a plane design which the military experts regarded as inferior to the lower cost Boeing design.

The hearings which followed indicated that the allegations were substantially accurate. It was the unanimous opinion of the top military commanders that the Boeing design offered an aircraft which was operationally superior to the General Dynamics design.

The requirements of the Air Force and the Navy in aircraft differ. The Air Force requires an attack airplane that can fly at low altitudes and at extreme speeds to its target in order to avoid enemy radar and to be able to return to its base at high altitude and high speeds. The Navy, on the other hand, requires a plane that can fly a certain distance from a carrier and remain there so that it can detect incoming enemy planes by its radar and destroy them with air-to-air missiles before they can reach the fleet. Weight is a serious factor in any aircraft design but with the necessity of landing and taking off from the deck of a carrier, much shorter and less stable than a land field, the weight problem is multiplied. The Secretary of Defense ordered a TFX design that would combine the dissimilar requirements of the Air Force and the Navy in one plane. The decision to build one plane to perform these dissimilar operations was criticized by military experts and testimony before our Subcommittee indicated that not only was it doubtful that any economy would be accomplished by having a common plane but that, in addition, it appeared most certain to sacrifice performance for both services.

It is common knowledge that the much-hailed F–111 will not be able to overtake and intercept intruding supersonic bombers or transports. It was not designed to do so. The F–111 will not be in the same league as the supersonic bomber or transport which will confront us, since the F–111 will be several hundred miles per hour slower. For example, it would not be a satisfactory interceptor even against the old and much disparaged B–70, which I see has recently set new world records for its size airplane. That huge aircraft has achieved a speed of mach 2.45 and has flown at supersonic speeds greater than mach 2 for long periods of time. That remarkable aircraft is expected to reach 2,000 miles an hour. I described the B–70 as "old" because the plans were laid down for this airplane about 8 years ago. The aircraft industry is now capable of building much more advanced aircraft. This is borne out by the successful development of the F–12.

Should it be possible to overcome serious problems of inadequate engine performance and other technical obstacles that currently seem to be plaguing the development of the TFX and it becomes operational, it will still be just what its original designation connotes—a tactical fighter—not the long-range supersonic interceptor that this country must have in the late 1960-early 1970 time period.

Whatever his reasons when he decided to develop the TFX as a tactical fighter, and to reject the advice of highly qualified military and civilian aeronautical engineers and aviation experts, it is to be hoped that the Secretary of Defense will not attempt to adapt that tactical airplane to the role which can be so ably filled by the F–12 type aircraft. That is the interceptor that this Nation needs to defend the sovereignty of our borders and to protect against supersonic manned aircraft in the next few years.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee brings to the House today in this $15 billion bill and in the $700 million bill also considered today, measures of fundamental national defense significance. These are pieces of legislation to give our country the needed hardware and demonstrate the firm will requisite for freedom. I sincerely hope they pass with overwhelming affirmative votes.

Since the general features of this measure will be widely discussed here by others, I would like to address myself to the so-called 35–65 provision of previous legislation included in the last three Defense Appropriations Acts, allowing for 35 percent of the funds made available for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels to be spent in privately owned shipyards.

There are several important reasons for keeping this provision, which during the past 3 years has had the full support of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy, and of which the Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships has said, in substance, "we can live with it."

First, in these days of great emphasis on cost analysis and economy in Government, studies have demonstrated that costs are generally higher in the naval shipyards as compared with private shipyards. It is a fact that private shipyards can build and repair ships at prices considerably lower than the naval yards.

Second, there is a huge investment in the private shipyards in this country. Not only in equipment, land, and other material assets, but also in men. These shipyards provide jobs for thousands of workers throughout the United States, helping the whole economy. The shipyards themselves pay into the Federal Treasury many millions of dollars in taxes. And they also represent an investment in the future—they are available for the present and future defense of our country, and are geared to stepped-up production in time of national emergency.

I urge the House to continue this provision which means so much to the national security of our country. It would be false economy to abandon this 35–65 provision, when in the future we might have great need for our existing shipyards and shipworkers—just as we vitally need them today.

It would be well to include in the legislative history surrounding H.R. 7657, a postscript to the previous comments pertaining to sections 302 and 303.

The issue with respect to the utilization of naval shipyards versus private shipyards has never been clearly defined. The proponents of Government operations and the proponents of commercial operations each have more than a scintilla of merit to their respective interests. Within the broad and essential requirement of properly serving the national security and the public's interest, the Congress has consistently taken an enlightened position. Cost analyses have demonstrated the extent to which costs are generally higher in the naval shipyards, and it is recognized that in the maintenance of our defense capability there may be instances in which higher costs cannot be avoided. But, these of course, should be the exception rather than the rule, if our total economic system is to remain sound and productive.

With regard to new naval ship construction, the Federal Treasury has benefited from the lower costs available in privately-owned commercial shipyards, and many millions of dollars have been saved.

With regard to cost differentials on naval ship conversions, alterations, and repairs, the record is far from conclusive. This is understandable for the reason that work in these categories is rarely identical.

However, it should be noted that in the past several years, the Navy's description of public and private shipyard costs for repair has progressed from "generally comparable" to "comparable" to "stack up" to "approximately the same" to "a little cheaper." The present vogue is to use the phrase "a little cheaper," and I am not convinced that this phrasing represents the actual situation.

The Navy has yet to furnish any substantive data to support the improving or improved situation which its adjectives connote, and there has been no change in the basic distribution of work between naval and private shipyards in the last 3 years, nor general improvement in shipyard economics, to support its contentions. In point of fact, if private yards, under their operational techniques, production efficiencies, and costing procedures, can build ships at prices considerably lower than the naval yards, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that they can convert, alter, or repair vessels cheaper than can the naval yards. Any other conclusion would require the invocation of an economic doctrine yet to be devised.

ON NEW CONSTRUCTION

Section 302 of H.R. 7657 provides:

The distribution of the assignments and contracts for construction of warships and escort vessels for which appropriations are authorized by this Act and hereafter shall be in accordance with the requirement of the Act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), that the first and each succeeding alternate vessel shall be constructed in the Government Navy yards: *Provided*, That, if inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed as required above, the President may have such vessel or vessels built in a Government or private yard as he may direct.

As suggested in House Report No. 271, this language is a restatement of the Vinson-Trammell Act requirement of long standing to govern the distribution of new naval ship construction between Government and private shipyards. The proviso reading "that, if inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed as required above, the President may have such vessel or vessels built in a Government or private yard as he may direct" is particularly pertinent and significant.

Under this proviso, the President, on the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy, has in recent years seen fit to depart from the implied 50-to-50 ratio. He has determined that it would be "inconsistent with the public interests" not to take advantage of the lower shipbuilding costs which are available from privately owned commercial yards.

As a consequence, private yards, according to figures and statements supplied by the Navy, have been receiving from 65 to 80 percent of the new construction work. It is important to note that this work is awarded competitively, and that the Secretary of Defense has frequently pointed to the dollar savings which have been accomplished through competitive bidding on all defense procurements. He has used, on a number of occasions, a figure of 25 percent to indicate the average savings resulting from competitive bidding.

The Defense and Navy Departments have consistently conceded that lower costs for new construction are available from the private sector of the industry, and the tabulation at the conclusion of my remarks on "Naval Ship Construction" reflects the extent to which commercial shipyards have been used for this reason "in the public interest"—to accomplish impressive dollar savings. The figures in this tabulation were furnished by the Navy's Bureau of Ships.

It is also important to note that this reliance on private enterprise is fully consistent with President Johnson's programs for greater economy in all Government operations, and fully consistent with his announced desires to strengthen competitive enterprise.

Any revision in this trend toward greater reliance on private shipyards for new naval ship construction would severely undermine the administration's very commendable efforts to make certain that every dollar for defense is spent wisely and with the view of saving money wherever and whenever possible. Obviously, as a result of increased use of private yards for these purposes, the national security and the competitive enterprise system have indeed been strengthened. The taxpayers would indeed be shortchanged by any change in this distribution practice.

As to "Conversions, alterations, and repairs," section 303 of H.R. 7657 provides:

The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

The purpose of the above language is to ratify the elimination of the following provision which has appeared in the fiscal year 1963, fiscal year 1964, and fiscal year 1965 Defense Appropriations Acts:

Of the funds made available in this Act for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels, at least 35 per centum shall be available for such repair, alteration, and conversion in privately owned shipyards: *Provided*, That if determined by the Secretary of Defense to be inconsistent with the public interest based on urgency of requirement to have such vessels repaired, altered, or converted as required above, such work may be done in Navy or private shipyards as he may direct.

This so-called 35–65 provision was originally instituted by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House. As I have said, for 3 consecutive years, it was supported by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships said of it in substance, "we can live with it." The White House recommended its adoption in connection with fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1965 defense appropriations, but it is not contained in the budget proposed for fiscal year 1966.

Unlike the logic, rationale, and dollar savings which have governed the distribution of new construction work between Government-owned naval shipyards and privately owned commercial shipyards, the division of conversion, alteration, and repair—CAR—work is arbitrarily assigned an entirely different scale of values.

In spite of the findings of independent accountants and the opinions of shipyard experts that costs for all types of naval shipwork are less in private yards; in spite of the 25-percent savings which the Secretary of Defense says have resulted from competitive bidding; and in spite of the longstanding national policy which has established a presumption in favor of Government procurements from commercial sources, the majority of this CAR work has consistently gone to the naval shipyards—as is illustrated by the tabulations at the conclusion of my remarks entitled "Naval Ship Conversion" and "Naval Ship Repair."

It is often stated that if private yards receive the larger share of new construction work, Navy yards should be permitted to have the larger share of CAR work. The fallacy of this statement rests in the fact that new construction contracts are awarded on the basis of lowest prices, and CAR work is assigned, without reference to ultimate costs, to keep the naval shipyards in operation. Some-

one has said that work is "spoon fed" to the Navy yards.

Moreover, it cannot be successfully argued that repair, alteration, and conversion capabilities will be preserved because private yards are receiving new construction work. Shipbuilding and ship repair are quite different arts, and while there is similarity between the skills and crafts employed, they usually are not done in the same facility.

History has effectively demonstrated that in times of emergency, reliance on private yards for all types of naval shipwork—to support fleet readiness—far exceeds that which is placed on naval shipyards. World War II was a classic example.

During the 1941–45 period, the private shipyard industry built a total of 3,921,000 displacement tons of naval vessels—plus 37,709,697 gross tons of merchant ships—while the naval shipyards produced only 996,000 displacement tons. In those years, the aggregate value of naval ship repair work in the Nation's principal private yards totaled $1,099,372,000, not including substantial support for the merchant marine. In 1944 and 1945, naval ship repairs represented approximately 50 percent of the volume of work completed by those same yards. Peak employment in the private yards during World War II was approximately 1,459,000 workers; in the Navy yards, 330,000.

The private shipyard industry thus has a historic role in supporting the fleet's readiness and its effectiveness. In the foreseeable future, that role could be equally as significant. Preservation of a "hard core" of geographically dispersed private shipyards should therefore be as important, on the basis of past performance, proven capability, and anticipated potential, as the preservation of the "hard core" of naval shipyards which the Shipyards Policy Board has recommended.

But, a hard core of private yards for CAR purposes can only be sustained and maintained through the assurance of a substantial volume of CAR work. To provide that assurance, the 35–65 provision was instituted after careful deliberations of all factors and was reaffirmed by the executive agencies and the Congress on two consecutive occasions. Under section 303 of H.R. 7657, this modest assurance of "at least" 35 percent of the available CAR work for the private yards on a competitive basis would be abandoned.

Despite all that has gone before, the potential savings to the Government through utilization of private yards are to be cast aside. In a curious juxtaposition of accepted cost finding practices, the Navy suggests that:

> If the volume of CAR work performed in the naval shipyards were increased from the present level of 65 percent to the former level of about 80 percent, it is believed that overall savings to DOD, at least in the short-run, would be $10 to $15 million annually.

The above position infers that certain elements of fixed overhead costs should not be considered when comparing the cost of accomplishing conversion, alteration, and repair work in naval shipyards versus private shipyards.

This form of financial analysis is extremely prejudicial in favor of the naval shipyards since the private shipyards must necessarily include fixed overhead in their cost formula as a matter of economic survival. Additionally, this technique of overlooking certain costs when comparing public enterprise with private enterprise is contrary to the policy of the Federal Government as expressed in Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2 and the Department of Defense instruction elaborating on that bulletin. These documents require that not only all costs of the public activity must be considered, but also certain other costs borne by the Government, not included in the budgets of the public activity, must be taken into account.

Most important among the other elements to be considered are the cost of capital—equipment to profit, interest and depreciation of private enterprise—and a provision to equate for the tax contribution received from private but not public enterprise.

Ordinarily, fixed overhead costs would range between 15 percent and 20 percent of total revenue for either a private or public enterprise. A 1962 "Survey of Cost Differentials and Other Factors Relating to Private and Naval Shipyards" conducted by the Ernst & Ernst accounting firm quantified the cost of capital, taxes, and other costs included by private shipyards, but excluded from naval shipyard costs, at 10 percent. Adding these two elements together, the Navy has, in effect, suggested that 25 to 30 percent of the true cost of performing shipwork in their yards should be deducted before comparing costs with private yards. This would, in turn, have the effect of allowing naval shipyards 33 to 40 percent higher cost levels than private shipyards, and then concluding that they are equal.

Private industry must earn a profit to pay shareholders for use of their money, to gather capital for new buildings and machinery as well, and to finance the cost of work being done by them until they are paid for the work. Similarly, financial institutions necessarily require interest payments for money loaned to private corporations, just as the Federal Government must pay interest to attract buyers for bonds with which to fund the national debt.

Corporations must also consider depreciation as a cost so that funds will be available to replace facilities and equipment as they wear out or become obsolete. Part of the price of earning a profit is also the payment of taxes on income; part of the responsibility of a private corporation is the payment of other taxes, such as property taxes, to contribute to the maintenance of State and local governments.

Further with regard to overhead costs, activities, and provisions absolutely essential to any industrial activity are a staff of engineers, accountants, supervisors, craftsmen, and other skilled technical and managerial personnel; tools, supplies, buildings, machinery, and furniture; accounts receivable, inventories, and cash reserves; insurance, plant security, safety programs, and medical facilities; and a host of other items which contribute to overhead, much of which is referred to as fixed cost because the expenditures are, in the short term, unrelated to changes in workload.

Would the Federal Government be willing to allow the private shipyards to list capital costs, taxes and fixed overhead, separately and not include these expenses when comparing costs with public shipyards? Private concerns have no alternative but to include these items in the cost of their services. Public enterprise, indemnified as it is against losses, relieved of the responsibility of accumulating capital and paying for it, not required to pay taxes, can perhaps set these factors aside. But to do so, would creat a system of financial comparison that would categorically prevent any private concern from ever demonstrating lower cost levels than a public counterpart unless the public activity were grossly inefficient.

The previously mentioned study, and the 1962 "Report on Survey and Analysis of Differences Between U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Costs at Naval and Private Shipyards" by another accounting firm, Arthur Andersen & Co., have adequately demonstrated that if the true cost of performing shipwork in naval shipyards is compared with private shipyards the costs in private yards are significantly lower.

The above quoted paragraph from the "Study of Naval Requirements for Shipyard Capacity" is contrived to disguise this fact by subtracting substantial sums, which really exist, from the public side of the cost equation, while not adjusting the private side of the equation accordingly, and then claiming as savings, the amount by which the private yards exceed these artifically low public yard costs.

The above quoted paragraph also attempts to justify the exclusion of fixed overhead as appropriate by viewing the cost problem from a short-term standpoint. While it is true that with an individual decision the additional incremental cost to the Government of accomplishing work at the naval shipyard does not include fixed overhead, it is equally true that the sum of many individual decisions over a period of several years constitutes the explanation of the existence of these costs.

The allocation of shipwork between private and naval shipyards is, however, not a short-term issue. The specific purpose and intent of the various pronouncements of the executive branch of the Federal Government, such as Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2, are to discard as unrealistic this type of rationale for setting aside substantial sums from public enterprise costs when examining the facts pertaining to a long-term decision.

Moreover it should be pointed out that the Arthur Andersen & Co. report established that the cost to the Department of Defense and the cost to the Government as a result of naval shipwork activities

are not the same. On the basis of total costs—as Arthur Andersen & Co. stated: "giving consideration to additional costs incurred—interest on invested capital—or covered—taxes—by the local, State, and Federal Government"—the savings to the Government could well be very much greater than the $10 to $15 million mentioned above if the same work were awarded to private yards.

Finally, taking into account all factors which led to the adoption of the 35-to-65 ratio on CAR work in the first place, there has been no change whatsoever in the situation. The Congress and the Department of Defense must continue to recognize the necessity for maintaining a hard core of privately owned facilities and skills to perform CAR assignments in time of emergency. This can only be done by assurances of a reasonable volume of CAR work—clearly stated legislatively or by an unequivocating statement of administration policy. At least 35 percent could hardly be classified as unreasonable.

CONCLUSION

I note from the testimony of Navy witnesses in February 1965 before the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that approximately 26 percent of the available conversion, alteration, and repair work in fiscal 1966 will be awarded competitively to the private yards and that about 74 percent will be assigned arbitrarily to the naval shipyards. By any yardstick, it is obvious that the private shipyard industry will receive less CAR work next year. A reduction of 9 percent may be inconsequential to some, but to me it is a matter of major portends.

If the national interest, as I have previously suggested, dictates a reduction of this magnitude—and we have no evidence that it does—then one might expect that language to that effect would be desirable with, of course, the usual escape clause which has been available and enforced in several instances during the last 3 years. For my part, in the absence of such specific language, I will consider the statements of the Navy spokesmen as a pledge; and as before, I will consider the 26-percent figure to be a "floor" not a "ceiling."

The intent of my remarks should not be misconstrued. My purpose is to insure that the record of consideration of H.R. 7657 will be balanced to the fullest extent.

Naval ship construction excluding Government-furnished material, outfitting, and post delivery

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Naval yards	Private yards	Total
1953	194,614	201,074	395,688
1954	----------	328,846	328,846
1955	254,004	306,908	560,912
1956	178,765	563,101	741,866
1957	353,956	483,387	837,343
1958	173,795	610,794	784,589
1959	283,428	636,662	920,090
1960	71,956	231,093	303,049
1961	281,551	702,667	984,218
1962	418,728	770,025	1,188,753
1963	139,537	1,105,056	1,244,593
1964	123,185	558,994	682,179
Total	2,473,519	6,498,607	8,972,126

Naval ship conversion excluding Government-furnished material, outfitting, and post delivery

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Naval yards [1] [2]	Private yards	Total
1953	96,960	----------	96,960
1954	70,321	----------	70,321
1955	114,942	----------	114,942
1956	139,037	7,818	146,855
1957	269,260	78,430	347,690
1958	100,151	----------	100,151
1959	114,406	26,122	140,528
1960	63,751	7,328	71,079
1961	96,729	----------	96,729
1962	135,133	21,084	156,217
1963	174,959	124,682	299,641
1964	117,385	53,227	170,612
Total	1,493,034	318,691	1,811,725

[1] This represents work performed in the continental naval shipyards, i.e., excludes Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard.
[2] Value of conversion work performed at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in fiscal year 1964, $4,148,000.

Naval ship repair [1]

Fiscal year	Naval yards [2] [3]	Private yards	Total
1953	$256,946,954	$80,749,952	$337,696,906
1954	252,208,880	90,726,234	342,935,114
1955	233,334,116	109,305,346	342,639,462
1956	269,062,779	109,288,417	378,351,196
1957	267,443,512	96,304,405	363,747,917
1958	268,973,548	95,048,379	364,021,927
1959	260,207,850	84,681,017	344,888,867
1960	278,264,978	77,253,368	355,518,346
1961	295,132,541	96,397,076	391,529,617
1962	369,882,984	159,831,522	529,714,506
1963	295,635,031	140,487,013	436,122,044
1964	275,465,307	151,828,277	427,293,584
Total	3,322,558,480	1,291,901,006	4,614,459,486

[1] This includes active fleet overhauls, MSTS work, Naval Reserve and District craftwork, inactivations, FRAM (MK–II) work, interim availabilities and Reserve Fleet work.
[2] This represents work performed in the continental naval shipyards; i.e., excludes Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard.
[3] Value of repair work performed at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in fiscal year 1964, $39,371,000.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7657. This is a complete bill which has been carefully and thoroughly considered by our committee. The committee has unanimously adopted this proposal and we trust the House will do likewise. It merits the support of every Member.

I simply wish to say, as has been made clear this afternoon, that under the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of our committee [Mr. RIVERS], and under the leadership on our side of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], the affairs of our committee are in good hands. We have a splendid, extraordinarily fine committee. The addition of the new Members has been the addition of an asset to the committee. We work as a unit. We work as a team. We work constructively and objectively for the best interests of our country. There are no politics on our committee. We have a job to do. We do it.

I repeat that the events this afternoon have shown the job is being done under this type of leadership. We are hopeful we can continue this record as time goes on. We shall exert every effort to that end.

I congratulate the chairman and the ranking Republican on the committee for the job they are doing.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the committee, so much time as he may consume.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, my dear and respected friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has given a lucid and persuasive description of what this bill will do.

There is little to add to what he has had to say and I rise to give my full and unequivocal support for this bill.

The chairman has indicated, and others, I am sure, will state that we held long and detailed and even sometimes arduous hearings on this bill. We examined every element of it—and there are literally hundreds of these elements.

We shaved a bit here; we added something there, as is our prerogative and our obligation. The bill is in a large measure a reflection of the request made by the executive branch. This is by no means surprising since, as presented, it was a well-considered, well-distributed, and finely balanced program.

Our disagreements with it were small in total amount. I think our addition of the nuclear guided missile frigate was a most significant improvement to the bill. Our addition of $7 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft was similarly significant. The Armed Services Committee has a long and well-documented history of insisting that manned aircraft be part of our inventory. It has a similar record in support of nuclear power for surface ships. Our great chairman is particularly knowledgeable in these and in all other fields.

Now, these were the only additions we made to the bill and both of them were unanimously agreed to by the committee.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee for the outstanding leadership which he showed throughout our hearings. It was nothing less than we on the committee and you in the House would expect. His deft hand guided us throughout the hearings and his attitude was at all times one of full disclosure to the committee of such information as might have come to him personally as chairman of the commiteee.

We welcomed 13 new members of the committee this year and it was a most gratifying experience to witness the vigor, ability, and interest which all of them showed during the hearings on this bill. They readily conceded that they were in a learning process, but I will say this for them—and for all of them—they learned quickly and contributed very markedly to the well-balanced bill which you have before you today.

There is no need of stressing the importance of this bill. The $15 billion which it will authorize in appropriations is part of the price we must pay to maintain ourselves in a difficult and dangerous world. It is small enough a price. For if we fail, all is lost. We are the leader of the free world. We must maintain that position of leadership and this bill is nothing more and nothing less than

one of the manifestations of our intention to maintain our position of leadership in the world.

To reiterate: I want to laud and thank the great able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, our dear, distinguished, and esteemed friend, Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, for his outstanding leadership in bringing this bill to the floor of the House, and I want to commend and praise my dear friend and able, distinguished colleague, Mr. BATES, and all the members of the committee, without regard to party or rank, who have worked so earnestly and tirelessly to bring this bill to the floor. The bill is indeed a tribute to them, as it is in such large measure to the great new leader of the House Armed Services Committee and our very diligent, capable staff. Particularly impressive to me, and I am sure to Members of the House, is the united front shown at this time by all the members of the committee behind the leadership of our distinguished chairman.

I will not discuss the details of this bill. As I see it, the bill presents no major controversial features and no special legislative problems, and I hope and urge that the House, when it works its will on the bill, as it will, and should, will take overwhelming favorable action, and thus by that action, and other action we have been called upon to take today, indicate our unswerving, nonpartisan, patriotic support of current national policy as enunciated by our great leader, the President of the United States.

These are days of upset and deadly peril. Make no mistake about that. And these are truly hours of decision, crucial decision, not only for the President, but for every Member of this body and the Congress.

We will indicate here today where we stand—whether we are determined to make our effective contribution to the cause of national security, and freedom in the world, or whether we propose to temporize, delay, and bog down in indecision, timidity, and lack of resolution.

Knowing the Members of this body as I do, I do not have the slightest doubt as to what their answer will be. This House will reaffirm, reinforce, and give new, forceful expression to its oft-expressed determination to keep this Nation in a state of readiness to confront every danger to the national safety and our free way of life.

The bill is of incredible complexity and rests principally upon highest expert and scientific knowledge. It authorizes defense procurement and research and development test and evaluation. In round terms, it authorizes the huge sum of about $15 billion for defense programs for the fiscal year 1966. These authorizations for appropriation are in three categories: first, for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; secondly, for research, development, test, and evaluation; thirdly, for all other research, development, test, and evaluation within the Department of Defense.

The bill was unanimously reported by the committee and is brought to the floor pursuant to the constitutional mandate to the Congress of providing for the defense of the United States.

In a different time, the committee would have been able to make some substantial cuts in these requests, but in view of present and developing world conditions, it can be well understood that that course was not practicable, sound, or wise, and that fact is fortified by the fresh request from the President for an additional $700 million to take care of the present crisis in Vietnam and in this hemisphere, forced upon this freedom-loving Nation by the gigantic world Communist conspiracy.

The bill authorizes large numbers of aircraft and missiles for all military services and an abundant number of new ships for the Navy as well as certain conversions of Navy ships.

It provides large numbers of vessels for all the services. It provides for a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate for the Navy which this committee believes is in the interest of a modernized naval program.

Without going into detail, I may state that the modern armament provided for the services is most impressive, both with respect to conventional weapons and the application of nuclear power, in broad categories of our defense setup. In every field covered by the bill, we have made authorizations and provisions that we believe are consonant with and necessary to the national defense. I believe that we have taken appropriate, essential action to fortify and strengthen the underlying research, development and test, and evaluation programs that are so vital to the building of new weapons, ships, aircraft, missiles, and everything that we need in these crucial times to maintain the impressive strength and superiority of our Armed Forces.

I am sure that every Member of this House is not only interested, but determined, to keep our defenses at the high levels needed to provide for every contingency that may develop in this dangerous, troubled world.

All of us want peace. The world yearns for peace. As Americans, we have no territorial ambitions, no desire to interfere in the affairs of other nations, no dictatorial aims, no imperialistic purposes. We are prepared at all times to negotiate with all those who are willing to negotiate in an honest, truthful, reasonable manner to settle the perilous questions of peace or war.

We will continue to seek, and we will welcome, every opportunity to make and to establish enduring peace in this world.

The weak will not be tyrannized, overrun, or exploited by ruthless, dictatorial forces seeking to destroy freedom and impress a bestial Communist serfdom upon mankind.

Today we have another opportunity to record our intention and our determination to stand up and be counted, not only in the defense of our country, but in defense of human freedom, human decency and human well-being and, above all, for the security and the safety of this great country which means so much to all of us and which we propose to defend and protect.

I have no doubt where this House will stand, and I want to thank and compliment my esteemed colleagues for their keen awareness of our national defense problems and their strong determination to protect the Nation and the cause of freedom. Let no one misinterpret this determination.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7657 and urge the adoption of this legislation as reported by the committee.

The number and type of weapons authorized in this annual bill are naturally governed chiefly by the level of military preparedness the current world situation demands. The adversaries of freedom have made tremendous progress in the technology of mass destruction. We must, therefore, more than ever before in our history, have in our military inventory sufficient weapons and force to survive a massive nuclear attack and to deliver a decisive counterblow.

The unswerving determination of those who direct the Communist conspiracy to attain their announced goals convincingly proves that we cannot risk letting down our guard. We must remain sufficiently strong to insure that no other nation would ever consider challenging our full military potential.

Further, our national defense effort, to be truly effective, must be based on a balanced and flexible military force—a force that can be employed at any time and at any place, either wholly or in part, to effectively counter any type of aggression, be it guerrilla warfare or nuclear attack.

The need for a strong and flexible military force is illustrated by the turbulence in which we are now involved on two far-reaching fronts—the new and unexpected rebellion in the Dominican Republic, 600 miles off U.S. shores, and the ever-increasing involvement and danger we face in the Vietnamese struggle, 6,500 miles away.

I commend the President for his decisive action in dispatching troops early and swiftly to Santo Domingo. The action he took to protect the lives and property of American citizens was justified, and we fully support him. There are signs that people trained outside the Dominican Republic are seeking to gain control there. It is entirely likely that our prompt military action will prevent a new Communist presence in this hemisphere, and we have seen in Cuba the ominous implications of such a presence.

Cuba remains an outpost of Soviet penetration into Latin America, fomenting trouble, acting as a source of supply and inspiration to bands of rebels, saboteurs, and subversives throughout Latin America. The threat to the United States and Latin America is clear and present.

Control of a Latin American government by a Communist regime tied to the Soviet bloc is contrary to the interests of the nations of this hemisphere. The

Monroe Doctrine has expressed for more than a century and a quarter the well-established American principle of self-defense against intervention by extra-hemispheric powers. Today, both history and need justify retention and enforcement of that principle. The action taken by the President in the Dominican Republic renews our faith in the Monroe Doctrine.

I also support the policy of retaliatory strikes and stepped-up military activity to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. I was pleased to join with my colleagues in supporting the request of the President for an additional $700 million for the current fiscal year to meet mounting military requirements in Vietnam. South Vietnam's struggle against communism is inseparably linked with the other Communist-caused conflicts in the area, and we must not back down from our commitment there.

Our increasing worldwide commitments point up more than ever the need for a follow-on manned bomber. Under the plans of the Department of Defense, work on a new manned bomber will be limited to developmental effort on a new design, advanced avionics, and an advanced propulsion system, expenditures for which will total $39 million in fiscal year 1966. In addition, development work on a new short-range attack missile that could be used on such an aircraft will be begun.

The committee has provided an additional $7 million in an attempt to encourage entrance upon the project definition phase of this development in fiscal year 1966, as unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have frequently expressed the opinion that it is important to expedite work on a new manned bomber to replace the aging B–52 fleet, and I still believe it is a matter of urgency to hasten the development of a new manned aircraft that can meet the optimum performance characteristics that the Air Force requires today.

We must be able to rapidly deploy general purpose forces to trouble spots around the world. In this connection, the decision to develop and procure the C–5A cargo transport aircraft will strengthen our capabilities to transport combat forces by air. Developmental work has started on this new, very large capacity airlift aircraft, and this bill provides $157 million for fiscal year 1966 to continue this effort.

Among the significant characteristics of the C–5A are the low operating costs as compared to present transport aircraft; the ability to transport bulky items of military equipment such as Army M–60 tanks, helicopters, missiles and other items too large for existing aircraft. An estimated 600 troops per aircraft could be carried. In addition, the C–5A will be capable of operating from relatively small, unimproved airfields.

By way of comparison, our largest current military transport, the C–141, has a gross takeoff weight of about 330,000 pounds. The C–5A will have a gross takeoff weight of approximately 725,000 pounds, or more than twice that of the C–141. This will greatly increase our mobility, reduce our reaction time and thereby strengthen our capability to meet crises wherever and whenever they may occur. We must be able to move our men and materiel quickly and expeditiously to the points in the world at which they will be used. This new aircraft will be able to carry all of the equipment of a combat division.

The C–5A represents many firsts in concept, design, and procurement. The sheer size of this aircraft almost defies the imagination. This will be the largest aircraft ever built in the world. The largest aircraft now operating is the XB–70 at about 500,000 pounds.

I believe it is very noteworthy that the C–5A will have for the first time an engine designed specifically for a cargo aircraft. The General Electric Co., Flight Propulsion Division in Evendale, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Pratt & Whitney of Hartford, Conn., received study contracts as well as demonstrator engine and design verification advanced development contracts.

The C–5A will be powered by four new high-bypass ratio turbofan engines of approximately 40,000 pound thrust. The General Electric design—GE1–6—represents major advances in propulsion technology and will provide significant reductions in specific fuel consumption. I would like to take this opportunity to commend GE for the impressive progress they have made in their demonstrator engine program for this aircraft.

General Electric's contender in the engine competition for the C–5A is a large turbofan engine based on the proven technology of a family of high performance aircraft gas turbines dating all the way back to the famous General Electric J–47 engine that powers both the B–47 and the F–86. Design principles that have been proved in nearly 45 million flight hours experience of GE turbine engines have been incorporated in the GE1–6 for the C–5A.

Because of the U.S. Air Force requirements for C–5A operational reliability, the Evendale designed GE1–6 is a workhorse of an engine that advances the state of the art without taking revolutionary risk steps. All of the design, production, and operational philosophies incorporated in the GE1–6 have been demonstrated by General Electric Flight Propulsion Division in engines such as the J–47, J–79, J–93, as well as a GE1–6 demonstrator engine that has been run in Evendale test cells. The GE1–6 engine will be produced in the same Evendale facilities and use the same highly skilled personnel that are currently producing the J–79 engine that powers such famous aircraft as the B–58, F–104, F–4, and A–5.

Since the engine selection will take place concurrently with the airframe selection, each of the three airframe contractors will propose designs utilizing both the General Electric and the Pratt & Whitney engine. After selection the engines will be provided to the airframe contractors as Government furnished equipment.

Although a decision on the question of producing and deploying the Nike X ballistic missile defense system has been deferred until 1967, I am gratified that approximately $400 million is included in the bill for continued development of the components of this system. This reflects an increase over last year of approximately $83 million.

The primary components of the Nike X system consist of a multifunction array radar, missile site radars, long-range Zeus missiles, short-range Sprint missiles and sophisticated data processing equipment. The Sprint will provide the predominant firepower of the Nike X system. This quick-reaction, high-acceleration missile will permit the defense to delay interceptor launch until the target reenters the atmosphere, making full use of the effects of the Earth's atmosphere in identifying objects accompanying the warhead.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance has assured our committee that the Army is proceeding as rapidly as possible on the research and development on the Nike X. I strongly hope the Army will continue to concentrate on this program so that an effective antiballistic missile system can be deployed at the earliest date.

The authorization for the expenditure of the funds provided in this bill and the purposes for which they will be spent will enable us to remain the strongest Nation in the world militarily.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to speak, first of all, in support of this legislation, which I do support wholeheartedly. I believe this bill is adequate to meet our needs in a dangerous world. And I want to join in the expressions of support and commendation that have been directed toward the chairman of our committee for the excellent job he has done in steering this legislation through our committee and for his brilliant presentation here today before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union with regard to what our beloved Speaker has already pointed out is the first major bill to come from this committee under his able leadership.

I also rise, somewhat reluctantly, Mr. Chairman, because of the lateness of the hour, to clarify what I think might otherwise be a matter of some confusion on the part of Members of the House because of a communication on this bill which I sent out to them back in March. Without some such clarification on my part I am afraid this issue might remain up in the air. My letter dealt, as Members will recall, with my views on an originally projected reduction of some $504.6 million in the very vital research and development funds for the Department of Defense in this authorization legislation for fiscal 1966. At that time I circulated my views on this projected cut to all the Members of the House and asked for their support in the effort I intended to make to restore them on the floor of the House when this authorization bill came up. Since I now support the bill, perhaps in fairness to those Members who had indicated their support for those original views, and there were many of them, I ought to indicate

what has transpired in the meantime. To do that let me run very briefly over the chronology connected with this bill.

On March 23, the committee first voted to report this legislation out as H.R. 6650. That bill did include a number of changes from the original budget request made by the Department of Defense to the House, and embodied in H.R. 4016. One of those changes was the drastic reduction of $504.6 million in research and development funds to which I have referred. I was the only member of the committee to oppose that cut. I felt it was dangerous. I felt it would be unwise in view of our current commitment in Vietnam. Therefore, I announced my intention to file additional views with the committee. The report had already been ordered written and filed, and I was asked to file those additional views with the committee staff by the 26th of March, which I did. Those views are as follows:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. STRATTON ON H.R. 6650

While I support this legislation I am deeply concerned over the likely results of the committee's action in substantially reducing the original Defense Department request, particularly its reduction of over one-half billion dollars in long-range defense research and development funds. In my judgment this action represents an unwarranted and unnecessary risk with our national safety, not merely for the next fiscal year but for many years to come as we strive to maintain our present edge of military superiority over the forces of communism. It is, moreover, a risk which in my judgment has been taken without any rational basis.

The budget submitted by the Department this year was one of the tightest in recent memory, a whopping $1 billion below the figures for last year. Testimony before the committee disclosed time and time again that individual services had requested funds for additional weapons or research projects which the Department denied in bringing in its final budget at this austere, reduced figure. Individual members of the committee frequently questioned the soundness of these cutbacks. Under the circumstances the wisdom of making still further reductions in such a budget escapes me.

Why the overwhelming bulk of these reductions should come at the expense of research and development is even more puzzling. To be sure, R. & D. funds do not represent specific hardware presently in hand. Budget cuts in R. & D. funds do not show up immediately in reduced service inventories or in seriously limited capabilities on the battlefield. On this basis attractive savings are possible without any readily apparent reduction in combat readiness.

Yet the implications for the future are devastating. After all, R. & D. is the seedbed of future military superiority. It is not enough for us to be ahead of the Russians and the Chinese today or even tomorrow. We must, at our peril, also make certain that we are still ahead of them 5, 10, or 20 years from now. And the time to insure that future superiority is now, not 5, 10, or 20 years from now. That of course is the precise purpose of defense research and development. We can be profoundly grateful that our efforts in this field thus far have yielded us an impressive superiority of just this variety. But we can hardly be optimistic about the future if we reduce the austere submissions of the Defense Department this year by a half a billion dollars—in fact by 8 percent of the full R. & D. request—simply because the damage done by such action may not be readily visible today or even tomorrow.

Over and over again in the past few years, on the floor of Congress, on the platform, and in the public prints, distinguished Members of the House and Senate have charged that the Defense Department has actually been neglecting research and development, and has failed to come up with an adequate number of new weapons and new military inventions.

I do not of course admit the validity of these charges. But I cannot think of a surer way to make them come true in the years ahead than by permitting such massive cuts in R. & D. funds as those proposed here to go unchallenged.

Moreover, these R. & D. cuts have been made without any real rationale. The committee's action appears to be a classic example of what has been called the meat-axe approach to budgeting. Reductions in research and development, in contrast to reductions in procurement, have not been directed towards specific projects of which the committee disapproves. They have not in fact been directed at specific projects at all. They were simply made on the basis of an arbitrary determination that the Department's R. & D. effort for fiscal 1966 in monetary terms ought not to exceed the 1965 effort.

Why not? Have conditions bearing on our national security altered between fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1966 or have they not? Has the power balance shifted one way or the other? Are some proposed R. & D. projects less urgent than they were 12 months ago? The committee does not answer these questions. In fact it does not even ask them. Its action turns out to be pure bookkeeping, intended to achieve a certain level of budget reduction by matching one set of figures against another largely unrelated set. To my mind this is a totally unacceptable risk for us to take.

The fact is that the increases proposed in the R. & D. budget submission for fiscal 1966 were not arbitrary. They represented a series of specific defense projects, all presented to us as urgently needed. To reject these requests would seem to require, at the very least, a positive judgment from the committee that these projects are in fact unnecessary and should be abandoned.

Yet even a cursory review of some of the projects which represent the monetary increases in R. & D. over fiscal 1965 fails to show that they should be abandoned. One of them, for example, is the Nike X, our latest anti-ballistic-missile missile system. With increasing reports that the Soviets are moving to develop a system of this kind of their own, can we reasonably say that an increased effort here is improper and should be curtailed? I think not.

Another increase involves improvements in the Navy's spectacularly successful Fleet Ballistic Missile system, including development of the new FBM missile referred to the other day by the President, the Poseidon. Can we safely scuttle development of this new weapon? I think not.

Increases have been proposed for new developments in the field of anti-submarine warfare (ASW), long regarded by the Navy as one of its most urgent tasks, particularly in view of the vast numbers of Soviet submarines currently roaming the sea lanes of the world. Can we safely do away with these new ASW developments—new sonars, new torpedoes, and so forth? I think not.

President Johnson recently announced at a White House press conference that steps are soon to be undertaken to develop a huge new transport aircraft, capable of ferrying 700 troops to combat hotspots around the world at a rate of deployment far in excess of that presently available. This is the C–5A aircraft, and it too accounts for an increase in budgeted R. & D. funds for 1966. Do we tell the President that we refuse to authorize funds for this new plane, and believe its development should be scuttled? I think not.

Perhaps the most curious aspect of the committee's action involves the development of a new follow-on bomber, the so-called advanced manned strategic aircraft (AMSA). Last year the committee overrode the objections of the Department to include $52 million of additional funds in the budget for stepped-up development of this new bomber. This year the Department has itself requested an increase in funds to continue development of this plane in which the committee was so deeply interested last year. Is the committee now to repudiate its decision of last year and deny the Department funds for development of a bomber which it forced on the Department only a year ago? I think not. Yet unless the committee's decision to eliminate all R. & D. increases over the 1965 figure is reversed, this will certainly be the effect of the committee's action.

For all these reasons, therefore, I oppose the reductions made in defense research and development and urge that the $504.6 million cut by the committee be restored.

I might also point out that on the 23d of March the committee staff issued a press release detailing the committee's action taken that morning, including its decision with respect to the cut in research and development funds, and quoting the chairman as saying action by the committee "had been completed" on the bill. That release is included at this point:

PRESS RELEASE, MARCH 23, 1965

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, announced today that his committee had completed action on H.R. 4016, an annual bill which authorizes the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and all research and development for the Department of Defense.

The bill as it was submitted to the Congress totaled $15,297,200,000.

Only one money addition was made in the procurement portion of the bill and that reflected the action of the committee in adding a guided missile nuclear frigate at a cost of $150.5 million.

Numerous money deletions were made totaling $654,179,260. Of this amount $504.6 million was in the research and development portion of the bill and a little less than $150 million in procurement.

The cuts in procurement reflected decreases in the Iroquois helicopter, the Shillelagh missile, and in the area of aircraft spares and repair parts and in support facilities for some Air Force missiles.

In research and development, the cut, in essence, held the amount of money for the items decreased to the same amount of money as approved last year.

Chairman RIVERS, stated that the overall decrease prior to the addition of the $150.5 million nuclear guided missile frigate was only about 4 percent.

He was firm in his statement that the Department of Defense would be in no way adversely affected by the carefully considered cuts which were made. He stated that, "We have merely accepted the responsibility to examine this proposal submitted by the Department of Defense in the closest possible detail. I can stand behind and justify with no trouble whatsoever each one of our actions, whether up or down."

He went on to say, "Indeed, I feel that we have a substantially better bill today than we had at the time it was presented to the Congress."

Mr. RIVERS also indicated that certain nonmonetary amendments were made to the bill which would repeal the outstanding old ship tonnage authorizations of the Navy which total over 3.3 million tons. He said

that this tonnage is no longer useful to the Navy in view of the enactment of laws during the past few years, and that the expensive bookkeeping efforts of the Navy would be eliminated by the amendment.

Also in the area of naval vessels, he said that an amendment preserved the requirement that combatant ships be constructed alternately in Navy and private shipyards and that the restriction which has appeared in appropriations acts over the past few years which limited the amount of ship repair, alteration and conversion that could be done in naval shipyards was eliminated for the future by amendment. This, he said, was a step in the right direction since it permits the Navy to weigh only economic and military considerations in the distribution of this kind of work.

Other amendments require that tanks and other similar combat vehicles must be authorized specifically before appropriations can be made, and an emergency fund which usually approximates $150 million for research and development must now be authorized prior to appropriation.

He indicated that he was gratified by the acceptance by the committee of an amendment which changed the name of the Military Air Transport Service to the Military Airlift Command.

Mr. RIVERS said, "I think we have a very good bill. I am pleased with the action that the committee has taken. We all worked very hard over a period of many weeks. And there is no shortcut to good legislation."

The net reduction in the bill was $503,679,260. The new total of the bill is $14,793,520,740.

The following morning in the New York Times, as well as in other newspapers, there appeared an account to this effect by the Associated Press. I include the New York Times report here:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1965]

HOUSE PANEL CUTS DEFENSE REQUEST—$14.8 BILLION IS AUTHORIZED AFTER $654 MILLION SLASH

WASHINGTON, March 23.—The House Armed Services Committee voted today to authorize $14,793 million for new aircraft, missiles, and ships after slashing $654 million from Defense Department requests.

The measure also includes a major addition—$150.5 million for a second nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate.

Research and development bore the brunt of the economy drive. A total of $504.6 million was cut from Pentagon proposals in this category.

Reductions of a little less than $150 million were made in the amount for procurement of weapons and equipment.

The committee chairman, L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, said in a statement that the committee had, in effect, decided that research and development costs for the fiscal year 1966, which starts July 1, should be held at current levels.

The procurement decreases reflected cutbacks in Iroquois helicopters, the Army's Shillelagh missile, and Air Force spare and repairs parts and support facilities.

The committee approved an amendment to eliminate the current 35–65 percent split between private and Government yards in getting ship repair, alteration, and conversion jobs. The House rejected such a move last year, and another round of controversy is likely in the Senate and House Appropriations Committee.

PUTS LIMIT ON NAVY

Mr. RIVERS said the amendment—which rejects the position taken by the Appropriations Committees—would permit the Navy "to weigh only economic and military considerations in the distribution of this kind of work."

However, the Armed Services Committee, taking into account Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's announced decision to curtail Government shipyard operations, approved continuation of the policy that alternates new ship construction between private and Federal yards.

Other amendments would require specific authorizations before appropriations can be made for tanks and similar combat vehicles and for the Pentagon's $150 million emergency fund for research and development.

The committee also approved a change in name for the Military Air Transport Service, making it the Military Airlift Command.

Mr. RIVERS said the Defense Department "would be in no way adversely affected by the carefully considered cuts which were made."

He announced his readiness to "stand behind and justify with no trouble whatsoever each one of our actions, whether up or down."

Authorizing action by both the House and the Senate sets money and policy ceilings for later appropriations of actual funds.

Mr. Chairman, because I felt so strongly that the committee had acted unwisely and in haste on this research and development matter, I not only filed these additional views with the staff for the report, but in an effort to enlist the strongest possible support from my colleagues in the House, I circulated a mimeographed copy of these views to every Member and asked for their support, as I have already mentioned. My covering letter, dated March 29, is included at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Within the next week or so the House will be considering H.R. 6650, the Defense Department authorization bill for fiscal 1966.

Because of the tremendous importance of a strong research and development effort in defense I thought you might be interested in looking at the attached additional views of mine which I am appending to the committee report.

If, after reading them, you should agree with me, I would greatly appreciate your support in the effort to restore these needed funds to the bill.

Cordially,

SAM.

I also made a copy of those views available to the press. As one member of the committee, I fully recognized that I would need a good deal of help from my colleagues if we were to forestall what I felt would have been a mistaken action on the part of the committee and of the House. Many Members wrote to tell me they supported my position.

Mr. Chairman, what happened thereafter I cannot entirely say with authority, but one thing was clear: The issue of the wisdom of these cuts had been clearly raised, not only with Members of the House, but also with the general public. I include here three press reports on the issue, one from the New York Herald Tribune for March 28, one from the New York Times for March 29, and one from the Navy Times for April 7:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

PENTAGON RESISTS ARMS SLASHES BY HOUSE

(By Laurence Barrett)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Department officials said yesterday that cuts in the new defense budget recommended Tuesday by the House Armed Services Committee would seriously hamper the development of several new military projects.

These officials, who declined to be identified, said they would appeal to the Senate to restore most of the reductions. The House committee, under the new chairmanship of Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, trimmed $654 million from an authorization measure of more than $15 billion covering procurement of aircraft, missiles, and ships plus research and development programs. Of the $654 million, $504.6 million came from the R. & D. category.

One committee member, Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York, sided with the Pentagon yesterday. He denounced the committee's meat-ax approach to the R. & D. program.

"Over and over again in the past few years," Representative STRATTON said, "* * * distinguished Members of the House and Senate have charged that the Defense Department has actually been neglecting research and development * * * I do not, of course, admit the validity of these charges. But I cannot think of a surer way to make them come true in the years ahead than by permitting such massive cuts in R. & D. funds."

The authorization bill that came out of the Rivers committee did not dictate precisely which projects should be cut back. Instead, it reduced R. & D. funds by 8 percent and recommended that there be no increases in specific projects above the current year's spending level. The new budget takes effect July 1.

Pentagon sources said this approach would impede the development of projects that would soon be moving from very preliminary to more advanced stages. Among these are the C–5A super transport, the Poseidon submarine missile (scheduled to replace the Polaris eventually), a number of antisubmarine devices and antiballistic missile systems.

Disclosure of the Pentagon's attitude and the Stratton statement pointed up the growing hostility between the majority of the House committee, led by Mr. RIVERS, and the Pentagon leadership and its House partisans.

Representative RIVERS succeeded from Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, to the powerful committee chairmanship in January. Since then, Representative RIVERS has shown much more aggressiveness than his predecessor, and has challenged Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara on a number of key issues. Representative RIVERS feels the committee should take a more active part in forming defense policies. Mr. McNamara, a man of equally strong will, has his own ideas on this score.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1965]

PENTAGON FIGHTS TO RESTORE FUNDS FOR RESEARCH

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, March 28.—The growing dispute over whether enough money goes for military research to produce new weapons has taken an ironic turn: The administration is fighting to stave off a congressional slash of more than a half-billion dollars in the Pentagon's research budget.

In recent years there have been widespread complaints that the administration has been too conservative in its outlays for weapons development. The election campaign last fall produced charges that, because of this, no significant new weapons had been produced since Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara took over at the Pentagon.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, emphasized the charges of "research conservatism" in a speech last Thursday, when he received the Forrestal Award of the National Security Industrial Association.

General LeMay, who fought unsuccessfully for years for increased investments in bombers, missiles and space weapons, cited what he called the "current conservatism in the Department of Defense growing out of economic consideration."

He said the roster of military and civilian conservatives included:

Those who believe it would be "more economical to invest a little more in improving existing weapons, rather than in developing new ones."

Scientists who see little chance of important weapons achievements in the near future and suggest that "the scientific community needs a short breathing spell."

Politicians who argue that new weapons would "automatically trigger the U.S.S.R. to undertake still more costly programs for countering our weapons, and so on up the never-ending spiral."

The general called for a reappraisal of military research and development policies in the light of Soviet space and Communist Chinese nuclear advances.

Dr. Klaus Knorr, director of the Center of International Studies at Princeton University, and Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, an economist and writer on defense affairs, also criticized these policies in a wide-ranging "policy memorandum" just issued by the center.

COST POLICIES SCORED

Among their criticisms, they charged that:

Secretary McNamara's renowned cost-effectiveness policies "may be excessive and constitute an overreaction to the previous lack" of such policies with the result that they "may act as too sharp a brake on the innovating process."

An overzealous Department of Defense has in recent years permitted less and less opportunity for healthy rivalry in research and through "something close to a stranglehold on the military services" has shackled rather than fostered the spirit of innovation.

The Defense Department's "fiscal overanxiousness" and rigid insistence upon clear-cut military requirements for proposed research "may kill off too many new ideas before their value can be sufficiently established."

A $500 MILLION CUT VOTED

In contrast, with these complaints, the House Armed Services Committee voted last Thursday to cut the Pentagon's research and development request by more than $500 million.

The Pentagon had asked for an authorization of $6.5 billion, $115 million more than last year. The committee approved an authorization of $5.9 billion, $400 million less than last year, with the explanation that it wanted to keep military spending down.

Pentagon officials believe the cut is very serious. Mr. McNamara will undoubtedly appeal to the Senate Armed Services Committee to restore it, but the consensus is that even if some restorations are eventually made in the Senate the usual compromise of a Senate-House conflict over budget items will keep the total below the original request.

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of upstate New York, noted an irony in the action of the House panel, which he, as a member, had opposed. He said that the reductions would inevitably affect some projects that are highly favored in Congress.

Among these are research for an antiballistic-missile defense system, an improved Polaris missile known as the Poseidon, improved antisubmarine warfare weapons, the highly touted MOL (manned orbital laboratory), and the planned 700-man C–5A jet cargo plane that President Johnson announced with a flourish last summer.

One of the research projects affected by the committee move, Mr. STRATTON emphasized, is the manned bomber for which the House panel last year had voted more funds than the Pentagon wanted.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1965]

RESEARCH CUT COULD BE HALF OF PAY RAISE

(By Robert S. Horowitz)

WASHINGTON.—Half the money needed for a billion-dollar military pay raise was "found" this week by the House Armed Services Committee.

The committee chopped $654 million out of the Pentagon request for procurement money, most of the cut coming out of requests for more research and development money. The committee added $150.5 million for construction of the Navy's third nuclear guided missile frigate, making a net cut of $503.7 million—about half the cost of the pay raise called for in a bill sponsored by all but three members of the committee.

About $300 million already is budgeted for a pay raise.

While the procurement authorization bill technically has nothing to do with a pay raise, committee sources made it clear that the forthcoming pay raise was in the minds of committee members when the half billion dollar cut was made. Hearings on a new pay scale will start in about a month, after the committee has had time to study the recommendations of the President's pay panel.

This week's action was on a bill to "authorize" procurement of aircraft, missiles, ships and research for the coming year. Congress still has to provide the money but the appropriations committees cannot go above the figures in the authorization bill.

The measure authorizes the spending of $14.7 billion next fiscal year on military procurement. Aside from research and development, the services suffered very few cuts.

The committee cut $30 million out of the Air Force's requests for airplane spare and repair parts. Air Force also lost $5 million in industrial facilities and $25 million in missile support money.

The Navy lost $49 million from its request for airplane spare and repair parts, but gained the $150.5 million for the nuclear ship, which means a net gain of about $100 million (except for R. & D.).

The Army lost $35.5 million worth of Iroquois helicopters and $5 million in Shillelagh missile funds.

While the committee cut $504.6 million from the three services' R. & D. money, no service was cut below this year's R. & D. budget on specific projects. In cases where the Pentagon requested less money for an R. & D. project than is being spent this year, the committee granted the Pentagon's request. In most cases where the Pentagon asked for more than is being spent this year, the request was trimmed back to this year's spending level.

There were immediate reports that the Pentagon would seek to restore some of the research money when the bill is considered in the Senate.

This puts a twist on the annual struggle—in recent years Congress has complained that the Pentagon failed to put enough effort into developing new weapons. The lawmakers this week trimmed some projects that Congress has supported for years—including antimissile defense, antisubmarine warfare projects, an improved Polaris, and the 700-passenger troop-cargo plane.

One controversial feature of the authorization bill (H.R. 6650) involves shipyards. The committee scrapped a requirement that the Navy give at least 35 percent of its ship repair work to private yards. This was rejected by the House last year, and the subject is certain to get thrashed out again in the House Appropriations Committee.

Another section of the bill adds tracked combat vehicles to the list of military hardware which will not be bought without Armed Services Committee approval, even if the Appropriations Committee comes up with the money. It thus clamps controls on the purchase of Army and Marine tanks, armored personnel carriers, tracked howitzers, Ontos rocket vehicles, and similar equipment. It does not apply to bulldozers and construction vehicles.

The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, for example, approved the Department's request for research funds on March 30 with a reduction of only $13 million as the attached news report from the New York Times for April 1 indicates:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1965]

SENATORS REVIVE NEW-BOMBER BID—PANEL APPROVES $82 MILLION NOT ASKED BY PENTAGON

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The Senate Armed Services Committee resumed today a campaign in Congress for a new manned bomber, which the administration has opposed.

The committee approved a $15,284 million military authorization bill. It provided all but $13 million the administration requested for military procurement and research and development.

But the committee bill varied in many particulars from the administration request. The most outstanding difference was the addition of an unrequested $82 million to speed the development of the new bomber.

Congress for several years has voted millions of dollars for a program to develop and build successor planes to the B–52 and B–58, whose production lines were shut down in 1962.

But Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, in both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, had refused to spend the money. Instead he has allocated relatively small amounts to carry on a bomber building research program.

HAD ASKED $15 MILLION

In this year's request for the Pentagon, the administration sought only $15 million in new funds and $24 million in unused past spending authority to carry on a modest bomber research program.

The Senate committee also added an unrequested $133.6 million to build two more nuclear-powered attack submarines than had been included in the administration proposal.

The Pentagon called for authorization of 4 new attack submarines, in addition to the 57 that have been authorized previously. The committee increased the new construction total to six.

These nuclear-powered attack submarines, similar to the *Thresher*, which accidentally sank 2 years ago, are intended to counter the growing Soviet submarine force. They are not to be confused with Polaris missile submarines.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, who is chairman of the committee, announced the committee action. He said:

"We think we have a very strong bill that meets the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

In its authorization, appropriations for which must be provided in a separate bill, the Senate committee differed on several important points with the military authorizations vote by the House Armed Services Committee last week.

Thus it appeared that even after the full Senate votes on the bill, probably next week, and the House acts on its version, also probably next week, a compromise conference will be required.

The House committee had cut $654 million, compared with the Senate panel's reduction of $13 million, in the administration request of $15,297,000,000.

The House committee also had slashed $654 million from the research request, compared with a Senate committee cut of $43.8 million.

But the Senate group's action on the manned bomber appeared to reduce the administration's flexibility in this respect.

HOUSE SHUNNED BOMBER

Ironically, the House panel, which 3 years ago led the fight for a manned bomber, this year did not, as in the past, include unwanted bomber authorization funds in its bill.

Another difference between the House and Senate committee versions developed when the Senate group did not propose a change in existing laws dealing with the allocations of ship construction work.

The House committee's bill directs that one of every two new naval ships must be built in Government's yards. In recent years, in support of private shipyards, the law requires that 35 percent of modernization and repair work be done in private yards.

Whatever was happening, it was apparent that forces were already underway to bring about a reconsideration of the committee's action before the bill could reach the House floor.

Originally H.R. 6650 had been scheduled to be considered on the floor of the House, as you may recall, during the Easter recess. However, we were later told on the floor that the committee was having some difficulty with the bill, and consideration during the Easter recess was therefore not undertaken.

I commented on these developments in my weekly report to my district scheduled for release on April 13 and predicted in it that most of these funds would somehow be restored before the bill was finally allowed to reach the floor. My report is as follows:

"SECOND THOUGHTS ON A MEAT AX": CONGRESSMAN STRATTON'S WEEKLY REPORT FROM WASHINGTON—NO. 14

Much of the important work of Congress is not done on the floor, with the galleries looking on, but in the individual committee rooms behind closed doors. Often some of the best stories take place there too. It was that way last week with our own House Armed Services Committee.

One important part of our committee's job is to pass on the President's defense budget, especially the sums he requests for buying new planes, ships, and missiles, and for research and development on new military inventions. It's our job to approve the authorization figure for these items, the top spending ceiling. The Appropriations Committee can go below that ceiling, but they can't go above it.

President Johnson came in with an especially tight defense budget this year, a whooping $2 billion under last year's figure. To help the President hold this budget line was one reason, you may recall, why I balked last month at cosponsoring a new billion dollar pay bill.

Two weeks ago our committee voted on the authorization bill. I was amazed when the committee leadership proposed we cut it by still another half billion, and make that cut mostly in research funds. After all, R. & D. is what keeps us ahead of the Russians. Cutting research funds now could hurt us badly 10 or 20 years from now. Was this the time to cut, I wondered, when the President has already pared the budget to the bone? Was this the time to cut, when the fighting is just heating up in Vietnam? No, I decided, and so I voted against the cuts, the only Member to do so, 36 to 1. Not only that, I filed a written report outlining what I felt were the grave military risks such a cut would involve. I sent out copies to my colleagues in the House, and to the press.

Then things began happening. The Defense Department was shocked by the committee's action, and said so. The White House found out about it, and they weren't happy either. The Senate, working on the same bill, decided not to wait for the House to act; they promptly passed their own version, making just a token cut of $13 million.

It's been more than 2 weeks now since our committee voted, yet our bill still isn't out. Last week the majority leader announced publicly that the committee was having "difficulties" with the bill and would be further delayed. What's up? I'm not sure because we haven't had a meeting since the meat-ax cut was voted. But I'd guess some effective pressures are being applied behind closed doors. And I'd be willing to bet that, somehow or other, before the bill ever gets to the floor, a good share of that missing half billion dollars will be back in it.

Swimming against the tide never makes you too popular in the congressional club, but I won't feel too bad if in this case one individual Member did have something to do with staving off a disastrous drop in our military superiority 10 years from now.

Two other articles appeared in the service press on this subject, reflecting what seemed to be a change in view. I include these here. One of them is an editorial from the April 10, 1965, issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces:

[From the Journal of the Armed Forces]

R. & D. CUTS ARE NO WAY TO FUND A PAY RAISE

There has been some disturbing talk during recent days which has linked a $654 million slash by the House Armed Services Committee in Defense procurement authorization requests—mostly in the research, development, test, and evaluation category—with military pay legislation. Actually, the committee made a net reduction of about $503 million, since it added $150 million for construction of a nuclear-powered frigate, sought by Navy leaders, but not supported by Secretary McNamara.

The case for a major adjustment in military pay is strong enough to stand squarely on its own merits. There is no need whatever to cripple weapons programs in order to eliminate inequities in service compensation.

The future strength of our Nation is tied closely to both a strong R. & D. program and to fair treatment for service people.

The other is a story by the Journal's congressional editor, Louis R. Stockstill, which appeared in the Journal for April 17, 1965, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE STRATTON MAY LOOK LIKE PROPHET

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York, is a courageous man.

In the 6 years since he first came to the Congress, the 38-year-old former mayor of Schenectady repeatedly has demonstrated that he is not afraid to walk alone.

Recently, when the House Armed Services Committee, of which he is the ninth-ranking majority member, voted to cut Pentagon R.D.T. & E. authority for fiscal 1966 by more than a half-billion dollars, Congressman STRATTON was the lone dissenter. The vote was 36 to 1.

Subsequent events may make him look like a prophet.

Each year, the Armed Services Committees must authorize the expenditure of DOD funds for procurement of major weapons—aircraft, ships, and missiles—and for research, developments, test, and engineering activities.

After the authorization bill is approved, the Appropriations Committees then provide actual funds. But the purse-string groups cannot OK money for anything the Armed Services Committees have not authorized, nor can they approve an amount greater than these committees have OK'd.

Generally, the procedure is fairly standard. This year, it developed complications.

When the House Armed Services Committee met several weeks ago to vote on the authorization bill, a cut of $504.6 million in R.D.T. & E. was proposed and approved. Congressman STRATTON voted in opposition to the slash, terming it a "meat-ax" approach made arbitrarily on the basis "that the Department's R. & D. effort for fiscal 1966 in monetary terms ought not to exceed the 1965 effort."

Congressman STRATTON filed a minority statement in which he said the damage created by the cut might not be "readily visible today or even tomorrow," but the "implications for the future are devastating.'

Committee arguments in favor of the cut were not known. No report was filed. As the weeks passed and the committee continued to remain silent, it seemed that others in high places may have had misgivings similar to those expressed by Congressman STRATTON and that behind-the-scenes pressures were being exerted to get the committee to change its mind.

This, as Congressman STRATTON himself has now revealed, is apparently what happened.

After he had filed his own report outlining "the grave military risks such a cut would involve" and had sent copies to his House colleagues and the press, "things began happening," he reports:

"The Defense Department was shocked by the committee's action, and said so. The White House found out about it, and they weren't happy either. The Senate, working on the same bill, decided not to wait for the House to act; they promptly passed their own version, making just a token cut of $13 million.

"It's been more than 2 weeks now since our committee voted, yet our bill still isn't out. Last week the majority leader announced publicly that the committee was having 'difficulties' with the bill and would be further delayed.

"What's up? I'm not sure because we haven't had a meeting since the meat-ax cut was voted. But I'd guess some effective pressures are being applied behind closed doors. And I'd be willing to bet that, somehow or other, before the bill ever gets to the floor, a good share of that missing half billion dollars will be back in it."

The Senate bill, which has been messaged to the House, contains, as Congressman STRATTON noted, an overall cut of $13.4 million, but this does not accurately reflect the full range of the Senate action. The Senators not only made some sizable reductions, they also made some sizable additions.

In the R.D.T. & A. area, the Senate reduced the Army program $8.5 million, the Navy program $10 million, and the Defense agency program $17 million. But, the Air Force program was substantially increased. The Senate added $82 million for "accelerated development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft."

For the Navy, the Senate chopped out $99.8 million for the procurement of 10 E–2A Hawkeye, carrier based, early warning aircraft, and added $48.4 million to the ship construction program by authorizing 6 nuclear-powered attack submarines instead of 4 requested by DOD, by eliminating 7 other ships.

The differences in the House and Senate bills probably will be easily resolved except for the R.D.T. & E. issue.

The latter problem has assumed staggering proportions for the House committee. If it insists on retaining the cut, it faces the possibility of being overruled by the House. If it restores a substantial portion of the

R.D.T. & E. authority before filing its report, the action will carry an implication of backing down under pressure.

How the dilemma will be solved is not known, but chances are that when the measure eventually reaches the White House most of the R.D.T. & E. program will be intact and Congressman STRATTON will have won his bet.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, the committee did meet again, on April 27, and did decide to reconsider its action taken on this bill on March 23. We ended up with the bill we now have before us, H.R. 7657, restoring all but $114 million of the $500 million originally cut out of R. & D. funds. I need hardly say that I was delighted with that reconsidered action. I fully supported the revised bill in the committee and I am happy, as I have already said, to support it fully here today.

Mr. Chairman, it takes a very big man indeed to be willing to change his mind. It takes a big man to be willing to listen to facts and to adjust his thinking when he is convinced that the facts do indeed justify it. Such a man is the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of our committee. It took a big man to do what he did with this bill. By restoring these funds to the bill he has done a massive job, in my opinion, toward assuring our continued military superiority over the Soviets. This Nation is in his debt today and as a member of the committee I salute him for his progressive, broad-gaged, and fairminded leadership of our committee.

It is certainly in the great, historic tradition of his predecessor, Carl Vinson, of the State of Georgia, and in keeping with the highest traditions of the House of Representatives.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I not only support this bill, but also urge all those Members of the House who indicated to me earlier that they shared my concern for the protection of adequate funds for military research and development to join with me today in voting for this greatly revised and vastly strengthened bill.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for H.R. 7657, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

However, I would like to urge my colleagues to restore the funds requested by the Department of Defense for military research and development.

Any cut in research and development funds at this time would seriously impair our future military superiority. We cannot take comfort in the fact that we are ahead of the Russians and the Chinese today. Rather, we must make certain that we are ahead of them tomorrow and in years to follow.

By authorizing the full $6,558,800,000 requested by the Department of Defense for military research and development in fiscal year 1966, we can insure our national safety and safeguard our military superiority. The budget submitted by the Department this year is one of the soundest yet. I fear that any reduction in R. & D. funds would put us in the position of being "penny wise and pound foolish." We might not immediately feel the effects of this unwise action, but we cannot afford to make any budget reductions that would jeopardize the security of this Nation and the free world.

Therefore, I urge the full $6,558,800,000 authorization requested by the Department of Defense for research and development.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, by now I have been a participant in hearings of the Armed Services Committee for a great many years and I have been a member of the committee from the time of the enactment of the basic law which requires this bill to be before the House today.

One would think that as the years went on it would become difficult to maintain a real interest in the proceedings on this bill for the reason that the variance from year to year appears, on the surface, to be very little, indeed.

Actually, this is not so. Our weapons systems represent dynamic advances in technology and instead of becoming less interesting, it becomes more interesting as the years go on; and the reason for this is simply because as knowledge grows, so does comprehension and understanding of what the Department is attempting to do.

I do not by any means intend to convey the idea that I find myself always in wholehearted agreement with the Department of Defense—far from it.

But where the procurement of the wherewithal for our forces is concerned, I do not find it at all difficult to find myself voting "aye" when the time for the rollcall comes in committee.

The chairman and other members of the committee have described the bill in some detail, but I would like to deal with two particular areas of the Army portion of the program: that relating to aircraft and missiles. First, I would like to say a few words with respect to the Army aircraft program and the importance of the aircraft in our modern Army.

The combat and support forces of the Army continue to rely heavily on the use of aircraft to provide increased capabilities in the areas of mobility, reconnaissance, command control, and firepower. The program we are presently addressing should be a major step forward in permitting the Army to satisfy within a reasonable period of time their inventory objectives for modern types of aircraft.

In the conduct of military operations numerous situations arise whereby troop movements and the movement of critical supplies must be carried out by air. This is particularly true in Vietnam where the helicopter has proven to be the most effective means of conducting military operations in a tropical environment against insurgents.

Army aviation, specifically the Iroquois helicopter, has made it possible for Vietnamese forces to be rapidly moved to the area of action. A squad of troops can be in position A in one instant and 10 minutes later can be in position B, 5 miles away, fresh and ready to fight. Air mobile forces can operate with fewer reserves than ground mobile forces and this has allowed more to be done with available manpower.

The Iroquois is our assault helicopter and is assigned to Army divisions as an organic part of the fighting forces. Moving our troops on the ground or in the air during tactical operations is a major problem. The supply of these personnel and evacuation of the injured are additional problems.

Our authorization of the Iroquois and the medium Chinook transport helicopters provides a means of solving such problems. The Chinook, a heavier aircraft, is engaged in the delivery of troops and supplies to the forward battle areas. Its large cargo capability serves to enhance the Army's ability to conduct successful combat maneuvers without fear of terrain limitations.

A major contribution to the Army's air mobility objectives will result from our authorization of additional procurements of light observation helicopters. These aircraft have the capability of extended operations in the forward battle area, which is an important factor in the conduct of prompt and sustained combat tactics. The importance the Army places on its missions of visual observation, target acquisition, reconnaissance, and command control cannot be overemphasized. Procurement of this new type aircraft will provide a vehicle more reliable and easier to maintain than its predecessors.

In terms of Army aviation, this bill is austere to say the least. With this in mind, and ever cognizant of the realization that an emergency will require immediate expansion of Army aircraft authorizations, I urge this House to support, as a bare minimum, the authorization sought for Army aircraft in this bill. Such action will be consistent with our ever-continuing goal of maintaining a combat ready military force second to none. It will insure that the tactical advantages to be gained from air mobility will be made available to our ground forces.

Now, I would like to discuss the Army missile program with particular reference to the Shillelagh and Redeye missile systems.

The potential enemies of the United States have placed increased emphasis on armor and mechanized formations in order to move swiftly in the early stages of conflict to overwhelm and destroy opposing forces.

In order to counter this major threat, the Army for many years has been working on a new primary armament system for tanks and armor defeating vehicles. This system is known as the Shillelagh missile system. The single gun tube is designed to fire either the Shillelagh missile or a conventional round of ammunition. This will enable our forces to engage a wide range of targets under varying tactical situations. The missile has

increased range, better hit or kill probabilities, decreased weight and overall user simplicity.

The highly successful firings and test results achieved to date bear out the reliability of the system and further substantiate its potential advantages to the Army Ground Combat Team.

The potential enemies of the free nations of the world currently enjoy a substantial superiority in numbers of tanks and personnel. With the introduction of the Shillelagh system, the Army will have taken a positive step toward providing our combat forces with a lethal weapons system capable of providing a qualitative offset to a known enemy quantitative superiority. I have heard that the Soviet Union and its satellites have some 80,000 to 90,000 tanks.

The other new Army missile which is now ready for use by our ground forces is the Redeye.

The introduction of the Redeye missile into the Army's inventory represents the first major step taken in several years to improve our forward area air defense posture. The fielding of this man-transportable, shoulder-fired air defense guided missle will give small combat units a significant air defense capability against low-flying aircraft.

The Army does have other low altitude air defense guided missile systems that are mobile, but these systems are complex, crew-served, and possess characteristics which prevent them from being deployed along the forward edge of the battle area.

The Redeye can be carried anywhere a soldier can carry a rifle. The effectiveness of Redeye against a variety of aircraft will fill a large part of the low altitude air defense void which now exists over our frontline troops.

By employing this system throughout the forward battle area, we gain coverage which will bring each target within range of two or more Redeyes. In addition to its direct tactical value, Redeye will provide a strong psychological deterrent which will degrade the morale and effectiveness of enemy pilots flying aircraft within the Redeye's range.

Let me conclude that I sat through all the long hearings on this bill and I voted for it in committee.

It is a good bill, a well-thought-out bill, and I would say that the authority in it represents a minimum for our defense needs this year.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support passage of H.R. 7657 which authorizes over $15 billion for military procurement. However, I am not in complete agreement with the decisions of the committee or the policies of the Department of Defense pertaining to the development of the advanced manned strategic aircraft.

The program proposed for fiscal year 1966 calls for continuation of the avionics and propulsion development programs at a cost of $39 million, with no plans or funds to enter the program definition phase before fiscal year 1967.

Frankly, it seems we are literally dragging our feet in the development of a new manned bomber. If we wait until next year to fund the program definition phase, it will be another 7 or 8 years before an aircraft would be available. Can we afford to wait until 1972 or 1973 for such a new weapons system?

The war in Vietnam clearly demonstrates the importance of airpower. We can vividly recall the vital role which airpower played in the Cuban crisis in 1963.

Time after time the Congress has voted additional funds to accelerate development of a new manned aircraft. Finally it appears the Department of Defense was willing to spend $28 million of the $52 million authorized and appropriated in this year's budget. But now we are told to wait till next year to start the program definition phase.

Fortunately we still have the B–52 strategic bombers among our operational weapons system; and more than $300 million has been requested to extend the life and improve the capabilities of the B–52 fleet. It is to be hoped that the B–52 strategic bombers will be kept operational until a follow-on manned aircraft is available.

Mr. Chairman, it seems appropriate at this time to recall the counsel of one of our great Air Force generals, Curtis E. LeMay who retired earlier this year as Air Force Chief of Staff. General LeMay last year told the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations:

> I firmly believe that the best defense lies in a mixture of weapons, what we call a mix of manned and unmanned systems. All our war gaming and all our experience indicates that you get a more efficient campaign if you fight with a mixture of unmanned systems and manned systems. You then can use the unmanned systems to do the things they can do better and you use the manned systems to do the things they do better. Therefore, your overall results are much more efficient than if you only had one system that would do one thing well.
>
> Now, that is after the fighting starts. I think the biggest advantage, however, occurs before the fighting starts. This is our primary purpose for being, to prevent a war. With the flexibility you have in the manned system, the things you can do with them, you have a greater opportunity for preventing a war than you have with a missile system where you only have two operations, you either fire it or you do not fire it.

I heartily commend the Committee on Armed Services for clearly restating in its report on this bill the constitutional responsibilities of the legislative and executive branches of our Government regarding military affairs. We must not abdicate the responsibility of Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distiguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of this discussion I sought the views of two fleet commanders in chief on shipyard requirements. I would like to summarize briefly their expressed statements on this important subject. These views are pertinent, since they bear heavily on the question of allocation of shipwork, and since some people have alleged that the Navy has interposed no objection to the 65–35 proviso contained in recent appropriations bills.

Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharp, former commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, stressed the wide range of complex shipwork required by operating ships in the modern Navy, and found that the Pacific Navy yards met all requirements while private yards generally had substantial deficiencies in dealing with such areas as fire control systems, boilers, and turbines. He indicated that only the Navy yards had facilities adequate to expand substantially and rapidly to accommodate a Korea-type contingency or any situation involving severe ship casualties. He found that many private yards are deficient in engineering talent, in services and facilities vital to the well-being of crews of ships in overhaul, and in their ability to deliver quality work in a timely fashion. Admiral Sharp presented data which indicated that among recent overhauls of ship types for which private yards are best suited—auxiliaries and amphibious ships—many overhauls in private yards had to be extended beyond their scheduled completion dates and some needed subsequent industrial work to correct defects found immediately after the overhaul.

Admiral Sharp expressed doubt that any total cost advantage accrued from private yard work, and concluded that the best interests of the fleet would be served by shifting substantial amounts of work from private yards to Navy yards.

Adm. Harold Page Smith, recently commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, headquartered in my district, similarly stressed the superiority of responsiveness of Navy yards to fleet needs, including emergency work, and the readiness to dispatch skilled mechanics to the Mediterranean, the Middle East, or any point of need. He emphasized the overriding importance of technical competence to fleet material readiness, and pointed to problems caused when additional ship time was required after an overhaul to correct for deficiencies. Admiral Smith notes that occasionally a private yard, in business to make money, has difficulty in overcoming selfish motivations while Navy yards are managed by specially qualified engineering duty officers whose primary interest is the fleet. He did not discern a cost advantage in private yards, but stated that any cost differential was more than offset by the additional functions and services Navy yards perform.

He concluded that for a ship, entering a Navy yard, where the atmosphere is Navy and the yard is run by competent engineering duty naval officers, is like coming home. The Navy yard exists solely to serve the fleet.

Mr. Chairman, our principal concern is the readiness of our fleet. Our fleet commanders in chief speak with unequaled authority on how to reach it.

Now I do not want to minimize the importance of our private shipyards. They too are essential to our national defense, and I know the Navy can be relied upon to safeguard these yards when making allocations of ships for repair and conversion. But it is essential that the erroneous policy embodied in

65–35 be discontinued. The Navy recognizes this necessity, even the Secretary of Defense recognizes it. The committee has recognized it all along, and in this bill we have taken steps to eliminate it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, this bill came out of the House Armed Services Committee by unanimous vote. I want to take this occasion to join those who have already commended the Chairman of our committee for the masterful job he did in the direction of this, the first major bill from the committee. I wholeheartedly support it and hope it will have a unanimous vote in the House today.

Mr. Chairman, a very thorough explanation as to what is provided in this $15 billion authorization bill has been given by my illustrious and able Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina. He has also indicated that the bill has the unanimous support of the members of the Committee on Armed Services. In my remarks I will concentrate on the research and development portion of the bill and will attempt not to repeat what has been said unless it is for further emphasis.

The R. & D. portion of the bill reflects an increase of $121 million over the amount appropriated by the Congress last year. It has been said that Defense expenditures for research and development have increased about threefold during the last 10 years. During this same time period, total Federal expenditures for this purpose have increased fivefold. The estimates for fiscal year 1966 are about $15½ billion, or 15 percent of the total administrative budget. This is indeed a large sum. It exceeds by several billion dollars our total military expenditures as late as fiscal year 1950. In fact, it is larger than the gross national product of most of the sovereign nations of the world. In addition, it has been said that a funding level for military research and development of the order provided in this bill, $6.4 billion, would, if continued at this level for the next 10 years, total more than the aggregate spent on military technology since the founding of this country.

As I indicated in my statement on the authorization bill last year, the high rate of increase experienced during the 1958 to 1964 time period is now leveling off as was to be expected. This is occurring because of the completion of many of the huge and unprecedently costly defense development projects undertaken during the last 10 years. Also, the ballistic missile, space, and nuclear research programs have required very expensive, essentially one-time investments in test complexes and other special facilities. For the moment, the bulk of these expenditures are behind us and our effort can be directed in a more balanced fashion to a variety of problems.

During the last decade, we have spent well over $10 billion on the development of ballistic missiles, including $2.3 billion on Atlas, $2.6 million on Titan, $2.5 billion on Polaris, and $2.1 billion on Minuteman I. To appreciate the magnitude of these expenditures, one has only to recall that the cost of developing the atomic bomb during World War II was less than $2 billion.

These numerous successful developments have been or are now listed as assets to our defense inventory. However, much of the expenditures and accomplishments have been offset by the programs that ended in failure and were terminated because of lack of progress or were overtaken by new technologies and eventually terminated before completion. These liabilities over the past 10 or 12 years have cost the taxpayers well over $6 billion. Hopefully we as a nation have profited from the mistakes made and I am sure technology has advanced as a result of these vast expenditures. But, the history of expensive programs started and then canceled is not all past history. During the consideration of this bill the committee was advised of the cancellation of the "regenerative turboprop aircraft engine" after the expenditure of approximately $37½ million on its development. For the past few years the committee has been told that—

> This engine is required to replace reciprocating engines and existing types of turboprop engines in the future antisubmarines warfare aircraft.

This engine was to be the powerplant for a follow-on, carrier-based, antisubmarine-warfare airplane to replace the S–2E Tracker, which has been in production since the early 1950's. In this instance the cancellation was not caused by lack of development progress or advancement of technology, but because the Department of Defense says that "the Navy has not designated a specific aircraft in which it will be applied."

In the area of ASW, which is described as second in priority only to the fleet ballistic missile system—Polaris—the Navy is told to continue to rely on an airplane which is rapidly becoming obsolescent, even though the engine for a more modern replacement is practically in hand.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it was a mistake to downgrade the requirement for a new antisubmarine-warfare airplane in view of the importance of this portion of the overall threat. I strongly urge the initiation of development of a follow-on, carrier-based ASW airplane to replace the aging S–2E Tracker as soon as possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn your attention to one of the programs that has long been of great interest to the Congress, a follow-on airplane to the B–52.

Our national policies dictate the continuing need for manned strategic aircraft well into the future—and well past the time that we can reasonably expect to depend upon the aging B–52 and B–58 aircraft. In addition to what has come to be known as the classical strategic bomber mission of deterring large-scale conflicts or retaliating if required, the large payload and accurate delivery capability of manned bombers can also be applicable to any lesser encounters requiring these capabilities. I can see no lessening of this requirement in the future.

Today we have an overwhelming strategic capability in the 630-aircraft B–52 force and the two wings of B–58's. These aircraft have performed an outstanding service for their country and, I trust, will continue to do so as long as they are able. But certainly they cannot last forever, like any other piece of equipment, their days are numbered. Forecasting their use well into the 1970's may be desirable; and possibly such forecasting can be done with some degree of certainty. But putting complete reliance for manned bombers on what will have to be weary aircraft in the 1970's—called upon to operate in the advanced defenses of the 1970's—is neither reasonable nor desirable.

You will recall that last year the Congress approved an additional $47 million above the amount requested in the President's budget to initiate the program Definition Phase of development for the AMSA. About half of the amount added was spent but not to initiate the program Definition Phase. Again this year the Air Force requested approval of the Department of Defense to include that phase of development in fiscal year 1966 but the proposal was rejected. In a reclama the Air Force made a strong plea for $7 million which would allow them the option of initiating that development phase during the coming year if the prerequisite phase is completely successful.

This too was denied by the Department of Defense. Mr. Chairman, $7 million is a small price to pay for an option that could save 1 year in the development of an aircraft that all agree is desirable and will be required in the early 1970's. That is why the committee added the $7 million to the Air Force budget and included the restrictive language which earmarked the new obligational authority for funds to be used only for the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA.

Another program of highest priority for which funds were specifically earmarked, is the manned orbiting laboratory. The requested amount of $150 million was authorized by the committee with the restrictive language that the funds were available "only for the development of the manned orbiting laboratory."

I have been asked—Why should this country undertake the effort of developing a manned orbiting laboratory? Also, for what reason should we endeavor to employ our national resources toward the objective of realizing a manned orbiting laboratory? One of the most obvious reasons for a manned orbiting laboratory is to provide an orbiting laboratory in which experimental analysis can be conducted under controlled conditions. This seems at first blush to be rather an expensive way to test your theories and prove out system concepts. And in a way it is, but it must be remembered that a space laboratory does provide one basic condition which cannot be simulated on the ground: zero gravity. But the absence of gravity has a very important

effect on the performance of most systems and knowledge of the specific influence of zero gravity is vital to the accurate final design of space systems. Thus, man will be called upon to carry out these zero gravity experiments of our space systems in the manned orbiting laboratory.

But what else can a manned orbiting laboratory do? What other features can it provide which will make it attractive as a manned military system?

Traditionally, the military have been responsible in this country for the operation of military systems and the repair and maintenance of these systems. It must be assumed that the experiments conducted in the MOL will lead to operational systems, capable of adding significant improvements to our defense arsenal. These operational systems may be manned or unmanned. They may require man as a vital part of the system operation, without his presence to operate the system it will not work. They may require man as a redundant part of the system, to monitor the system's operation and increase its reliability. Or it may even require man as a cost effective element of an automatic system, to reduce the necessity for redundant electronic components and to provide judgment not capable of being designed into circuit elements. Then again, man may be necessary for final assembly of components fabricated on earth, disassembled and packaged for efficient boost into orbit, and reassembled into operating condition upon arrival at the earth orbital altitude desired.

One thing is certain, however. In all of the above conditions man is essential for maintenance of space systems designed for long life. We have never yet been able to design military systems which are failure-free for any extended period of time. It would seem, then, that if we go to the expense of putting sophisticated systems into orbit about the earth, we should have available techniques for servicing this equipment and extending its operational lifetime.

Reliability may be improved by designing redundant components or component parts into a system to achieve the effect of built-in parts. Two disadvantages of this are: First, the increased cost of incorporating such spares; and second, the resultant decreased capabilities of the system which are due to weight and volume limitations. Redundancy in design cannot be used beyond an upper limit of system complexity.

Beyond this upper limit, weight and volume considerations prevent use of additional redundancy without degrading system performance below the desired level. At this redundancy limit, the entire system must be replaced when it fails, or a maintenance capability must be provided to replace malfunctioning system components.

With a skilled satellite technician in the MOL vehicle, maintenance could be provided on malfunctioning satellites. With the maintenance vehicle orbiting close to the satellite, rendezvous could be effected. After the MOL vehicle docks at the satellite, the technician could step into space and make the required checkout of the satellite, switching or replacing parts and components as necessary to accomplish a "fix" before returning to the MOL vehicle. Before separating from the satellite, the MOL could render side benefits by returning the satellite to its programed velocity if there had been any slowdown in its orbital velocity and by correcting any attitude changes relative to the earth, thus eliminating the cost of launching an eventual replacement satellite. MOL could then go on to perform additional maintenance functions on other satellites in the system or continue with the analysis of the laboratory experiments or space system operations.

Thus with MOL, the nation would have the capability to extend its military strength to space—to perform research of new military systems or maintain and operate existing ones.

Mr. Chairman, I will discuss briefly one more program only, the Poseidon Missile System, under development by the Navy. This missile will follow the Polaris A–3 and will further enhance our ability to counter possible antimissile defense systems in the 1970 era.

This new missile will incorporate improved accuracy and larger payload as compared with the Polaris A–3. Its larger payload will permit it to carry a much greater weight of penetration aids, and thereby to penetrate heavily defended targets. Alternatively, it could be used to attack a hardened point target with greater accuracy and a heavier warhead. With the retrofit of a portion of the Polaris fleet with the Poseidon missile, the "kill" capability of the submarine force will be greatly increased.

Despite the increase in size, 1½ feet in diameter and 3 feet in length, the Poseidon missiles will fit into the same missile tubes that carry Polaris. Only a minor and relatively inexpensive modification to the missile tubes will be required.

The increased capabilities of the Poseidon plus the inserent survivability of the nuclear-powered submarine give every reason to believe that the fleet ballistic missile system will continue to be a reliable and credible deterrent force for this country in the years ahead.

Poseidon then, is aptly named. Poseidon was the god of the sea in Greek mythology. He was known as the earth shaker because of his ability to cause earthquakes far inland—but he was also the "preserver," since he could send calm seas.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me assure you that the funds authorized in this bill will, in my opinion, continue the necessary efforts to provide advance technology which will lead to the required weapons systems of tommorrow.

I ask the Committee to support the bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this bill, the first major bill to come out under the capable and distinguished leadership of the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7657 and strongly urge its immediate passage. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I can assure you that each title and section of this bill was seriously investigated and studied. The needs of the Nation were carefully researched and contemplated by the committee under the able direction of its distinguished chairman, MENDELL RIVERS, of South Carolina, and this bill comes before the House by unanimous vote of the Armed Services Committee.

The responsibility given this body by article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America is indeed a grave one. The duty of maintaining the strongest military system ever known in the history of man is undoubtedly the most vital of the thousands of problems on which we act each year. With each passing day we come to realize that the very survival of freemen throughout the world depends greatly on what we do here in this Chamber on the issue of national defense. Considering the current Dominican situation, the rising pressure in Vietnam, the constant tension of Cuba and Berlin, and the scores of brush fire wars happening all over the globe, our national security depends on our would-be opponent's conviction that it would be suicide to threaten America with armed aggression. This appropriation will enable our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to be even better prepared for massive retaliation in the event of nuclear attack as well as being on guard for smaller wars of a more conventional nature.

The question before this body phrased simply is, Are we maintaining the force structure necessary to support our foreign policy and to deter war and are we doing it at the lowest possible cost to the American people?

Now that the power of the United States is without peer and our retaliatory capabilities render it sheer insanity for any nation to challenge us with nuclear attack we can turn and have turned to stabilization and reduction in defense spending. H.R. 7657 evidences this stabilization and reduction. In fiscal 1964, the defense budget of $51.2 billion hit an all time high. The proposal for next fiscal year represents a $2.2 billion reduction in spending from that high. The savings represent a high degree of success in the administration's policy of cost reduction and economy wherever possible.

There are basically two areas of discussion in this bill, nuclear war prevention and readiness and conventional war capabilities. In the area of nuclear war prevention and readiness for massive retaliation there are two things to contemplate, strategic offensive and defensive forces. On the matter of strategic offensive force I quote our very able and effective Secretary of Defense:

I believe it is clear that only a portion of our total programed ICBM and Polaris force and none of the strategic bombers would be required to inflict on an aggressor unacceptably high levels of destruction. The remaining elements of the strategic offensive forces are being procured because it is believed they,

along with air defense forces, will limit damage in the event deterrence fails.

This of course is not meant to imply that manned aircraft is obsolete as an effective deterrent. In fact, H.R. 7657 authorizes procurement of over 2,250 new aircraft along with over 38,000 new missiles. Although funds are authorized for assured destruction missiles such as ICBM and Polaris, the great majority of the missile appropriation will be used for the damage limiting type such as Terrier, Sidewinder, Hawk, and Shrike. In the area of missile development we are making further strides. The Poseidon project, an improved undersea-to-surface ballistic missile program, will be eight times as effective as the latest Polaris. It will be twice as accurate and deliver double the payload. A general integration of Poseidon and Polaris will take place on board our nuclear-powered submarines within the next few years.

Among the authorized aircraft are the Intruder, a versatile craft effective for either nuclear or conventional use. It could also be used for close troop support; the SR–71 reconnaissance; the new F–4E which increases both our air-to-ground and air-to-air capabilities; and several varieties of helicopters which can be effected for troop movement and missile site support among other uses. With our present aircraft and missile systems, and the new systems authorized by this act, America will continue to have the mightiest war deterrent in history.

This bill authorizes further progress in the fields of antiaircraft defenses, antiballistic-missile defenses, and antisatellite defenses. Various warning and control systems will be improved, manned interceptor aircraft supply will be increased, and interceptor missiles will be further stockpiled. This phase of the program is designed to make the assured destructibility weapons of the enemy less effective, thereby making attack more and more undesirable.

In the area of civil defense the recommendations of the Department of Defense were a bit disappointing. Fallout shelter construction was said to be a top-priority item yet no funds were specifically requested for this purpose. Being a strong supporter of shelter increase myself, I hope the Department sees fit to begin an intensive construction program at the earliest possible date.

The constant danger and present reality of limited conventional war makes it necessary to make further advancements in troop movement capabilities and ground weapon production. The bill authorizes procurement of such weaponry as the M–60, Shillelagh, a surface-to-surface lightweight guided missile used in close-in troop support; the Redeye a portable bazooka-type weapon used against low flying aircraft; the M–60A1 combat tank; the M–109 howitzer and many other ground weapons. Increased production in this area may serve as a deterrent to limited war. We must remember that no one ever starts a fight they are positive they will lose.

Naval advancements are vital to both nuclear and conventional capabilities. This bill will authorize the construction of 62 new ships and the conversion of 12 others. The addition of a nuclear-powered frigate to the fleet will put us a step closer to the dream of an all-nuclear-powered task force. Many ships utilized in troop movement will also be authorized. An amphibious force flagship, an attack cargo ship, an amphibious transport dock are but a few of the proposed ships that will give the Navy a more powerful and effective means of troop landing and support.

There are many more technical aspects of the bill that I would like to discuss with you but in the interests of time and to effect a more hasty passage of this vital legislation I will now conclude my remarks. As we have seen in the foregoing, this procurement legislation does in fact increase our nuclear and conventional capabilities. It accomplishes this feat at the lowest possible cost. That is all we can possibly ask. I am sure that the House will approve this bill by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, although I am serving my fifth term in the House, I am serving my first term on the Armed Services Committee. As many of you know, former colleagues, Carl Durham and Paul Kitchin, represented North Carolina on this committee. The press often refers to it as the powerful Armed Services Committee and after the hearings which resulted in the bill we have before us today, I can understand their meaning.

But, I will say that it is powerful in what it does rather than what it is. It is most impressive for a new member of the committee to sit through weeks of hearings covering matters which are the very heart and lifeblood of our country's military posture.

One cannot escape feeling a strong sense of responsibility as his realization grows of what is involved in the consideration of a bill of this kind. It is no time for partisanship, it is no time for irresponsibility. I speak for myself when I say this, and I feel that I speak for the other members of the committee, too.

I am privileged to have within my district both Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base—installations with which I have maintained a close association for many years. A number of the commanding officers and the staffs of these installations have been my friends in both a personal and a professional way. Many enlisted men at these installations have shared their problems with me.

I do not have anything approximating a total comprehension of every matter in this $15 billion bill before us today. There are few who could so contend. I believe it is safe to say, however, that the combined experience of the committee, particularly the senior members who have been doing this same thing year after year, does provide a solid basis for bringing this bill to the floor.

The bill is divided into two major sections—procurement and research and development. The procurement total is, in rounded figures, $8.8 billion and the research and development portion is $6.4 billion.

I would like to talk briefly on the subject of procurement, and I would like to direct your attention to a single procurement item—the C–141 aircraft.

The C–141 is such a tremendous advance in our aircraft capability that I think it imperative that those interested in military matters have a real understanding of its capabilities. I say this because it is possible and even probable that the carrying capacity and the speed of these planes can, sometime in the future—perhaps the very near future—make the difference between the outbreak of hostilities or the kind of action which will prevent such an outbreak. If we are there in time and with enough, we may well tip the balance in our interest. It has happened before and it can happened again.

Let me describe the C–141 to you.

The C–141 is built by the Lockheed-Georgia Co. and is the Air Force's newest all-jet cargo aircraft. The current contract calls for 132 of these airplanes. It is capable of transporting 154 troops or a combination of men and supplies across the ocean, nonstop, at more than 500 miles per hour.

Its 145-foot fuselage will accommodate a 70,000-pound payload. The clamshell rear doors can be opened in flight for dropping paratroopers and equipment and can be opened on the ground for rapid mechanized loading and unloading. It takes off at a gross weight of 316,000 pounds with the shortest takeoff and landing distances of any jet transport. It can utilize 1,850 airports around the world.

We will get 64 C–141's in the Military Air Transport Service during this current year.

And while talking about the Military Air Transport Service, I would like to draw the attention of the House to section 306 which—we hope—will change the name of this great organization to the Military Airlift "Command." Its importance warrants the new name of Military Airlift Command—a designation of dignity and truly descriptive of this great military arm.

The C–141 is a matter of personal, as well as overall defense interest. When the airborne division at Fort Bragg moves, it may well move in the future in some of the very planes for which we are asking authorization today.

I would now like to go to another matter which is of special interest to me, and I know of interest to many of you. And that is the John F. Kennedy Center for Special Warfare located at Fort Bragg, N.C. I will readily concede that this does not have a direct relationship to the bill we have before us but ultimately why do we procure weapons and other material but for the men to use them. And it is men—very unusual men—that are the product of the John F. Kennedy Center for Special Warfare at Fort Bragg.

The center did not start at Bragg, it started at Fort Riley, Kans., many years ago; but its predecessor schools and organizations have been at Fort Bragg since 1952 and about 4 years ago, its name was changed in order to describe it in a functional fashion. At that time

it was named the Special Warfare Center.

Very briefly its function is to train in the three basic fields of special warfare: counterinsurgency, unconventional warfare, and psychological operations. This is the school that has as the symbol of graduation, the beret, a piece of headgear that is worn with pride.

I have been privileged to observe the Special Warfare Center personnel during their training exercises and demonstrations of special skills. These men perform some of the most important services of any part of our military forces. They speak at least two languages and some of them three or four. They can take apart and put together weapons which were captured or otherwise obtained from other countries. They can take household materials and make an explosive charge in a matter of a few minutes. Each unit has one or two people trained in medicine.

So here we have perhaps the most highly trained, most versatile group of military people in the world—the men with the berets.

Now, I would like to raise a question with respect to these highly skilled and especially selected volunteers. Are they being used today in the manner in which they should be? I will say first that I do not know. But I will also say that I have some serious doubts that they are. I have a real fear that if we look closely we may find a foreign weapons specialist as a jeep driver—a multilingual explosive man on static guard duty. Special Forces personnel should not perform duties unrelated to their mission—as some of them are reportedly now being used in South Vietnam.

We have heard from time to time about waste in the Department of Defense—waste in research and development. It is a shameful thing, indeed, if the same accusation can be made with respect to the men in the berets.

With the $8.8 billion procurement measure we recommend today, I trust there will be a guarantee by the Defense Department that our Special Forces and all personnel units will be as properly utilized as they are equipped.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the 13 new members of the House Armed Services Committee the chairman spoke about. Service on this committee over the past 4 months has been most interesting. I am grateful my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee nominated me for this assignment.

I did not have the privilege of serving on this committee under the chairmanship of the former dean of the House, but I do know from personal experience of the last 4 months that the man who chairs the Armed Services Committee today has learned well the best traditions which embody the wisdom of the former Member from Georgia. Indeed, if I may make reference to the naval background of our former chairman, I would be hard pressed to think of ways in which the gentleman from South Carolina could run a tighter ship than he does each day the committee meets. Under his leadership, the committee not only has conducted its business with dispatch, but it has also taken definite steps to strengthen and reinforce its proper authority over the military affairs of this country.

I want to congratulate and compliment the beloved chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, for the manner in which he has taken the reins of leadership and imparted a new sense of direction to the committee's activities.

In the few minutes allotted me, I would like to discuss some of the ways in which the chairman has sought to assert and exercise congressional prerogatives in military affairs under article I of the Constitution, for it is my firm belief that these efforts will set the tone for all of the military authorization bills which this House will have occasion to vote on in the coming months and years.

When the administration originally transmitted its requests to Congress for authorizations related to research and development and to hardware procurement, there seemed to be an expectation among those who direct work on the other side of the river that the Congress ought to approve the authorization with a minimum of discussion and with a minimum of change. For some reason the civilian officials downtown and the military officials in Virginia assumed that the committee would be satisfied to conduct a series of meetings behind closed doors, to learn a few broad details of current planning, and then to report dutifully without delay or modification the authorization drafted for us.

I am pleased to report that from the very start the committee has done its best to shatter such false expectations. Our chairman takes quite seriously the provisions of the U.S. Constitution which grant to the Congress powers over the Armed Forces which are coordinate with those of the Commander in Chief. He recognizes that under the Constitution the President possesses certain authority with which the Congress properly should not interfere. But by the same token, he considers it of primary importance that the executive branch recognize anew the integrity and significance of explicit powers and authority given Congress under the Constitution, first, "to raise and support armies"; second, "to provide and maintain a navy"; and third, "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Proper exercise by the Congress of these constitutional prerogatives is central and, may I add, vital to the maintenance of a correct military posture, for these powers are an integral part of the structure of democratic constitutional government.

I know the full committee and the House of Representatives as a whole share our chairman's insistent belief that the President cannot and should not evade any legislative regulations which the Congress might promulgate pursuant to its constitutional authority.

Let no one interpret those sections in the committee report relating to these constitutional questions as an exercise in historical exegesis. They are something far more than that. They constitute a statement of fact about the proper authority granted Congress by the Constitution and an affirmation of our resolve to maintain both the spirit and the letter of those provisions. They are a statement of the operational philosophy that will guide the committee in its actions over the coming months and years.

Because this constitutional issue is of such fundamental importance, it is appropriate to read into the RECORD today excerpts from several statements by senior members of the Armed Services Committee, previously quoted by our chairman in his report on this bill. I now quote from a statement which appears in the committee report at page 3:

> [The committee] will reaffirm, not in a perfunctory way but in a very militant way, those principles and provisions of our great Constitution which place upon the Congress of the United States the responsibility of providing for the common defense and the armed services of this Nation.

And here is another statement in the report that it seems to me is noteworthy:

> I hope in the months to come this committee will have the opportunity to prove to this Nation that we will discharge our responsibility as written in the Constitution and that this committee and the Congress is not the creature of an agency or a department, but that department is our creature and it is ours to direct and guide.

Mr. Chairman, these are exemplary statements of our position with which virtually every member of the committee is in full and unqualified agreement. Anyone who would understand the activities of the Armed Services Committee would be well advised to keep statements such as these firmly in mind at all times. I think it can be accurately asserted that they are not just empty gestures. They have already been used—and they will be used again—as guides to committee action.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON].

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I, too, join those who have commended our great chairman for the outstanding job he has done. Also I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], the ranking minority member of the committee as well as the outstanding and able staff who helped develop this fine legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Armed Services Committee, I can say that I have never before had a more rewarding experience than the hearings which have just been concluded on H.R. 7657.

Of course, in a very true sense I entered into a world which had heretofore been quite foreign to me. My knowl-

edge of modern weapons systems was restricted to that gained from newspapers and magazines.

Although I am sure that my interest will spread as my information increases, I will say that I did pay particular attention and was unusually interested in the ballistic missile program of the Department of the Air Force.

And I not only paid close attention to the discussion of this matter in the committee, but also have extended my reading in order that I might familiarize myself somewhat more in this important field. The one big conclusion I have come to is that tremendously rapid progress has been made during the past few years in missile capability and reliability. During fiscal year 1965, the remaining first generation missiles, namely the Atlas and Titan I, are being phased out of the program. The Air Force's Titan II, utilizing a storable noncryogenic propellant and containing an all-inertial guidance system as compared to a radio guidance system in Titan I, continues to be procured. The Titan II will carry the largest payload of all our ICBM's. The launch control complex of the Titan II has a greatly increased hardness over the Titan I and reacts much more rapidly. The Titan II operational force is deployed at three locations, covering the Southwest area of the United States. These are Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz.; McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.; and Little Rock Air Force Base, Ark.

The procurement of Minuteman II peaks in dollar requirements in fiscal year 1965, but the quantity of missiles produced is relatively level from fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1970. The Minuteman II missile system will eventually replace Minuteman I missiles as launching sites are modified to accept the improved version. The newer model will carry a greatly improved warhead, will employ multiple target capability, and will have increased range and survivability, as well as many other improvements which will make it a far more effective weapon than Minuteman I. The Minuteman II force, when completely operational, will be deployed, as I understand it, at five locations covering the north central area of the United States. These are Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont.; Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak.; Minot and Grand Forks Air Force Bases, N. Dak.; Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo.; and F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo. Continued research and development effort is currently in process to further improve the accuracy, survivability, and penetration capability of the Minuteman II.

The other missile programs—guided air rockets, guided air missiles and drones—while obviously not as powerful or as well known as ballistic missiles, nevertheless play a surprisingly vital—surprising at least to me—role in the effectiveness of the Air Force. In past years, the Congress has authorized the procurement of air-to-ground guided missiles, radar-seeking air-to-ground missiles, air-to-air missiles of various types, and drones which have been utilized to test, train, and improve the operational forces of the Air Force, primarily in fighter category.

The inventory levels of these systems, for the most part, appear from my study to be adequate to support operational plans of the Air Force. This position is reflected in the fiscal year 1966 budget, which provides for the continued production of the Shrike air-to-ground missile; procurement of inert center sections to convert available Bullpup air-to-ground guided missiles into an economical training vehicle; and production of the Firebee drone which simulates infrared and radar characteristics of real targets.

It can be anticipated that Congress will review requirements through the next few years that will continue to enhance the striking power of our strategic and tactical forces. A continuing developmental process is in being in the Air Force to replace aging weapons and to insure the availability of the most modern weapons which can be devised.

Mr. Chairman, let me again state how gratifying my experience on the Armed Services Committee has been so far. Although it might be said that I am not yet wholly qualified to make a judgment in depth on military matters, I can say this without any hesitation whatsoever: The bill was gone over in the greatest detail, the witnesses questioned closely and although I sometimes felt a little lost in the technical details, my overall conviction is that the bill as it is before the House today is a sound one and commends itself to the approval of every Member.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee is my old and dear friend. We came to the Congress together.

What more could I say than to echo the glowing tribute paid to my old friend by our beloved Speaker. I find myself, happily, in the position to agree with both the Speaker and with my chairman's highly complimentary response. Two finer men—two finer friends I have never known.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 7657, now before the Committee of the Whole House, is the annual authorization for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and for research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces in fiscal year 1966. The bill is based upon the programs presented to the House Armed Services Committee beginning in early February. Since that time, the participation of U.S. military forces in the defense of the freedom and independence of South Vietnam has risen to a new and higher level of activity. And just within the last week, the United States was forced to send troops to the Dominican Republic to help evacuate our citizens and help reestablish law and order in that tormented country.

Although the inventories of weapons and equipment and stocks of war consumables now on hand, funded in prior years, and requested in the fiscal year 1966 budget are generally ample to meet presently forseeable needs, we should keep in mind that if these inventories and stocks are to be maintained at the desired levels of readiness, they must be replaced when actually consumed in military operations. Combat consumables such as ammunition have been procured in recent years at much higher rates than previously in order to build up stocks on hand sufficient to enable our forces to engage in combat for sustained periods of time or until production is able to catch up with wartime consumption. But if we are to maintain this capability, stocks actually consumed in combat must eventually be replaced so that at all times we will have sufficient supplies and ammunition on hand to permit the planned forces to engage in sustained operations anywhere in the world.

While the consumption rate of combat supplies and the attrition of weapons and equipment in Vietnam is still quite small in relation to our inventories on hand and deliveries from new production, the future course of the war in Vietnam is marked by great uncertainty. It, therefore, behooves this Nation to hedge against that uncertainty by providing in advance for future attrition and combat consumption, even though we do not know at this time how long the conflict in Vietnam and the civil disturbance in the Dominican Republic will last or whether they will increase or diminish in scope and intensity. As President Johnson stated in his request for an emergency fiscal year 1965 supplemental appropriation of $700 million for U.S. military operations in Vietnam, which was transmitted to the Congress yesterday:

> The additional funds * * * are needed to continue to provide our forces with the best and most modern supplies and equipment. They are needed to keep an abundant inventory of ammunition and other expendables. They are needed to build facilities to house and protect our men and supplies.

The House Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee held hearings on the emergency request. A separate bill will be reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee later this week and discussion of its contents might best be postponed to that time. I would simply like to point out now that that bill will provide for the additional needs of the Defense Department in the fiscal year 1965 funding period. Whether additional funds will be required for fiscal year 1966 cannot presently be determined; that will depend upon future events in Vietnam. The bill now before the committee provides for the fiscal year 1966 programs presented to the House Armed Services Committee by Defense Department witnesses earlier this year. But before I discuss the details of that bill, there are a few remarks I wish to make about the character of the struggle in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, southeast Asia is at this moment the area in which the free world's struggle against Communist expansion is most acute. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the various capitals of the Communist world should be mounting a propaganda barrage which attempts to conceal the true nature of

the war now raging in Vietnam. What is surprising is that such propaganda has actually succeeded in convincing some, both abroad and at home, that what we see in South Vietnam is merely a local rebellion by a discontented populace.

Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no doubt whatever that the fighting in Vietnam represents, not an indigenous rebellion, but a war directed, controlled, and supported by the Communist leaders in Hanoi. The very organization which the Communists claim to be the true leader of the "rebellion"—the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam—is itself a creature of the Hanoi Communists who organized it in 1960. As long ago as August 1961, there was found on the body of a Vietcong soldier in the central part of South Vietnam a document which said in part:

> In implementation of the Third Congress of the Lao Dong Party (the North Vietnam's Communist Party), the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam was set up to unify the revolutionary struggle * * *. The revolution for the liberation of the South would never succeed if the party were not directing it.

There is further evidence in the unanimous opposition to the Vietcong on the part of every South Vietnamese leader since partition—Buddhist, Catholic, military, civilian. No matter their differences; none has shown sympathy for the Vietcong. None has called this a civil war. All have agreed that the Vietcong movement in South Vietnam is the aggressive creation of Hanoi, and subject to its direct control.

Finally, as the most tangible evidence of direct Hanoi support, there are the men, weapons, and supplies infiltrated from the north to the south. Our intelligence agencies calculate the number of infiltrators with great care, keeping their estimates deliberately conservative. Yet their figures reveal a conscious, mounting effort to destroy South Vietnam with a flow of trained, indoctrinated, hardcore guerrilla fighters and terrorists—40,000 since 1959—and that total is unquestionably low.

The great bulk of the weapons used by these guerrilla terrorists—at least 60 or 70 percent—comes from outside Communist sources. For example, in February a ship sunk along the South Vietnamese coast contained 500,000 rounds of 7.62-millimeter ammunition, along with 60 weapons of the same caliber. Another 750,000 rounds of this ammunition were captured in April. This particular type of ammunition is never used by the United States or the forces of South Vietnam. It can only have come from some other source and was, in fact, manufactured in Communist-bloc nations.

Thousands of Communist-bloc weapons already have been captured this year, in every corps area in South Vietnam. As an example, in a recent major action in Chuong Thien Province, Government forces fought two units of Vietcong—the 96th Battalion, and a guard battalion of military region 9. In this encounter, 90 percent of the small arms and 100 percent of the larger weapons captured by Government forces were of Communist-bloc manufacture. These included: 20 Soviet 7.62-millimeter rifles; 52 Chinese Communist 7.62-millimeter carbines; 4 Chinese Communist RPD 7.62-millimeter machineguns; and a quantity of Czech arms.

As if all this were not enough to disclose the true nature of the conflict, proof now exists that a combat unit of the regular North Vietnamese Army—the 2d Battalion, 101st Regiment, of the 325th Division—has secretly entered South Vietnam and is located in northwest Kontum Province. There may also be other elements of this division in this area. There had been previous indications of this infiltration from various intelligence sources. Also, in an encounter on March 29 and 30 between the Government's 21st Ranger Battalion and this force, it was clear that the South Vietnamese forces had met a professional enemy unit—disciplined, skilled, aggressive, and more heavily armed than other Vietcong units. This identification has now been confirmed by extensive interrogation of a prisoner taken from this regular, North Vietnamese battalion.

No amount of Communist propaganda can conceal the fact that what South Vietnam now suffers is not armed rebellion but armed invasion. If some 40,000 armed South Koreans were to infiltrate North Korea and wage a war directed by Seoul, would the Communists call it a popular rebellion? They certainly would not.

The war of subversion against the people and Government of South Vietnam represents nothing less than a clear demonstration of the current Communist strategy for overthrowing free governments anywhere in the world. In South Vietnam they are testing their theory that, despite the free world's overwhelming military superiority, they can nevertheless, by covert means, impose Communist control by armed might.

It would be a terrible delusion to believe that, because this aggression comes in the form of faceless guerrillas and midnight terrorism, it is somehow not a deliberate act of armed aggression aimed at conquest. We must prove the futility of this new strategy in Vietnam once and for all—just as we proved in Korea that overt armed aggression could not succeed. If we do not, then as sure as night follows day, we will have to prove it somewhere else. For aggression feeds on success, and its appetite is boundless. The alternative is clear. As the President has eloquently said:

> This is the same battle we have fought for a generation. Wherever we have stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace has been restored, and liberty has been maintained.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California, a member of the committee [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we are authorizing in the pending legislation $2,512,173,000 for the repair, alteration, conversion, and construction of our naval fleet for 1966, one of the five largest authorizations we have ever considered.

The private yard share of this budget—62 percent—was exceeded only twice since World War II.

Some people talk about giving the private yards who are struggling for their lives 35 percent of the conversion, alteration, and repair budget. What they do not say is that the private yards have had at least $1½ billion every single year since the Kennedy-Johnson administration took office—as high as $2.2 billion in 1963 and that the Navy yards have barely exceeded $1 billion only twice during this administration.

These private yard spokesmen do not say that they enjoyed 62 percent of the total budget only 1 year before 1961, but since 1961 they only dropped below the 62-percent figure on one occasion.

If you consider only repairs, alterations, and conversions the private yards again will prosper even if the discretion of the Navy Department gives them only 26 percent of this class of work. They would receive $221 million as opposed to $218 million received under the current mandatory 35-percent program.

Under the current program proposed by the Department of Defense the private yards would receive a total of $1,557,065,000 as opposed to $955 million by the Navy.

I would like at this time to refer you to a new chart prepared by the Department of Defense comparing the health of private yards and Navy yards in the post-Korean period. It is readily apparent that the parity between the two entities that existed for 10 years before 1960 was altered to a two-thirds to one-third relationship favoring private yards in the post-1960 period. There is no reason for this relationship to further deteriorate.

There is no doubt but that this shift in emphasis by the Department of Defense has resulted in the operational merger between Mare Island and San Francisco and the closing of Brooklyn and Portsmouth. This action was contained in the order of the Secretary of Defense last November 19.

In that order, referred to as the Magna Carta of private yards, there was the following ameliorating appendage:

> Our studies show that on the basis of "incremental costs" (as contrasted with "total costs") there is little or no advantage in contracting certain ship repair work to private yards. We believe that, at least in the short run, annual savings of $10 to $15 million would be possible if the proportion of conversion, alteration and repair work in public yards was raised from 65 percent to about 80 percent, thereby spreading fixed overhead costs over a larger workload. It will continue to be in the national interest to direct a portion of such work to the private yards in order to help maintain a competitive industrial base. Thus, in the future, the scheduling of any specific year's ship construction and repair program should be directed principally to achieving the most effective utilization of both Naval and private shipyard capacity. To this end, we are requesting the elimination of the statutory "35–65" ratio for the allocation of ship repair, alteration, and conversion work between privately owned and public shipyards contained in section 539 of the Defense Appropriation Act for 1965.

The health of the private yards was attested to last month in the shipyard council's annual report.

Statements are made as follows:

Naval ship orders: During the year 1964 contracts for 39 new naval ships, aggregating 194,960 displacement tons, were placed with private shipyards. In terms of both numbers of ships and tonnage, these orders represent a new postwar high. As a point of reference, during 1963 the private yards received contracts for 29 new naval ships totaling 149,000 tons.

Naval ship deliveries: A total of 21 naval ships, aggregating 107,970 displacement tons, were delivered last year. During 1963, the output was 17 ships of 81,000 tons.

Naval ship backlog: The volume of naval ship construction in private shipyards showed a sharp increase during 1964. Whereas on January 1, 1964, a total of 83 ships totaling 450,300 displacement tons were under construction or on order, this backlog had grown to 101 naval vessels totaling 537,250 displacement tons on January 1, 1965. * * *

Merchant ship orderbook: The signing of a contract on December 31, 1964, covering the construction of four freighters for American President Lines, prevented a further contraction of the commercial ship orderbook. This year-end contract enabled the private yards to begin 1965 with 47 ships totaling 537,800 gross tons remaining to be completed. Consequently, the work backlog topped—by a narrow margin—the 45 ships of 517,000 tons building or on order on January 1, 1964.

Employment, hours, and earnings: Data compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal that total employment in the private shipyard industry averaged 118,000 during 1964. The comparable figures for 1963 and 1962 were 115,700 and 114,600, respectively. The foregoing figures cover "all employees."

The following statistics show the 10-year upward trend in both the repair and new construction areas—naval and commercial.

Dollar volume of repair and conversion work performed during year by private yards

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Commercial ships [1]		Naval ships		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
1954	$196,140	78.0	$55,180	22.0	$251,320
1955	218,810	76.1	68,900	23.9	287,710
1956	328,390	84.1	62,000	15.9	390,390
1957	398,590	91.5	36,880	8.5	435,470
1958	275,510	87.0	41,300	13.0	316,810
1959	202,690	84.2	37,960	15.8	240,650
1960	221,790	82.9	45,810	17.1	267,600
1961	213,200	70.1	90,840	29.9	304,040
1962	233,650	74.6	79,680	25.4	313,330
1963	[2] 228,000	66.8	[2] 113,000	33.2	[2] 341,000
1964	[3] 239,000	65.5	[3] 126,000	34.5	[3] 365,000

[1] Includes MSTS work.
[2] Revised.
[3] Preliminary.

Approximate value of unfinished shipbuilding work in private shipyards as of Jan. 1

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Commercial	Naval vessels	Total
1954	256,000	371,000	627,000
1955	122,000	601,000	723,000
1956	231,000	668,000	899,000
1957	949,000	704,000	1,653,000
1958	874,000	952,000	1,826,000
1959	659,000	1,060,000	1,719,000
1960	492,000	974,000	1,466,000
1961	490,000	965,000	1,456,000
1962	525,000	1,124,000	1,649,000
1963	369,000	1,249,000	1,618,000
1964	387,000	1,176,000	1,564,000
1965	[1] 519,000	1,728,000	[1] 2,247,000

[1] Preliminary.

Statistics and pictures speak louder than 435 Members of Congress trying to shade the facts in the direction that best suits his side of the argument.

It is fair to say that the private yards have never been healthier and the public yards since last November 19 have never been so contracted.

In fiscal 1966 the private yards will receive $1.335 billion in new construction and the real clamor over the 65–35 issue is whether they will receive $221 million additionally in CAR or $294 million. The real fight, therefore, is over $74 million in work, but more than that it is an issue of whether the Navy Department and the Department of Defense can have the discretion to operate their facilities in the manner that they think best. Stated another way, the dollar argument resolves itself over whether we will mandatorily expend 2.9 percent of the procurement authorization in Navy or private yards. It would seem reasonable that if you give the Navy Department the discretion to handle 97 percent of the budget that you would feel safe in trusting them for the balance.

Mr. Chairman, I would next like to discuss the matter of comparative costs.

In the past, several misleading statements have been made to this body regarding shipwork in naval and private yards. The facts which have been given today by my fellow Members have covered most of these areas, but I would like to address a few specific statements which have been made from time to time.

Various figures have been quoted, showing lower costs by private shipyards ranging from 8 to 32 percent. The fact is that savings do occur in new construction work in private yards and that these savings have been, on the average, about 16 percent. A major factor in lower private yard costs is the ability of private yards to decide on what they are going to bid. Generally, the private yards concentrate on a given type of work and are so staffed. The Navy has consistently given a large majority of this type work to the private shipbuilders. In the past 2 years, over 80 percent of this type has been awarded to them. This has been the most significant portion of shipwork, because in every year since 1953, except one, the funds appropriated for new construction have exceeded considerably the funds appropriated for conversion, alteration, and repair.

On the other hand, the price differential in conversion, alteration, and repairs is much less, if it exists at all. The same accounting firm which measured the new construction differential, has stated that no significant conclusions could be reached with respect to cost of conversions, alterations, and repairs. The study showed that, on an hourly productive cost basis, 7 of 24 private yards studied had higher costs than Navy yards. Three yards had roughly comparable costs. The remaining 14 yards had slightly lower costs. The total average was only slightly lower for the 24 private yards than the 11 naval shipyards. When the much more extensive facilities of Navy yards are considered, it appears to me that it is perfectly logical that costs for this type of work are comparable, or may even be less under proper workload conditions in Navy yards.

Turning to another mistaken impression, after the inclusion of the 65–35 restrictive proviso in the fiscal year 1963 act, its supporters claimed Department of Defense support because it was not directly attacked by military witnesses in the 1964 and 1965 hearings. This circumstance actually stemmed from the desire of the Department of Defense to gather facts and experience under the proviso to permit a full and complete assessment of its impact. The Secretary of Defense advised the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee during the consideration of the fiscal year 1965 bill that a determination would be made of the amount of excess capacity in the industry, and actions taken to eliminate the Navy portion of it. After this, he went on to say that economy and fleet readiness considerations should be the basic guidelines for distribution of ship construction, repair, alteration, and conversion, rather than a statutory assignment ratio.

With the completion of the shipyard study, the Department of Defense has reached a firm position on this issue. The proviso was omitted in the recommendations in the President's budget submission. All principal DOD witnesses concerned with this limitation have supported its omission.

Secretary McNamara's testimony before the House and Senate committees contained the following statement:

Our studies show that, on the basis of costs, there is little or no advantage in contracting certain ship repair work to private yards. It will continue to be in the national interest to direct a portion of such work to the private yards in order to maintain a competitive industrial base. Thus, in the future, the scheduling of any specific year's ship construction and repair program should be directed principally to achieving the most effective utilization of both naval and private shipyard capacity. To this end, we are requesting the elimination of the statutory 35–65 ratio for the allocation of ship repair, alteration and conversion work between privately owned and public shipyards, contained in section 539 of the Defense Appropriation Act of 1965.

To sum up my two points: There is no basis for concluding that private shipyards are cheaper in the area of conversions, alterations, and repair, and the position of the Department of Defense is clear that no restrictions, the 65–35 proviso or otherwise, should be placed on the scheduling of this type of work.

Therefore, I stand in favor of section 303, which prevents any restrictions in such assignment.

As an additional consideration, the Secretary of Defense stated in the order of November 19 referred to as follows:

(b) In respect to conversion, alteration and repair (CAR) work, the studies show that in many cases it is cheaper for DOD to perform such work inhouse. This results from the fact that the naval shipyards which must be maintained for strategic and operational reasons have a high fixed overhead cost which continues regardless of workload assigned. Hence, if the volume of CAR work performed in the naval shipyards were increased from the present level of 65

percent to the former level of about 80 percent, it is believed the overall savings to DOD, as least in the short run, would be $10 to $15 million annually.

Another factor that affect costs was testified to a few weeks ago by Secretary Nitze before the Armed Services Committee. He stated that the prime problem facing the service today was the $200 million lost every year by the failure of qualified personnel to reenlist.

He attributed the loss to first, unsatisfactory homeporting and leave with families; second, unsatisfactory pay; third, unsatisfactory recognition; and, fourth, unsatisfactory housing.

By failure to recognize the need for sailors to be with their families—the human element—and by repairing ships helter skelter throughout the country, we are compounding catastrophically our costs of production without knowing it. In the order of the Secretary of Defense above referred to, he stated the following on homeporting:

(e) Homeporting: Proximity of overhaul yards to homeports was another important factor considered by the Board. Statistics drawn from questionnaires circulated to shipboard personnel confirmed that overhauls at substantial distances from homeports adversely affect morale and reenlistment rates. Not only was it felt that homeporting of Navy ships should be given consideration in determining which naval shipyards should remain in operation, but that consideration should be given to this factor in selecting private yards to perform conversion, alteration, and repair contracts.

In this respect the Navy has recently stated:

Overhaul location: Fleet commanders have stressed the importance of increasing the number of overhauls which can be conducted in homeports. This is a problem involving both private and naval shipyards. In fiscal year 1963, for example, 129 of 379 ships were overhauled more than 50 miles from homeport. Also, when a ship is assigned to a private shipyard the ship's company usually doesn't know where the ship is to be overhauled until 14 days before start of overhaul. The ship may even be assigned to a different naval district, and with split bids for drydock work, it is not uncommon to have drydock and topside work done in separate ports and sometimes different districts. The Navy needs the flexibility denied it by the 65–35 proviso in order to minimize the effects of these problems.

There are, in addition, other factors to be considered if we are going to straitjacket the Navy in the administration of its missions.

Workload balance: Before the 65–35 requirement was imposed, there was considerable flexibility to balance work and capability in the short range and adjust employment levels as required by long-range trends. The 65–35 requirement has eliminated this much-needed flexibility. This is particularly troublesome when there are certain ships which involve large dollar amounts and which should logically be assigned to one particular shipyard. Overhaul of *Enterprise* is an example of a ship which should go private—to Newport News. Conversion of *Midway* in fiscal year 1966 should logically be assigned to a naval shipyard on the west coast. Similarly, certain of the SSN's and the SSBN's must be assigned to a particular private shipyard for the initial overhaul. Flexibility is needed to handle these special problems.

Competition: As long as the commercial workload in an area is relatively low, competition for work is reflected in reasonably low repair bids. The ship repair market is, however, subject to the normal laws of supply and demand. Thus, when shipyards in an area generally have a heavy workload, they raise their bid prices. With freedom to allocate work to naval shipyards, the Navy has a lever to keep bids reasonable by potential of total rejection without resorting to moving its ships many miles away.

Of the approximately 250 holders of master ship repair contracts, the vast majority are repair yards only. Many have no drydocking capabilities under their own control and they normally depend on work obtained through split bidding. These yards typically have marginal industrial facilities, a small nucleus force, and they hire and fire most of their workmen as workload demands. In many cases the repair yard operates fundamentally as a general contractor, subcontracting substantial portions of each overhaul.

Deficiencies fall into two categories: lack of skilled personnel, equipment, and facilities for accomplishing repairs in an effective and timely manner; and inability to provide special services to fleet units normally provided by the naval shipyard or the base complex of which it is a part.

Private repair shipyards do not have the skilled personnel necessary to complete overhauls of many of today's modern ship systems. Lack of in-house capability leads to split bid and farm out of work with the attendant difficulties of planning, scheduling, and inspection. Lack of adequate design and engineering personnel leads to delays in analysis of engineering problems. The result is that naval ships at private repair shipyards are frequently completed late and with less than satisfactory quality. The following tabulation is indicative of recent experience of Pacific Fleet auxiliary and amphibious-type ships in this regard.

	Number of overhauls	Late completions		Requiring additional availability for correction of defects	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Naval shipyards	33	6	18	6	18
Private shipyards	80	36	45	25	31

This poor performance is a nuisance, to say the least, even though corrective work is done at the contractor's expense. Strong efforts are being made to eliminate the marginal producers in this field.

The private repair shipyards lack many of the facilities for support to the ship's force normally provided while ships are in naval shipyards. Typical of these are:

First. Work space, tools, technical publications, transportation, and facilities for training.

Second. Fire protection, fresh water, steam, electrical service, safety, security, and cleanliness measures do not meet the high standards of naval shipyards.

Third. Supply and communications support.

Fourth. Morale services such as dental, medical, laundry, navy exchange, dry cleaning, berthing, messing, mail, and recreation.

Naval shipyard capabilities: Naval shipyards have extensive facilities and a large, stable work force of experienced, specially trained men backed up by a large force of design, engineering, and planning personnel. The economical operation of this complex requires workload in balance with the work forces, both in total numbers and with respect to trades and skills.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge the passage of H.R. 7657, the 1966 armed services procurement bill. The measure, including section 303, was fully debated in committee, and it is before the House today with unanimous support of the committee, the Navy, and the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense has not exactly enamored itself with Navy yard interests by its order of November 19 referred to. I think it right and just now that the Navy Department now be given full discretion to manage the complex that remains in the most economic fashion.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of Congress and my first opportunity to serve on the Committee on Armed Services, I do want to join in all of this praise which has been heaped upon the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of our committee [Mr. RIVERS]. Based upon the knowledge of some of the folklore that I have heard around here as to the lack of opportunity of a new Member to participate in the activities of the Armed Services Committee in the past, I would like to state that that has not been the case this year. The new Members have been permitted all of the participation that they desired on this bill and certainly I want to add my support to all of the others who have stated their praise of the work of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to come to a clear understanding of the meaning for private industry of the cutbacks in the Navy yard complex. Some groups seem to feel that the aim of the cutbacks is to benefit private shipyards. This is totally inaccurate.

The closure of the New York and Portsmouth Naval Shipyards was not directed toward, and will not result in, making additional shipwork available to private yards. The decision was made to close these yards because the Navy's overall peacetime and wartime mobilization needs can be fully met without them and closing them will achieve substantial savings. The conversion, alteration, and

repair—CAR—work that would have been assigned to these two yards will be distributed among the remaining Navy yards in order to increase operational efficiency; that is, to reduce unit costs of work.

Inasmuch as the recent Department of Defense study concluded that the remaining Navy yards must be retained because of strategic and operational reasons, the distribution of available work must be made in a manner to assure efficient operating levels. The study indicated that the volume—table A—of conversion, alteration, and repair work performed in Navy yards should be increased and that overall annual savings of $10 to $15 million would result from such an increase.

Because fixed operating costs at Navy yards continue regardless of the workload assigned, additional work assignments will not require additional fixed overhead, thus lessening the total cost per unit. This is an economy any businessman can understand.

Closing the New York and Portsmouth Naval Shipyards will increase the utilization of the remaining Navy yards. In June 1964, operation of the 11 naval shipyards was about 63 percent of optimum capacity. By 1967, utilization would have dropped to about 53 percent if all yards were retained. Redistributing the New York and Portsmouth workloads will materially increase the level of operation of remaining yards. Utilization of private shipyards has recently been estimated as 40 to 55 percent of optimum.

These private shipyards which are capable of constructing naval vessels and the more capable private repair yards are the principal private portion of our private shipyard mobilization potential. Of the 230 private yards with which the Navy has master ship repair contracts, only 78, which together employ about 80 percent of the private shipyard labor, have this potential. Of—table B—this 78, only 18 employ more than 1,000 workers, 31 having less than 300 employees. Even the largest have some repair limitations when compared to Navy yards, and the smaller have quite severe limitations for complex work. Nevertheless, the Navy has consistently assigned more than one-half of its—table C—total work to this complex, including the major portion of its new construction work and a substantial portion of conversion, alteration, and repair work.

This work has sustained and even increased private shipyard employment, in spite of declining commercial work. The inability of private shipyards to expand further is primarily attributable to economic forces at work in the shipbuilding industry: America's private yards are unable to compete successfully in the world market for shipwork. The Navy cannot and should not attempt to compensate in full for declining commercial work, since such action would not be compatible with its basic responsibilities for this Nation's defense.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to that portion of the remarks by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services concerning section 303 in the pending bill, I was reminded of a statement made several years ago by the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu, now Under Secretary of the Navy, which made clear the truism that both naval and private shipyards are needed to service the naval fleet. This fact frequently becomes obscure in the emotions of debate surrounding the naval/private shipyard issue and for some years I have endeavored to place the entire issue in proper balance or clear perspective.

To that end, I introduced H.R. 3593 on January 26, 1965. But section 303 in H.R. 7657 is intended to do exactly the opposite of what my bill has for its purpose—to insure that the private yards of this country on the basis of proven "economic and military considerations" receive at least 35 percent of the available naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair work, leaving 65 percent—I repeat 65 percent—for the Navy yards. The logic of my bill is confirmed by the fact that the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy in three instances, and the White House in two instances, have supported the inclusion of language identical to H.R. 3593 in the Defense appropriation bills for fiscal 1963, 1964, and 1965.

Nothing has really changed to alter the reasoning for setting aside 35 percent—a small share indeed—of conversion, alteration, and repair work for the private yards. The announcement that two naval shipyards are to be closed—one in the middle of 1966 and the other in 10 years has yet to be translated into reality. The naval shipyards continue to receive the lion's share of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair work with little or no regard for the ultimate costs to the taxpayers.

Two separate studies made in recent years, one by Arthur Andersen & Co., engaged by the U.S. Navy itself, and another by Ernst & Ernst, sponsored by private industry, both proved that privately owned shipyard costs are from 8 to 32 percent cheaper than costs in Government-owned yards for this type of work. Any assertions to the contrary are merely "window dressing" to justify the assignment of work to the higher cost naval shipyards.

As to military requirements, in World War II private shipyards employed a maximum of 1,397,700 workers while the Navy yards employed only 333,100. Again, during the Korean affair when the need for merchant vessels far exceeded our available fleet, the private shipyards activated many World War II reserve ships and put them on the line promptly to service our military requirements during the conflict. This elasticity and capability, peculiar to the privately owned segment of the U.S. shipyard industry, so necessary in time of either limited or total emergency, cannot be maintained without the basic facilities on hand to begin with, and will not be available for future emergencies if not sustained by a reasonable share of conversion, alteration, and repair work—and certainly "at least 35 percent" is not unreasonable.

Further, as to military considerations, there are approximately 950 large and small private companies performing ship and boat work in the country today, 50 of which may be classified as major shipyards capable of constructing, converting, altering, or repairing large ocean-going vessels. These major shipyards are strategically located throughout the country—in every major port of the United States, including the Great Lakes, Atlantic coast, gulf coast, and west coast. It can reasonably be said that the private yards are more strategically dispersed than the naval yards.

At a time when President Johnson is striving to achieve greater economies in Government—at a time when President Johnson is endeavoring to place greater reliance on private enterprise for defense procurements—at a time when President Johnson is building a Great Society to strengthen our private competitive enterprise system, I find it difficult in the extreme, to comprehend the reasoning which prompted my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services to act in a manner which will take away from the private enterprise system—and eventually cost the taxpayers more money.

Rather than adopting section 303, the Congress might well consider the feasibility of stimulating the appointment of a "watchdog" bipartisan committee composed of members of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees, representatives of the Defense Department and the Budget Bureau, and spokesmen from private industry. This committee would review the whole subject of distribution of naval ship conversions, alterations, and repairs between naval and private shipyards to make sure that the national interests are properly protected—to make sure that the naval fleet is being served efficiently and economically—to make sure that the taxpayers receive the most mileage for every defense dollar spent. The longstanding controversy must be ended—and the taxpayers reassured.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of the great military area of San Diego I, of course, appreciate the great leadership of Chairman RIVERS. As different men see things in different lights, there is some concern felt in my community over the possible effects of section 303 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, for many years Government-owned and operated naval shipyards have performed most of the naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair work coming under the jurisdiction of the Navy's Bureau of Ships. Less than one-third—more accurately about 25 percent—has been awarded competitively to commercially owned shipyards.

The Bureau of Ships thus has a split personality. On one hand, it operates shipyards which compete with commercial yards. On the other hand, it supervises the award of work to the private

yards with which it competes. Similar conditions in private industry would doubtless be considered violations of the antitrust and restraint of trade statutes. But the military—quite properly, I think—is immune from these proscriptions.

It has frequently been asserted that the naval shipyards are indispensable. Agreed—but should the naval yards be permitted to overshadow commercial shipyards in every department? Are we to forfeit the benefits of competition? In terms of both size and assets, the Navy complex is many times larger than the entire private shipyard industry combined.

This seeming contradiction in our private competitive enterprise system has prompted past Congresses to impose a restraint, by setting the so-called 35-to-65 ratio to govern the distribution of naval ship conversions, alterations, and repairs. This formula, obviously, was the result of painstaking and methodical consideration in both House and Senate.

Spokesmen for labor and management in my district have therefore expressed to me their concern with regard to section 303 in H.R. 7657, which would revoke and eliminate the 35–65 formula now and for an unspecified time into the future. They contend, with good reason, that there has been no change whatever in the justification which prompted the adoption of this formula 4 years ago. They fear, with good reason, that the cards are stacked against private shipyards, and thus against private enterprise, in the future.

The comments pertaining to section 303 in House Report No. 271 provide no basis for dispelling these fears. There is no statement to the effect that the existing national policy establishes a presumption favoring procurements from private sources. On the contrary, the Committee on Armed Services, through section 303, would establish a presumption favoring the arbitrary assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair work to naval shipyards with little or no consideration to final costs.

Let us fully realize what we are doing, Mr. Chairman, when we approve section 303. We are endorsing the concept that nationalization is good for naval shipwork, but wrong for all other military materiel. We are undermining the private enterprise system. We are failing to recognize the cost advantages—proved in two independent audit-studies—which may be achieved through the use of commercial shipyards. And we are asking the American people to believe that our often stated faith in the private enterprise system is a collection of words unsupported by resolute actions.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, there came to my office recently a copy of the April 1965 annual report of the Shipbuilders Council of America containing a most interesting section entitled "Government and Commercial Shipyards."

This account of developments affecting the naval-private shipyard issue in recent years bears so significantly in our considerations of section 303 that with unanimous consent I place it in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT AND COMMERCIAL SHIPYARDS

To understand the present situation with respect to the utilization of Government-owned versus privately owned commercial shipyards for the accomplishment of naval shipwork, recent and past developments must be placed in perspective.

The Government-owned and operated naval shipyard complex, composed of 11 facilities—one of which is scheduled for closing in mid-1966—employs approximately 83,000 production workers in the construction, conversion, and repair of naval ships. It is many times larger than the entire private shipyard industry combined. Only 48,000 of the total private yards' 120,00 employees are engaged on contracts for the U.S. Navy.

Total assets of the naval yards, according to the Navy's own estimate, are in excess of $3 billion. According to the Census of Manufactures, total assets of the private yards, including the smallest boatbuilders, are approximately $750 million. Two recent studies by leading public accounting firms have concluded that shipwork costs in the naval yards range from 8 to 32 percent higher than in private yards—depending on the type of work involved.

Thus, in this country—the citadel of private enterprise—we have the oddity of an immense, high-cost, nationalized activity competing with a much smaller, lower cost private industry. This oddity has existed for many years—the first naval shipyard was authorized in 1800, and from that beginning the Government shipyard complex has grown, and grown, and grown, until now the Navy points to it with pride as an "industrial giant."

Through the years, the naval shipyards have been a contradiction to the long-standing national policy favoring Government procurement from private sources. Through the years, these federally owned and operated shipyards have enjoyed a special immunity from Presidential and Bureau of the Budget directives intended to enforce that policy. Through the years, this nationalized industrial complex has overshadowed the entire U.S. commercial shipyard industry in direct negation of the widely accepted axiom that Government must do only those things which private enterprise cannot do. Until only recently, this ambiguity in our way of life remained unchallenged.

The Secretary of Defense, in November of last year, in an unprecedented action, ordered the closing of the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Naval Shipyard by June 30, 1966, and the Portsmouth (N.H.) Naval Shipyard by 1975. This latter directive, since it covers an event 10 years hence, can hardly be considered as having any immediate effect. There are, however, threats of congressional investigations and legislative counteractions to nullify these closings.

In any event, it appears that all of these moves will not increase the volume of work to be awarded to private yards on a competitive basis. Secretary McNamara has said: "* * * I don't believe these actions will influence the distribution (of work) between public and private yards."

With two naval shipyards presumably to be closed, the Congress—and thus the taxpayers—will soon be asked to spend upward of $200 million to modernize the remaining Government yards even though their costs are higher than those in private yards—even though there is an excess of capacity in both at this moment.

Though the naval shipyard system has perpetuated itself for more than 160 years, a penetrating focus of public and congressional attention on the scope of operations and the magnitude of the costs of the Government facilities did not begin until 10 years ago. Supported by the findings of the Hoover Commissions, private yards, through the shipbuilders council, claimed that costs in the public yards were excessively high and that their functions had been unrealistically expanded while many private yards were going out of business.

But, there seemed to be no comprehensive data on which to make a persuasive case. For example, on January 17, 1958, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress informed a Member of the U.S. Senate: "An extensive search of material in the Library of Congress, Government documents, periodicals and other literature, including the files of the Department of the Navy, has failed to show any evidence that there has ever been rendered a unified and systematic account of naval shipyards with respect to their general activities in maintenance and repair" of naval vessels. Congressional reports on appropriations, from time to time, commented on the needs and problems of the Bureau of Ships, which administers the naval shipyards, but they never touched on the basic questions of "where does legitimate Government activity in the field of shipyard operations begin?" and "where does illegitimate or undesirable government competition with the private sector end?"

To provide the answer to these questions, certain Members of the Congress, in succeeding years, pleaded for congressional hearings on the subject and urged greater reliance on privately owned commercial shipyards—all in vain. The specific bills they introduced to accomplish these objectives were pigeonholed. Efforts to have the General Accounting Office—an arm of the Congress—conduct a study of comparative costs between naval and private shipyards failed. Discussions with the executive agencies similarly led to naught. The Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce, as the voice of business within Government, abstained from intervening on the grounds that jurisdiction rested solely with the Department of Defense.

However, in July of 1961, a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, composed exclusively of Congressmen having naval shipyards in their own or neighboring districts, conducted hearings to review "the present and future mobilization potential of every existing naval shipyard." The mobilization potential and demonstrated wartime ingenuity of the private shipyards were virtually ignored, and the subcommittee's conclusion read in part: "The subcommittee, on the basis of its inquiry, was of the unanimous opinion that a continuation of the existing naval shipyard support complex is essential to our national defense." The subcommittee also urged a 10-year modernization program to "accomplish the incremental replacement of obsolete and obsolescent production equipment at naval shipyards."

Immediately thereafter, the Shipbuilders Council of America undertook to prove authoritatively that costs were higher in the Navy yards and that more defense could be obtained from each dollar spent by greater reliance on commercial yards, for all types of naval shipwork. This effort had the overwhelming support of the entire private shipyard industry. The accounting firm of Ernst & Ernst was retained to make a "Survey of Cost Differentials and Other Factors Relating to Private and Naval Shipyards."

The Navy's Bureau of Ships, under date of March 9, 1962, "declined" to furnish certain cost information requested by the accounting firm, which necessitated a number of assumptions favoring the naval shipyards. Even so, the April 1962 report by Ernst & Ernst found that, after taking into account all relevant cost elements, "shipwork accomplished in naval shipyards is estimated to be 20 to 28 percent more costly than at private shipyards." The report also demonstrated that "higher wages and more liberal vacation, holiday, and sick leave benefits result in higher naval shipyard costs of approximately 15 percent per hour worked."

Armed with this definitive report, the case for the private shipyards was taken to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Over the protests of naval shipyard employees associations, a provision was included in the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal 1963 requiring that at least 35 percent of the funds for naval ship repairs, alterations, and conversions must be spent in private shipyards. In earlier years, the private yards had received only 20 percent.

Not satisfied with the Ernst & Ernst conclusions, the Department of the Navy commissioned another leading accounting firm, Arthur Andersen & Co., to make a "Report on Survey and Analysis of Differences Between U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Costs at Naval and Private Shipyards." With full access to the Navy's books and records, and with full cooperation from the private shipyard industry, the Arthur Andersen report, dated November 30, 1962, essentially confirmed the Ernst & Ernst conclusions. There were some variations of degree, but their results indicated that costs in the naval yards are 8 to 32 percent higher than in private yards—depending on the type of work.

For nearly 6 months, the Arthur Andersen & Co. report was withheld from the public—probably because it did not help the cause of the naval yards. An enterprising newspaper reporter finally forced the findings out into the open.

These developments—plus the support of the White House, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy led to a continuation of the 35–65 provision in connection with Defense appropriations for fiscal 1964 and 1965. It was argued that 35 percent of the repair, alteration, and conversion work was a modest and reasonable share for private industry. Though the naval yards received the larger share of 65 percent, their supporters continued to complain, and are doing so even today.

Statistics released by the Bureau of Ships have never conclusively shown that the "at least 35 percent" requirement was met. Nevertheless, as a result of this single provision, it is estimated that the private shipyard industry received an additional volume of repair, alteration, and conversion work amounting to $300 million over the last 3 fiscal years. The entire effort also served to put the spotlight on the available lower private yard costs for new ship construction, and that volume also increased.

The proposed budget for 1966, as presented to the Congress on January 25, 1965, however, eliminates the 35–65 provision. Despite 3 previous mandates by the Congress, the White House, the Defense Department, and the Navy Department have withdrawn their support with the statement that: "We think we are fully capable of deciding where we can most economically place our business without having a ratio preestablished for us by the Congress."

It is believed that this departure from an administration position, expressed with little or no hesitation for 3 years consecutively, is based on a November 17, 1964, report by the Shipyards Policy Board. In addition to recommending the closure of two naval shipyards over the next decade, this Board also urged the assignment of more work to the remaining Government yards to reduce fixed overhead costs, regardless of the lower costs which might be available from commercial yards. This same Board also recommended the modernization of the naval yards mentioned earlier.

Theoretically, the Shipyards Policy Board was chartered by the Secretary of Defense to review both private and naval shipyard capabilities. An offer of cooperation from the industry, through the Shipbuilders Council, at the outset of the Board's considerations, was summarily rejected, and the antipathy toward the private shipyard industry is only faintly disguised in its report.

The net effect of all of this, unless the Congress intercedes, will mean less work for the private yards in all departments and more work in the nationalized sector of the industry. Since the end of World War II, a total of 34 major shipbuilding or ship repair yards have gone out of business—of that number 18 have closed their gates since 1955, and if conditions do not improve, more can be expected to terminate their operations. No decrease of these proportions is contemplated in the naval shipyard complex—even with two planned closings already mentioned.

The private shipyard industry of the United States stands ready at all times to cooperate with and to serve the U.S. Government. It is perhaps paradoxical that the Government is at once the industry's best customer and its principal competitor. The industry does not enjoy the continuing dialog and controversy with respect to naval and private shipyards. In supporting the Navy fleet, there should be a proper role for both within the framework of our national economy and strategic requirements.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7657.

I consider my appointment to the Armed Services Committee as conferring a real honor upon me. There is no more important committee in the Congress or one which must assume—and does assume—a greater responsibility.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to the chairman and the senior members of the committee for the wide opportunity which was given to me to pursue those matters of particular interest to me during the hearings on this bill. A junior Member, as I understand it, is not always granted the prerogative of free and open discussion. But not so on the Armed Services Committee. I was given my opportunity along with all of the other Members and for this I am grateful.

It has been a most gratifying experience for me and it is my intention to give my very best to my service on the committee.

I found the Polaris submarine to be of particular personal interest notwithstanding the fact that my home is far from the sea. It is, of course, one of our most important weapons systems and I engaged in some independent study, inquiry, and conversations with Navy people in order that I might become better informed on this important subject. I learned this:

The fleet ballistic missile weapon system, better known by the name of its missile, Polaris, has been operational since November 15, 1960, when the U.S.S. *George Washington* (SSBN 598) deployed with a full load of 16 tactical missiles.

Besides the missile itself, the FBM system includes nuclear-powered missile launching submarines, sea and shore support facilities, and personnel.

Operational ballistic missile submarines in the Atlantic are under the control of the commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Command who exercises his authority through the commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet and commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet. FBM submarines, in the Pacific are under the control of the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Command who exercises his authority through the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Target selection and assignments for operational FBM submarines are made under the control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with the assignments to other parts of the Nation's strategic retaliatory force.

System development and production is being managed for the Navy by the Director of the Special Projects Office, Rear Adm. Levering Smith. Assisting him is an imposing team of Navy missile experts, scientific leaders, universities and more than 30,000 industrial contractors and Government agencies.

With almost unlimited cruising range and with endurance limited by only the crew, the FBM nuclear submarine is capable of extended submerged operation in the international waters of the world which comprise about 70 percent of the earth's surface. Free of the need to surface or extend a snorkel above the surface for continuous operation, FBM nuclear submarines remain hidden by an oceanic curtain, their locations unknown to any potential enemy. The Polaris missile, powered by solid propellant, is ready for launch within minutes of receiving the command without the need for long countdown. Mobile, hidden, ready for instant action (or carefully considered delayed action), the FBM system provides the United States a powerful deterrent to those who might start a global war.

FBM submarines of the *George Washington* class are about 389 feet long with a beam of about 33 feet and displacement of about 6,700 tons. There are two larger classes of FBM submarines. *Ethan Allen* class submarines are about 410 feet long and displace about 7,900 tons. *Lafayette* class submarines are about 425 feet long and displace some 8,250 tons. *Ethan Allen* and *Lafayette* FBM submarines can accommodate all three generations of Polaris missiles. *George Washington* class SSBN's will be given this capability as they return to the United States for overhaul. The *George Washington* is now in overhaul at General Dynamics Electric Boat Division Shipyard in Groton, Conn. She returned to Charleston, S.C., on June 2, 1964, to end her initial deployment which started in 1960.

All three classes are driven by steam turbines powered by water-cooled nuclear reactors. Each class carries 16 Polaris missiles stowed in 8 pairs of vertical launching tubes in the space immediately behind the sail. Each submarine has a 300-ton capacity or greater air-conditioning plant. FBM submarines are also equipped with air scrubbers and precipitators to remove irritants from the air and maintain the proper balance of oxygen, nitrogen, and other atmsopheric elements. Electrolytic oxygen generators permit the submarine to manufacture its own oxygen from sea water.

Twenty-seven submarines, carrying a total of 432 Polaris A–1, A–2, or A–3 missiles have

deployed on operational patrols since 1960. There have been more than 160 2-month operational patrols to date, none of which has been aborted for any reason. During these operational patrols each submarine maintained an average of 16 Polaris missiles ready to fire 98.1 percent of the time and 15 99.9 percent of the time. The Polaris A–3 missile has recently scored its 21st consecutive successful firing. The launching of this 2,880-mile range missile also marked the 26th successful firing in 27 attempts bringing the average of successful A–3 launches to 96.4 percent.

Thirty-four fleet ballistic missile submarines have been launched to date. Of these, 29 are in commission.

When the authorized 41 fleet ballistic missile submarines are all operational in mid-1967, 28 will carry the 2,880-mile range A–3 missile and 13 will have the 1,725-mile range A–2 Polaris.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the prompt enactment of this bill is, of course, imperative. It would authorize the expenditure of $15 billion, in round figures, for those items which are essential to continue our military preparedness at its maximum capacity.

With commitments in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, and elsewhere, it becomes increasingly important that we in Congress leave no stone unturned, engage in no unnecessary delay, in fully and adequately providing for the weapons of war that are required not only for the engagements to which I have referred but also for our overall defense structure.

Earlier today the House authorized the additional expenditure of $700 million because of the developments in South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Only seven votes were registered against the measure. That demonstrates the solidarity of our position in the Congress and our determination to give full support to the President in meeting the pending crisis. The prompt enactment of this bill will add to that expression and determination. Let us hope the action on this measure will be unanimous, as it should be.

Our Committee on Armed Services has given weeks of careful study to every item in this bill. It has been thoroughly considered. The fat has been removed. The bill is sound and it is justified. The hearings and the committee report confirm this fact. Under the able direction of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the measure has received extraordinary attention, and it was reported without a dissenting vote. It has my enthusiastic support.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, as you have already been made aware, the committee made only two additions to this bill. One was $7 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft known as AMSA, and the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate which is estimated to cost $150.5 million. It is to this latter addition that I wish to direct my remarks.

Anyone who has read the hearings of the Armed Services Committee over the past few years or, indeed, who has been present on the floor of the House when we have presented our annual procurement and research and development bill, knows well that the Armed Services Committee—to a man, so far as I know—feels that the Department of Defense has failed to realize the tremendous gains in our capability which can be achieved through the use of nuclear power for surface warships.

I will say this: The Navy Department seems to be fully aware of the great advantages of nuclear propulsion, but its feelings and desires have been frustrated by the lack of support of the Secretary of Defense.

Some of you may have read in the press that the Secretary of Defense told the Armed Services Committee this year that he had virtually made up his mind to request a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier next year. Perhaps Mr. McNamara made up his mind quite independently with respect to this decision, but I cannot help but believe that he was aided to some extent by the realization that whether he requested a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier next year or not, he was going to get one. So whether this was pure objective and isolated decision or gracious resignation, we will never know.

All of this brings me to the second addition to our bill that I mentioned, the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate.

To my mind, this may well be the most important single action which we took with respect to this bill. I consider it unfortunate that it was necessary for it to appear on the floor today as an addition. I would be much happier if it had come up to the Committee as part of the original request. The reason I say this is that if it had come up to us in what I will call normal fashion, it would have given me reassurance that the Department of Defense—and I am referring to the Office of the Secretary of Defense—had come to the realization that we must proceed more expeditiously toward a nuclear fleet. By this, I do not mean that every ship in the Navy should be nuclear powered; this certainly is not warranted but I do say that in my opinion, every ship which is of size and function which would lend itself to nuclear propulsion should have nuclear propulsion.

The old days of cost differential between conventionally powered and nuclear-powered ships, are gone.

It has been a fact in the past, it is true, that cost conditions have been the principal impediment to what I would consider a more appropriate exploitation of nuclear propulsion. To me, the whole picture is something like buying a very good suit or a cheap suit. We all know through experience that, in the long run, the good suit is cheaper.

But, today, even the original investment is not so much greater as to preclude the widespread use of nuclear power for propulsion of surface ships.

It is perfectly obvious that the mobility of our Navy ships is utterly dependent on the availability of fuel supplies. This dependence requires fuel distribution systems all over the world. Cut off our black oil and cut off our Navy.

I read recently that in the early days of World War II, a carrier force was compelled to transit the submarine-infested North Atlantic without escort. Sea conditions were such that fuel transfer from the oiler to the other ships was impossible. As a result, the destroyers, because of lack of fuel, simply had to turn back to their home ports; they could no longer proceed with the carrier. There is no reason why that same thing could not happen today.

As a matter of fact, an enemy with the submarine potential of the Soviet Union—and I have heard figures from 400 to 500 submarines—could utterly disregard the warships of our fleet and concentrate their efforts on the fuel suppliers. The fleet would be as ineffective under these circumstances as if they had been sunk. They simply could not move.

As a matter of fact, in World War I, the Russians did this exact thing with respect to Turkey. Because of lack of coal during the blockade of Istanbul, the whole Turkish fleet was immobilized.

Another consideration of great importance is the fact that the advantages of nuclear power are severely limited when one single ship in a task force is nuclear and the rest are conventially powered. At page 7 of the committee report, it is stated that:

> It is appropriate to note at this point that carriers are accompanied in their missions by many other surface ships. At the present time the *Enterprise* must be accompanied almost entirely by conventionally powered ships with all of the inherent disabilities of these ships from the standpoint of sustained steaming. There is a proverb "A man on foot is a poor companion for a man on horseback." No truer application of this proverb could be made than in the context of a carrier task force where the carrier is nuclear powered and its protective ships are conventionally powered.

It would be interesting to discover how much thought has been given to the tremendous savings that could be effected through the use of nuclear power by reason of the fact that advance bases could be greatly diminished in size and cost. One of the principal functions of these bases is to supply black oil to the fleet. It is obvious that these bases would still have to exist, but they certainly would be less costly, much smaller, and much less important to the effective operation of the fleet.

There is no one who could say that today we do not have a global responsibility. Concomitant to a global responsibility is a global capability, and where can there be found a greater source of global capability than in the use of nuclear propulsion.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has mentioned that the newly developed reactors will be so advanced that a ship need to be refueled—that is, given a new core—only once during its entire life. This is a most impressive fact. The *Enterprise* is truly a global ship. It can proceed virtually indefinitely and with virtually no dependence on any other kind of fuel. If we have the responsibility, we must achieve the power and capability.

Reaction time is another element which is of very great importance. The ability to react—and nuclear power provides this ability—can mean the difference, as someone has said, between a "Lebanon" and a "Korea." That critical margin can be provided by nuclear propulsion.

We used to hear about battleship admirals. This necessarily meant that there were some nonbattleship admirals. There was at that time, therefore, a division of thought with respect to these great old ships.

Today, to the very best of my knowledge, there is no divergence of opinion with the Navy as to the need for widespread nuclear power throughout our fleet. There are no nonnuclear admirals, so far as I know.

Let me draw the attention of the committee to pages 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the committee report which deal with our addition of the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate. I rather doubt that there is any other single item in the bill which has been treated either in such detail or at such length. This nuclear-powered guided missile frigate, as I said at the beginning, may well be the most important single item in this bill.

Although I have limited my remarks solely to the nuclear frigate which was added by the committee, I support this bill wholeheartedly. It is because of my strong interest in this particular ship and the expansion of our nuclear surface fleet that I have devoted my remarks exclusively to it.

I commend this bill to the House without reservation.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Armed Services Committee I, too, want to compliment and commend the able chairman for his exemplary work on H.R. 7657. I also want to express my appreciation to the senior Members on both sides of the aisle for the courtesy and understanding afforded to all the new members of the committee. To become at all knowledgeable in this extremely technical field would be most difficult without their patience, help, and consideration.

There is little to add to the remarks already made by the distinguished chairman and so it is with a great deal of pride that I join him and all other members of the Armed Services Committee in full support of this legislation which is so necessary to our national defense.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the newest members of the House Committee on the Armed Services, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sentiments about the excellent manner in which my chairman presented the $15 billion military procurement bill in the House.

It was another demonstration of the effective leadership he has exhibited since assuming the chair of the committee upon the retirement of the Honorable Carl Vinson, who served as chairman so long and well. We who are freshmen on the Armed Services Committee will look to L. MENDELL RIVERS for continued leadership of the same high caliber.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7657

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of 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 1966 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, $344,500,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,915,800,000; for the Air Force, $3,545,200,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $253,700,000; for the Navy, $364,000,000; for the Marine Corps, $13,000,000; for the Air Force, $771,100,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,651,600,000, of which amount $150,500,000 is authorized only for the construction of a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 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, $1,406,400,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,439,200,000;

For the Air Force, $3,103,900,000, of which amount $150,000,000 is authorized only for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory and $7,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

For Defense agencies, $495,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Outstanding tonnage balances remaining in law for construction of Navy ships are hereby repealed.

SEC. 302. The distribution of the assignments and contracts for construction of warships and escort vessels for which appropriations are authorized by this Act and hereafter shall be in accordance with the requirement of the Act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), that the first and each succeeding alternate vessel shall be constructed in the Government Navy yards: *Provided*, That, if inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed as required above, the President may have such vessel or vessels built in a Government or private yard as he may direct.

SEC. 303. The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

SEC. 304. 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, or after December 31, 1965, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of tracked combat vehicles, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates."

SEC. 305. No funds may be appropriated after June 30, 1966, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

SEC. 306. Section 8074 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) The Military Air Transport Service is redesignated as the Military Airlift Command."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 365, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

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. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—396

Abbitt	Burke	Devine
Abernethy	Burleson	Diggs
Adair	Burton, Calif.	Dingell
Adams	Burton, Utah	Dole
Addabbo	Byrne, Pa.	Donohue
Albert	Byrnes, Wis.	Dorn
Anderson, Ill.	Cabell	Dowdy
Anderson, Tenn.	Callan	Downing
	Callaway	Dulski
Andrews, George W.	Cameron	Duncan, Oreg.
	Carey	Duncan, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Carter	Dwyer
	Cederberg	Dyal
Annunzio	Celler	Edmondson
Arends	Chamberlain	Edwards, Ala.
Ashbrook	Clancy	Edwards, Calif.
Ashley	Clark	Ellsworth
Ashmore	Clausen, Don H.	Erlenborn
Aspinall		Evans, Colo.
Ayres	Clawson, Del	Everett
Baldwin	Cleveland	Evins, Tenn.
Bandstra	Clevenger	Fallon
Baring	Cohelan	Farbstein
Barrett	Collier	Farnsley
Bates	Colmer	Farnum
Battin	Conable	Fascell
Beckworth	Conte	Feighan
Belcher	Cooley	Findley
Bell	Corbett	Fino
Bennett	Corman	Fisher
Berry	Craley	Flood
Betts	Cramer	Fogarty
Bingham	Culver	Foley
Boland	Cunningham	Ford, Gerald R.
Bolling	Curtin	Ford, William D.
Bolton	Daddario	
Bonner	Dague	Fountain
Bow	Daniels	Fraser
Brademas	Davis, Ga.	Frelinghuysen
Bray	Davis, Wis.	Friedel
Broomfield	Dawson	Fulton, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	de la Garza	Fulton, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Delaney	Fuqua
Broyhill, N.C.	Dent	Garmatz
Broyhill, Va.	Denton	Gathings
Buchanan	Derwinski	Gettys

Gibbons	McGrath	Rooney, N.Y.
Gilbert	McMillan	Rooney, Pa.
Gilligan	McVicker	Roosevelt
Gonzalez	Macdonald	Rosenthal
Goodell	Machen	Rostenkowski
Grabowski	Mackay	Roudebush
Gray	Mackie	Roush
Green, Pa.	Madden	Roybal
Greigg	Mahon	Rumsfeld
Grider	Mailliard	Ryan
Griffin	Marsh	Satterfield
Gross	Martin, Ala.	St Germain
Grover	Martin, Mass.	St. Onge
Gubser	Martin, Nebr.	Saylor
Gurney	Matsunaga	Scheuer
Hagan, Ga.	Matthews	Schisler
Hagen, Calif.	May	Schmidhauser
Haley	Meeds	Schneebeli
Halpern	Michel	Schweiker
Hamilton	Miller	Scott
Hanley	Mills	Secrest
Hanna	Minish	Selden
Hansen, Idaho	Mink	Shipley
Hansen, Iowa	Minshall	Shriver
Hansen, Wash.	Mize	Sickles
Hardy	Moeller	Sikes
Harris	Monagan	Sisk
Harsha	Moore	Skubitz
Harvey, Ind.	Moorhead	Slack
Harvey, Mich.	Morgan	Smith, Calif.
Hathaway	Morris	Smith, Iowa
Hawkins	Morse	Smith, Va.
Hébert	Morton	Springer
Hechler	Mosher	Stafford
Helstoski	Moss	Staggers
Henderson	Multer	Stalbaum
Herlong	Murphy, Ill.	Stanton
Hicks	Murphy, N.Y.	Steed
Holifield	Murray	Stephens
Horton	Natcher	Stratton
Hosmer	Nedzi	Stubblefield
Howard	Nelsen	Sullivan
Hull	Nix	Sweeney
Hungate	O'Brien	Taylor
Huot	O'Hara, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Hutchinson	O'Hara, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Ichord	O'Konski	Tenzer
Irwin	Olsen, Mont.	Thomas
Jarman	Olson, Minn.	Thompson, La.
Jennings	O'Neal, Ga.	Thompson, N.J.
Joelson	O'Neill, Mass.	Thompson, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	Ottinger	Thomson, Wis.
Johnson, Okla.	Passman	Todd
Johnson, Pa.	Patman	Trimble
Jonas	Patten	Tuck
Jones, Ala.	Pelly	Tunney
Karsten	Pepper	Tupper
Karth	Perkins	Tuten
Kastenmeier	Philbin	Udall
Kee	Pickle	Ullman
Keith	Pike	Utt
Kelly	Pirnie	Van Deerlin
Keogh	Poage	Vanik
King, Calif.	Poff	Vigorito
King, N.Y.	Pool	Vivian
King, Utah	Price	Waggonner
Kluczynski	Pucinski	Walker, Miss.
Kornegay	Purcell	Walker, N. Mex.
Krebs	Quie	Watkins
Kunkel	Quillen	Watts
Laird	Race	Weltner
Landrum	Randall	Whalley
Langen	Redlin	White, Idaho
Latta	Reid, Ill.	White, Tex.
Leggett	Reid, N.Y.	Whitener
Lennon	Reifel	Whitten
Lindsay	Reinecke	Widnall
Lipscomb	Reuss	Willis
Long, La.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wilson, Bob
Long, Md.	Rhodes, Pa.	Wilson,
Love	Rivers, Alaska	Charles H.
McCarthy	Rivers, S.C.	Wolff
McClory	Roberts	Wyatt
McCulloch	Robison	Wydler
McDade	Rogers, Colo.	Yates
McDowell	Rogers, Fla.	Young
McEwen	Rogers, Tex.	Younger
McFall	Ronan	Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—37

Andrews, Glenn	Flynt	Mathias
Blatnik	Gallagher	Morrison
Boggs	Giaimo	Powell
Brock	Green, Oreg.	Resnick
Brooks	Griffiths	Rodino
Cahill	Hall	Roncalio
Casey	Halleck	Senner
Chelf	Hays	Smith, N.Y.
Conyers	Holland	Talcott
Curtis	Jacobs	Toll
Dickinson	Jones, Mo.	Williams
Dow	Kirwan	Wright
	MacGregor	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Toll with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Holland.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Wright.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Jones of Missouri.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 365, the Committee on Armed Services is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 800.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 800

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of 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 1966 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, $344,500,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,816,000,000; for the Air Force, $3,550,200,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $253,700,000; for the Navy, $364,000,000; for the Marine Corps, $13,000,000; for the Air Force $796,100,000.

Naval Vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,549,500,000, of which amount $133,600,000 is authorized only for construction of two nuclear-powered submarines.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 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, $1,429,500,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,462,600,000;

For the Air Force, $3,221,300,000, of which amount $82,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

For Defense agencies, $483,400,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 800 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 7657, as passed:

"TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 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, $344,500,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,915,800,000; for the Air Force, $3,545,200,000.

"Missiles

"For missiles: For the Army, $253,700,000; for the Navy, $364,000,000; for the Marine Corps, $13,000,000; for the Air Force, $771,100,000.

"Naval vessels

"For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,651,600,000, of which amount $150,500,000 is authorized only for the construction of a nuclear powered guided missile frigate.

"TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 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, $1,406,400,000;

"For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,439,200,000;

"For the Air Force, $3,103,900,000, of which amount $150,000,000 is authorized only for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory and $7,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

"For Defense agencies, $495,000,000.

"TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 301. Outstanding tonnage balances remaining in law for construction of Navy ships are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 302. The distribution of the assignments and contracts for construction of warships and escort vessels for which appropriations are authorized by this Act and hereafter shall be in accordance with the requirement of the Act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), that the first and each succeeding alternate vessel shall be constructed in the Government Navy yards: *Provided*, That, if inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed as required above, the President may have such vessel or vessels built in a Government or private yard as he may direct.

"SEC. 303. The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

"SEC. 304. 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, or after December 31, 1965, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of tracked combat vehicles, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates.'

"SEC. 305. No funds may be appropriated after June 30, 1966, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

"SEC. 306. Section 8074 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(c) The Military Air Transport Service is redesignated as the Military Airlift Command.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7657) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of yielding to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time, after conversing with the distinguished minority leader, to announce first of all an addition to the program.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, advises that he will undertake to call up under unanimous consent the bill H.R. 7855 to authorize additional funds for the construction of 17 small Coast Guard vessels.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I would like to advise that we have made such good progress today, thanks to two committees which have expeditiously handled two very important bills, if we can finish the NASA authorization bill and the transportation bill which have already been scheduled for tomorrow, it will be my purpoes to ask that we adjourn over until Monday next.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

In order to attempt to do this, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the taking of rollcall No. 90 on yesterday on H.R. 2985, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 90 on yesterday which was taken on H.R. 2985, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 90 on H.R. 2985, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "aye."

CITIZEN'S WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Vietnam is one of the most complex issues ever to be before this Congress and this Government. In order to aid the Members of the Congress in their deliberations concerning this vital issue, I wish to bring to their attention a recent paper. This paper, entitled "A Citizen's White Paper on American Policy in Vietnam and Southeast Asia," was written by Marcus Raskin, codirector of the Institute for Policy Studies. I believe that it is a keen analysis of our policy in southeast Asia and its historical background, and I include it herewith:

A CITIZEN'S WHITE PAPER ON AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Marcus G. Raskin)

I

In 1943 at the Cairo Conference and then again at the Teheran Conference, President Roosevelt stated that American and Indochinese interests were best served by Indochina losing its status as a French colony and becoming a U.N. trusteeship area. It was to become what some now call a "neutralized area." Roosevelt said that the area had been milked dry for 100 years by the French, and that that was quite enough. However, by March 1945, the French wanted Indochina back in a quasi-colonial status.

Originally, this proposal did not meet with American approval, but by 1946 the United States acquiesced. It was not the time to alienate the French when it appeared that the American-Soviet split was irreparable, and American planners wanted to forge the Western Alliance.

In Vietnam other forces were at work. Immediately after the surrender of Japan, Ho Chi Minh, the nationalist Communist leader, established a government and declared Vietnam's independence. The French Communists advised Ho Chi Minh to go slow and not to act in haste to the detriment of the French Communist Party.

The French Government, with the support of the French Communist Party, fought Ho Chi Minh. Stalin at first adhered to the French Communist line and refused to recognize Ho Chi Minh's Republic of Vietnam. In December 1946, Maurice Thorez, the Communist Vice President of France, countersigned the order for "military action" against the Republic of Vietnam. Even after the French Communist Party tempered its opposition to Ho the Russians still refused to recognize or give support to Ho.

In May 1950, the United States and France worked out the contours of the Schuman plan, an attempt to fashion a coal and steel cartel for Europe which was thought to be one more concrete step in the dream of a united West Europe tied to the United States. Coincident with this plan, Dean Acheson and Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, joined in announcing the new American involvement in Vietnam. After all, if a Western community was to come into being, and the United States intended to be its leader, then, it was said, we had to "share responsibilities" in non-European states that the West Europeans once controlled. In Indochina that meant:

1. Primary responsibility would continue to rest with France and the people of Indochina;

2. U.S. aid would be given to promote and restore "security" and the "genuine development of nationalism"; and

3. U.S. aid would go to France and the associated states of Indochina "in order to assist them in restoring stability and permitting these states to pursue their peaceful and democratic development.

Of course this meant that the United States could deal directly and openly in the Indochinese area. Although estimates vary, American aid to France for Vietnam totaled about $1 billion between the summer of 1950 and the spring of 1954. But the French, who until 1954 had primary responsibility there, were unable to organize indigenous political groups that would rally around either the French puppets or the American cause of anticommunism.

In January 1953, President Eisenhower held a review of Indochinese policy. The Eisenhower administration thought that the ingredient which the French needed to win the Indochinese war was a comprehensive military plan. He made increased American aid contingent on effecting such a plan. Named after Gen. Henri-Eugene Navarre, the plan called for the creation of indigenous forces to undertake garrison duties so that French forces could be released for an all-out military effort. It was no more successful than any of the other plans, and by May of 1954 the French had lost their military position in Vietnam at Dienbienphu.

Between January and May of 1954, the French, British, and Russians undertook exploratory talks to bring the war in Vietnam to a close. This drew strong opposition from Secretary of State Dulles, Senate Majority Leader Knowland, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Walter Robertson, Admiral Radford, and Vice President Nixon, who pushed hard for "united action" against the forces of Ho Chi Minh. Mr. Dulles used Life magazine as his instrument to say that the allies should be prepared to risk a war with China. He was undismayed by the possibility of Chinese forces entering Indochina to engage the white Western Powers. Yet, this did not reflect Eisenhower's view. He was much more reticent about a land war in Asia, as was General Ridgway, the Chief of Staff of the Army. After the United States sent 200 Air Force technicians to Indochina, Eisenhower said that he could conceive of no greater tragedy than the United States becoming involved in a war in

Indochina. The Western Powers and President Eisenhower, over Dulles' objections, dropped the idea of united action, for the British were uninterested, the American people were just recovering from the Korean trauma, and the French desperately needed peace. Indeed, Pierre Mendes-France had come to power on the promise that he could make peace in Indochina.

In 1954 the great issue for the West European states was the creation of a European Defense Community (EDC). The United States bent all its efforts to EDC's creation, for it meant a substantial step in the unification of West Europe. The French, however, had grave doubts about the EDC. They feared the rearming of West Germany, either independently or as the major element in a united West European Army, because it might have meant a possible German hegemony over West Europe. The Russians felt the same way. Seeing the possibility of a diplomatic success, they offered to intercede with Ho Chi Minh in exchange for a French vote against the European Defense Community. Pierre Mendes-France delivered the French Assembly. And, in exchange, Russia pressured the Vietminh into a peace conference at Geneva, when Ho believed he could have won control of all of Vietnam without having to arrive at a negotiated settlement.

The Geneva conference turned out to be typical in the history of diplomacy in the 20th century. No nation wanted to be there, but all knew that something had to be done. In attendance were Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, France, Laos, Communist China, the state of Vietnam, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and the United States. The conference dealt with all three states of Indochina. It stated that no military base could be established by foreign powers in Vietnam and that the purpose of the Vietnamese part of the agreement was to settle a military question. The military demarcation line (the 17th parallel) was not to be "interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." Furthermore, article 7 of the declaration permitted the Vietnamese people "to enjoy the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot." An election was to have been held in July 1956 "under the supervision of an international commission composed of representatives of the member states of the International Supervisory Commission."

Article 8 provided that "The provisions of the agreements on the cessation of hostilities intended to insure the protection of individuals and of property must be most strictly applied, and must, in particular, allow everyone in Vietnam to decide freely in which zone he wishes to live."

The United States took note but did not sign the final declaration of the Conference. Instead, Undersecretary of State Walter Bedell Smith read a statement saying that the United States would "(i) refrain from the threat of the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with Article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force; and (ii) it would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

South Vietnam was not a signatory and stated at the Conference that it was not bound by the Geneva accords.

The French, on the other hand, were not dissatisfied with the agreement since their primary purpose was to get out. They hoped that once the dust settled a bit, political parties would form in Vietnam and a democratic nation would emerge from the projected elections of 1956. But this hope was not regarded as a vital French interest. French foreign policy in Vietnam was now dictated by the need to end French domestic instability, since many politicians believed that the demoralization of the French people and the precarious state of the economy were caused by colonial policies in Indochina and Algeria.

II

In 1954 the United States was dominated in its foreign policy thinking by those who view Communist nations rhetorically as implacable enemies to be liberated and contained. In reality, however, the Eisenhower administration pursued an accommodation bargain by negotiating a stand-off in Korea with the Chinese and North Koreans a scant year before. The State Department in July 1954, looked for a line of resistance in Southeast Asia against "communism," much in the manner that was developed in Europe. Dulles thought that through the formation of a separate state—South Vietnam had finally found that line in Indochina.

The United States found a man, Ngo Dinh Diem, who could help in establishing that line. Diem, who lived in the Maryknoll Seminaries in the United States from 1950 to 1953, was sponsored by Cardinal Spellman and various liberal American Catholic politicians (e.g., Senator John F. Kennedy and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD were strong supporters of Diem). In a complicated maneuver aimed at aligning South Vietnam to its side, the United States pressured Bao Dai, the playboy puppet of France, into backing Diem against General Le Van Vien, a warlord who operated gambling, narcotics, and prostitution in South Vietnam through the powerful Binh Xuyen, a crime syndicate; and General Hinh, who had been the first choice of Bao Dai and the French for Vietnamese political leadership. To show its seriousness of purpose in establishing the line of resistance, the United States had formed the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) alliance.

The pact was a guarantee by Western powers to "consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense" where political integrity or independence was under attack. Dulles hoped to use the alliance to protect the newly created state of South Vietnam. However, the SEATO treaty had virtually no operational meaning or utility since the last thing that the European signatories of the treaty wanted was to get involved militarily in Vietnam.

During the early part of his regime, Diem seemed to be securing his own power and creating a national identity for South Vietnam. He was able to isolate General Hinh by deflating any support he had, while controlling the political and economic operations of the Binh Xuyen, which strangled the city of Saigon and the countryside. On the other hand, in North Vietnam the Communists, copying Chinese methods, instituted a harsh tax system and committed atrocities and wholesale murder against the landlords, bourgeois, and peasants in their attempts to enforce collectivization and political conformity in the North. The Geneva accords provided for free movement of Vietnamese from one part of Vietnam to the other. Hundreds of thousands of people fled North Vietnam, and in that process it was emptied of a potential resistance to Ho. The experiences of these refugees seemed to serve as the basis for a unifying bond against communism in the South Vietnamese nation. Many thousands of Catholics left the North for the South because of their hope in Diem and material aid from the Catholic church. And Diem, the Central Vietnamese Catholic, needed active support of Vietnamese Catholics from the North to survive in South Vietnam, among the Buddhist majority.

In October 1955 Diem held an election in which the people were to choose between Bao Dai, the absentee playboy, and himself. Upon winning that election by a fraudulent 97-percent majority, Diem formally proclaimed a new state—the Republic of Vietnam. This move ended any possibility of an election for all of Vietnam: an election that both Diem and the United States feared would have resulted in a victory for the North Vietnamese.

Ho Chi Minh's government resigned itself to the existence and stability of South Vietnam. In the early years of the Diem regime the North Vietnamese emphasis was on consolidation in their zone. Indeed, such consolidation was necessary. In November of 1956 the North Vietnamese peasants staged a revolt similar in intent to the Hungarian revolution. Ho admitted excesses, but continued many of them.

What turned the wheel of fortune against South Vietnam and the West were the internal policies of Diem's government. In 1956 he staged a crackdown on the Chinese living in South Vietnam: those Chinese not born in South Vietnam were disallowed from owning businesses in 11 major categories deemed vital to the economic life of South Vietnam. Diem estimated that the Chinese comprised 10 percent of the nation, and yet they owned two-thirds of its businesses. Rice exports came to a virtual halt as a result of Chinese reprisal to Diem's move. To further secure his power base in the South Vietnamese Government, Buddhists were systematically excluded and replaced by Catholics, while Catholicism became the officially favored religion. The Buddhist majority became the object of petty annoyance and persecution.

In 1957 Diem reorganized the police and placed on the Government payroll a huge net of informers. Diem's brother, Nhu, proceeded to rid the Diem oligarchy of any person who did not favor the Diem government. Diem also took the advice of American experts who said that the Viet Minh controlled between 40 and 70 percent of the villages which were not run by the religious sects, the Cao Daists, Buddhists, or Catholics. The Americans argued that the Viet Minh was a threat to the internal security of the state and would ultimately undermine Diem's rule. "The de facto integration of South Vietnam within the American military defense structure implied that the region ought to be secure; and hence, ought to be purged of anything which might, however remotely, serve the Red cause." (Phillippe Devillers.)

By 1958, Diem's police actions were transformed into military operations. The Government, now with the active military support of the United States, began pacifying outlying areas. The methods which they used were not dissimilar to those used by the North Vietnamese a few years earlier in their treacherous pacification operation. Arrests, torture, plundering, and "regroupment" came to be the order of the day. These tactics greatly alienated the peasants and farmers, since Diem seemed to be offering only torture without reform, or even ideology. In December of 1958, after the death of a score of prisoners in one of Diem's concentration camps, armed bands of rebels sprung up in South Vietnam. Their support by the peasants and the villagers was assured by Diem's behavior.

III

The foreign policy of Communist nations is traditionally conservative when it comes to foreign military involvements. The Communists and rebels in South Vietnam forced the hand of the North Vietnamese government to become active militarily. Until 1960, the North Vietnamese restricted their efforts to plaintive diplomatic notes to Diem. These notes invariably included demands for the restoration of communication (rail, post, sea, and trade) between the South and the North, and talks for elections, but little more. However, in March 1960, North Vietnamese leaders reexamined the situation in South Viet-

nam—in part because the Chinese had contact through Laos with the South Vietnamese rebels. The North Vietnamese feared that they would be "mousetrapped" by the Chinese if they did not actively support the South Vietnamese rebels. The wheel of fortune was given another turn. The manifesto of the 18th, signed by leaders in the spring of 1960 who opposed Diem, appeared to make clear that he could no longer hold the support of the moderates. The stage was set for civil war. The Nam-bo Declaration, drawn by South Vietnamese rebels with the aid of North Vietnamese leaders, also in the spring of 1960, detailed the list of grievances against the Diem government. It stated that the Veterans of the Resistance Association would fight to end the Diem regime and "to set up a democratic government of National Union in South Vietnam—in order to realize national independence and democratic liberties and to guarantee a decent life to the people."

They contended that only then could the Geneva accords be implemented.

By December 1960, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam began officially, under its own flag, to make successful attacks on South Vietnamese military forces. By 1961 the situation had deteriorated at a faster pace than had been expected by the United States. The South Vietnamese Government expanded its repressive and punitive activities without being able to implement any effective economic or social plans for the country. The Vietcong and the National Liberation Front killed minor officials in the towns by the thousands, and stepped up their campaign to win over the peasants in South Vietnam with a "carrot and stick" policy of reform and repression. As they became more successful, their need for repression dropped off considerably.

It was in this atmosphere that the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam was greatly increased at the beginning of the Kennedy administration. President Kennedy's advisers wanted to settle Laos as a neutralist country since it was thought that the United States could not, and should not, fight in both South Vietnam and Laos. They believed that with a neutralist government in Laos under Souvanna Phouma, Diem's government could be secured. In the spring of 1961, the mission of Maxwell Taylor and Walt Rostow, then White House advisers, recommended that guerrilla tactics be used by the United States and the South Vietnamese against the rebels. Influenced by their experience in the OSS, Rostow and Roger Hilsman, soon to become Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, thought that the way to beat the tactics of Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, the Vietminh military commander, and Ho was to emulate them. However, to fight that kind of war one needed the support of the peasants, and by this time the South Vietnamese peasants were totally alienated from the central administration. Commandos were not guerrillas. On the whole, the peasants were not interested in giving support to American military advisers or to Diem's army, which had swollen to 400,000 under the insistence of the Americans who believed that a ratio of at least 10 to 1 was necessary to beat a guerrilla force. (They never got beyond 5 to 1.) Yet the economy of the country could not support a larger force. By the end of 1962, the United States was flying bombing and strafing missions against villages where there was any suspicion of Communist support. Indiscriminate bombing with napalm, and atrocities against peasants who may or may not have helped the Vietcong were commonplace. All of the Vietnamese suspicions about U.S. imperialism were now confirmed.

Although publicly the Kennedy administration supported Diem, privately many American officials expressed great dissatisfaction with Diem, who viewed himself as the savior of South Vietnam. Americans saw him as an aloof man, controlled by his family. Indeed, the liberal American interventionists thought that if he were removed from the scene, the military, students, peasants, and Buddhists would be pacified, and the war would go better. By the fall of 1963, South Vietnam was in an uproar. The army was plotting against Diem, with American knowledge and assistance from some groups in the octopus-like American mission to South Vietnam, each of which had its own clients that it supported with material aid and advice. Buddhists were burning themselves alive in protest against Diem. (And in the American Government, high policymakers who had viewed the Buddhists as an insignificant political force went scurrying around looking for American Buddhists who could explain to them what was going on.) With the next turn of the wheel of fortune, Diem and his brother were murdered.

The military emerged with a weak strongman in January 1964, General Khanh. He alleged that some approaches had been made by Diem's brother during the last weeks of his life to North Vietnam and the Liberation Front. General Khanh, on the other hand, promised to prosecute the war to its end. That was what American policymakers in Washington and Saigon wanted to hear, since American policy was structured around the premise of a military victory against the Communits and rebels. Reformist economic and social activity was useful, but the Vietnamese operation was viewed by the American mission and General Harkins as primarily a military effort. In Washington the Vietnamese situation was looked at in more sophisticated terms. But no one knew how to express that sophistication except militarily, or in some pathetic organizational response such as fashioning a counterinsurgency group at the White House which would deal with the organization, training, and activities of guerrilla forces.

Almost no attention was paid to the consequences of military operations where whole villages were destroyed in search of one sniper. Although the United States had established its military presence with 20,000 military personnel, by the beginning of 1964 it had accomplished little else. The vast majority of engagements with the rebels, the peasants, or whoever they were, invariably ended in some measure of failure for the South Vietnamese army and its American advisers. The changeover in the top command structure of the American missions in South Vietnam changed nothing. General Taylor, the American Ambassador, and General Westmoreland, the American military commander, were as frustrated as any of their predecessors.

By the summer of 1964 events took on a slightly more ignominious quality. The American reprisal in the Gulf of Tonkin in violation of international law led to the military disaster of Bien Hoa, where at least 28 American planes were damaged or destroyed by a few guerrillas with mortars. Helicopters were destroyed by the score; thousands of people were killed monthly. By December 1964, Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, who was deposed after several months in power, found himself making a bid for his return with the statement that the Vietnamese military would not fight "to carry out the policy of any foreign country." Against official American wishes, he wanted all power to the military. Formally, he lost that battle. But for interesting reasons. On February 7, the Vietcong attacked Pleiku and Camp Holloway killing and wounding 75 Americans.

The attack came while McGeorge Bundy, the President's special assistant for national security affairs, was surveying the deteriorating military situation and attempting to compromise the differences between the competing South Vietnamese military and civil groups. He also used his stay in Vietnam to warn the North Vietnamese to stop their military involvement in the South. The Pleiku raid served as a "handle" (as it is called in government) to air attack installations in North Vietnam. This new turn of the wheel was predicated on several political and military theories. Politically it was thought that the United States had nothing to negotiate about at a diplomatic bargaining table with Ho; since it had for all practical purposes "lost" the war. Military and psychologically, the bombings were ordered and allowed in order to pacify the South Vietnamese and American military in Vietnam. The South Vietnamese military officers chafed at the American insistance that a civilian form of government be continued even if it was a facade, and feared that the United States would not expand the war thus undercutting their military and political raison d'etre. On the American military side the decision to bomb North Vietnam was an attempt to show the North Vietnamese and the Chinese that they were not "paper tigers." The American military, goaded by Chinese propaganda and psychological feelings of impotence, feared that they looked like paper tigers because of their poor military showing in South Vietnam. In reviewing the comments and evidence on the matter I find that virtually no one believed that the bombing had any military value, or that the supply routes would dry up. After all, those supplies came from us. After 4½ years, the guerrillas, with the use of American weapons—and their own abilities—ended up controlling far more territory than they did at the time of the massive American military intervention in 1961. The wags of Washington were saying that if only the United States would withdraw the South Vietnamese Government's strategic position would improve since the guerrillas would not be as well supplied. Ninety percent or more of the rebel's weapons came from captured United States or South Vietnamese store depots or the black market, not from Vietnam. U Thant made this point in a more diplomatic, yet didactic way. He noted that communism could be controlled in southeast Asia if there was no American military present.

In February and March of 1965 the Buddhists, who found among their monks a penchant for politics sought ways to end the war. They initiated a peace movement under Thich Quang Lien, who held a master's degree from Yale University. His aim was that of forcing all foreign military units out of North and South Vietnam. Once the bombings in North Vietnam were increased, various nations of the world feared an escalation into a far reaching war. They did not believe the aesopian language of those who said that our responses were "measured and controlled." Indeed, the image of super rationality was exposed rather quickly when one studied the events of the war with anything more than casual interest.

For example, the use of nonlethal gas was unknown to those concerned with a controlled response, or the order to let pilots choose their own targets in North Vietnam gave many pause to wonder what control meant in that context.

The Department of State white paper had succeeded in arousing anger in many quarters because of its pedestrian quality, its failure to show how the war was controlled from the north, and hence, why it was necessary to bomb the north on a regular basis. No arguments in that flimsy document were adduced from international law, very few from the facts of the situation and none from history except that ersatz kind which men who have control of vast bureaucracies use to justify their personal (although because of their power they are translated into institutional) actions.

In Vietnam the course of events was effected in new ways by the bombings. The

United States increased its forces in South Vietnam by mid-April to over 35,000. The North Vietnamese responded rather mildly to American bombings of their country perhaps for several reasons. They did not have the air power to engage or fend off American and South Vietnamese air attacks in anything but haphazard ways. Also, North Vietnamese policy was aimed at attempting to isolate the United States on a moral level from its allies in the Western alliance and in Asia since the bombings reflected little more than military inadequacy and our seeming willingness to apply any self selected means (with little care for cost) to obtain a self-defined end.

On the political level the North Vietnamese leadership which historically favored the Soviets over the Chinese Communists wanted Soviet aid, but not Chinese intervention. The Soviet Union as in 1946, and even after the American bombings of North Vietnam while Premier Kosygin was present in North Vietnam, did not want to endanger its own relations with the United States.

In South Vietnam there was little change in the course of the war. The rebel noose around Saigon grew tighter, American quarters were bombed regularly, the American Embassy was destroyed, and 75 percent or better (who really knew?) of the towns, villages and countryside were in the hands of the Vietcong. The United States sent reinforcements of Marines to places in which the whole countryside was controlled by the Vietcong. In the Da Nang area, for example, the American military garrisons were present at the sufferance of the Vietcong. American military officials openly admitted that the South Vietnamese army was unreliable: that many soldiers were Vietcong or members of the Liberation Front. The Vietcong bragged that it was now not only supplied by the American forces but trained by them as well.

In France those generals who studied American military tactics at the beginning of the monsoon and rainy season of 1965 thought they witnessed a déja vu to their own military campaigns which ended at Dienbienphu in May 1954.

Diplomatically, the wheel of fortune also turned. And in a way it was the final irony. By the late fall of 1964, De Gaulle and the French wanted a conference whose objective could only result in a settlement along the lines proposed by President Roosevelt in 1943 and 1944. In January 1965, it was said in Washington that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) or others had made approaches through intermediaries to Ho Chi Minh for negotiations, but were greeted unreceptively. Yet De Gaulle said that the Chinese and the North Vietnamese wanted to negotiate and we had better not stipulate preconditions to a conference that we needed at least as badly as the North Vietnamese. And the British, who in 1954 wanted the United States to support the Geneva Agreements, including the provision for elections, now seemed to favor continued American military involvement in southeast Asia because of the precarious situation between its creation, Malaysia, and Indonesia.

The diplomatic policy of the American Government by the end of December 1964 was almost totally militarized. Those who interested themselves in negotiation without expanding the war into North Vietnam were eclipsed by those who merely wanted to expand the war per se or who wanted to bomb and negotiate. The latter policy became the policy of the doves. The previous deterrent to a substantial military involvement in southeast Asia, war with China, seemed to become the spur or objective. "No more sanctuaries," the Chinese were warned by American leaders, thus leaving the direct implication that the source (China) would be struck if the war continued.

The growing American involvement in Vietnam was little understood in the United States. Although Congress was silent on the course of the war, privately there was anger and disbelief at the policies of the Johnson administration. Some blamed the policies on carryovers from the Kennedy administration. They believed that the President was a neophyte in foreign affairs and had counted too heavily on the advice of the military, the CIA, State, the NSC machinery: those who had a vested interest in the militarized foreign policy. By April of 1965, newspapers, liberal and conservative, called for a definition of American aims. University professors and students held marches and "teach-ins" in favor of negotiation. The President spoke on April 8 to the American people in reply to the critics of the policy and the March 15 declaration of the nonalined nations calling for negotiation. President Johnson's speech on April 8 was predicated on the official American position that North Vietnam controls the Vietcong in South Vietnam and the course of the guerrilla war there. This view, enunciated in the Department of State's white paper was open to serious question. A special Japanese envoy to study the situation in Vietnam for the Government of Japan, Mr. Matsumoto, pointed out that the Vietcong is much like the French underground during World War II representing different groups in the country. "It can be said that the Vietcong is not directly connected to Communist China or the Soviet Union.

Consequently, it is not certain that the Vietcong will give up fighting because of the bombing of North Vietnam. In Vietnam I often heard it said that the Vietcong is a nationalist movement. This means the Vietcong will not give up resistance until they have achieved their objectives. Mr. Matsumoto said that no one could really define the character of the Vietcong and that even our own administration in Saigon estimates that the Communists only include 30 percent of the Vietcong. The Japanese position would seem to comport with the dynamics of revolutionary or resistance movements. Those who in fact do the fighting, live through hardship and misery, are not very quick to hand over their power to another, be it Ho Chi Minh or Mao Tse-tung. Ironically, the interests of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong further diverged once the United States undertook to bomb North Vietnam. Although the North Vietnamese were suffering in their own country the Vietcong continued to flourish. If this is true it would mean that Ho Chi Minh may find it very difficult to stop the war. There are four ways of looking at this "reality" in terms of American policy:

1. That the official U.S. position is correct; that Ho controls the Vietcong enough to stop the war;

2. That the United States has been foiled by its own ideology which insists on continuing Communist conspiracy as the way of explaining revolution or civil war movements;

3. That the United States wishes to stabilize the southeast Asia area and in due time will offer Ho Chi Minh and his group leadership in an attempt to countercheck the power of Communist China; or

4. That U.S. planners really accept the interpretation of the Japanese, knows that there is little connection between the southern rebels and North Vietnamese controlled conspiracy mask its unwillingness to settle the war.

The American rationale may be predicated on the third point; viz, that the United States wishes to counterbalance the power of Communist China by using Ho Chi Minh and the anti-Chinese feelings of the North Vietnamese to counterbalance the Chinese. The insistence on negotiating with Ho Chi Minh to the virtual exclusion of the Vietcong appears to fly directly in the face of the stated policy of an independent South Vietnam. It would appear that it was to American advantage to negotiate or agree to negotiate with the Vietcong and Liberation Front since they would, likely (and given the emphasis on the regional character of the country) build their own political power relatively independent of North Vietnamese domination.

The President's speech which outlined the possibilities of the Mekong River Delta project while not something which could immediately yield results would have the positive effect of diverting war energies to more constructive ends. What is important in this case is not that the Mekong project would take a decade before it "bore fruit," but that it reflects a new process toward cooperation and activity in the name of man. In that sense (and although both parts of the President's speech reflected the terrible hubris of the United States) the second half of that speech should be taken as a direction in which the United States is prepared to participate not as boss but as good neighbor. That view is quite far from the views set forth in the first part of the speech which left the impression that we could only be satisfied in international affairs according to our values and principles since we did not fight for such mundane things as territory or colonies. No price it seemed was too great to pay for what we believed "right."

Not surprisingly the speech was read by the Chinese in the context of the military buildup by the United States in Vietnam, its increased raids and military titillation of the Chinese border. The North Vietnamese, while rejecting the offer of "unconditional discussions" seemed more disposed, according to East European sources, to take the President's offer seriously even to the extent of neutralizing both North and South Vietnam. Most diplomats in the East and West agreed that no negotiations or unlimited discussions could be entered into until the United States stopped bombing North Vietnam. Since the military purpose in such bombings were admittedly infinitesimal and since, as the President said in his speech, "We have no desire to devastate that which the people of North Vietnam have built with toil and sacrifice," cessation of bombings in North Vietnam would hardly be costly to the United States.

IV

Since the Second World War, American policymakers have developed America's foreign policy role as that of world's policeman. We assumed this role in Vietnam, a place where we did not begin to comprehend the complex cross-currents of politics, nationalism, personality, tradition, history, and other people's interests. To support our role as policeman our military and CIA programs in southeast Asia grew to mammoth proportions without rhyme or reason. These programs often reflected little more than the power struggles of the agencies of American bureaucracy, rather than anything which went on in Asia. A report on Vietnam and southeast Asia prepared by four Senators on the request of President Kennedy in 1963 stated:

"It should also be noted, in all frankness, that our own bureaucratic tendencies to act in uniform and enlarging patterns have resulted in an expansion of the U.S. commitment in some places to an extent which would appear to bear only the remotest relationship to what is essential, or even desirable, in terms of U.S. interests."

The United States, by the military and covert way it operated in Vietnam in the past 10 years, has nurtured strong anti-white and anti-Western feelings in southeast Asia. Whether we called it "responsibility" or empire, the facts were that the United States succeeded to the Japanese and French hegemony in Asia without really

knowing why or with what purpose. Empires are very seldom built by design. They start almost accidently; their dynamics and actions define what they are. Each empire has its own characteristics, although historically they all seem to involve defense of some allies, suppressing certain regimes in favor of others, and a powerful ideology. Ultimately, there are common characteristics in the lack of judgment on the part of their leaders who no longer are able to distinguish between real and chimeric interests because of the empire's octopuslike tentacles. Those tentacles, especially if they include extensive military involvement strangle the judgment of its leaders.

Relating to Vietnam militarily has camouflaged America's real interests and distorted the type of diplomacy and politics which should be employed there. The methods we have followed in Vietnam may not be without their costs in terms of our own Nation's stability and freedom of choice. Thus, when we ask the military to undertake projects which are inherently unmilitary, we are courting great danger. It is overdramatic to say that the United States will be faced with a French Organization de L'Armee Secrete (OAS) situation with our military if we substantially expand the war, and then attempt an accommodation, but such seeds are easily sown. For example, the official American policy in South Vietnam is to support a civilian government in Vietnam, whereas the rank and file military, including high-ranking American military officers in Vietnam, support the South Vietnamese military. Bad habits are learned in such wars and they may too easily be applied at home.

It is hard for American civilian leadership to learn that the military is not a machine which can be started and stopped by pressing a button. By definition of their mission, the military want to follow through to a military victory. We will find that each day that American policymakers procrastinate on a political settlement, the war will escalate upward militarily just by its own momentum. In this regard the military bureaucratic course of the war is quite instructive. The special forces and the Army were the military forces under President Kennedy who were given responsibility for the war. After the apparent failure of these forces to pacify the country, the Air Force lobbied for involvement.

Using the Gulf of Tonkin as the pretext, the Air Force sent planes to South Vietnam as a deterrent. But deterrents are vulnerable and can be easily destroyed by guerrillas as these were at Bien Hoa. Here the psychology of the paper tiger played its part. The Air Force's pride was wounded and it decided to involve itself more fully so that it could prove itself. Once this occurred, the Marines and the Navy (but less so) lobbied for an expanded role which was granted. Not wanting to be left out, the Army also wanted greater involvement. This was also granted by the White House. Finally, SAC in a nonnuclear way also wanted involvement. Paradoxically, the military may have wished for that involvement because they feared that the war would end, because the politicians would negotiate military withdrawal before they had a chance to test themselves in battle. Although that might have been their fear, objectively, because of such a massive military involvement in the war in a political sense it becomes very hard to impress our opponents of peaceful intentions, or to counter those groups in the American Government and the public who want a win in the military sense of the term.

The Vietnamese operation as a military venture is not one in which very many can take any particular pride. The bad habits of that war have included torture, napalming, defoliation, and inability to understand what means could yield suitable ends. Although governments are, by their nature, notoriously uncritical of themselves, democracies, by their nature, have a better chance of holding their governments and the actions of the individuals in that government to account (even though personal responsibility for actions is not a very fashionable virtue in government). Too often governments, that, is men in government, are expected to operate by inverted meanings of responsibility and morality or forget about them while in government. (Indeed, one of our former Secretaries of State, Dean Acheson, gave such behavior ideological gloss in his Amherst College address in December 1964.) This sort of responsibility and morality can be seen in Vietnam. Where, as in the case of Vietnam, three out of four Americans until the middle of 1964 were not even aware that the United States was involved militarily, officials seem to have felt themselves free to allow sadistic and totalitarian methods in the name of fuzzy objectives. Such methods spread easily, and unthinkingly, in governments. It is best that they be exposed and terminated.

v

With the realization that neither the United States alone nor the Western Powers together can dictate a result in southeast Asia, does there remain any role which these countries can play in that area? Most certainly it is not that of policeman or white man's burden for Asia. That lesson was learned, or should have been, 10 years ago. Perhaps the moderately clever even learned it at the end of the Second World War. Nor is it likely that pacts such as SEATO, which do not comprise the great nations having real or geographical interests in southeast Asia, Japan, Indian, and Burma can ever mean anything. If the great powers are to exercise a role, and if there is to be a long-term settlement, it will have to be in concert with other nations; that is, through the U.N. Although the present line of the Chinese Communists and the North Vietnamese is to oppose U.N. involvement, because they fear that the Geneva and Laotian agreements would be scrapped, any new settlement would necessarily be predicated on the 1954 and 1962 agreements. The purpose of U.N. involvement would be to guarantee that the terms are kept.

While the U.N. machinery appears to the West to be unwieldy and leaves much room for improvement, the facts are that the U.N. in the southeast Asian area has done more to stabilize that region than either the SEATO arrangement or the American military intervention. For example, the U.N. was instrumental in ending the 1961 Laotian crisis whereas SEATO was unable even to agree on what the crisis was. The probability is that America's allies in SEATO would be more likely to act under U.N. direction than under SEATO auspices in southeast Asia, since SEATO, as an international or regional institution, has absolutely no moral or political force behind it. Furthermore, the nations of southeast Asia are more favorably disposed to the U.N. because of the voting power of the Afro-Asian and Latin American nations in the General Assembly than they are to pact alliances which are comprised principally of white Western powers. The prescription of action is not an easy one, for it will mean that we shall have to reconsider how the United States is to relate to the world, and to itself. No doubt there are other courses that parallel the one I outline. The policy I've drawn is illustrative as any policy must be until it is put to the hard test of negotiation and practice.

1. Recently more and more evidence has been reported in the United States about the torture and napalming of the Vietcong and peasants by the South Vietnamese Army, with either American participation or acquiescence. This brutality and torture can only revolt those who are concerned with politics rather than sadism. We cannot control the torture of the North Vietnamese. We are responsible for what we do and for what our agents do. That is, we are responsible for our torture of prisoners and napalming of villages. In the spirit of shouldering our responsibility we must immediately put a stop to the bombings and torture now either allowed or sanctioned by the United States. That policy is shortsighted politically and foolish militarily. It has not resulted in any advantage to the United States. If a political settlement is the objective aimed at and elections are held, those South Vietnamese who supported the torture and napalming will be defeated. The only way that the South Vietnamese, whom we support and prop up, will change, is for us to change. When that happens, they may be able to retrain some favor in South Vietnam.

Although there is evidence which makes clear the historic roots of torture in Indochina as a method of politics, there is sufficient evidence to show how Western methods have updated the more "primitive" Vietnamese ways. At the very least, we should adopt and enforce the Prisoners of War (POW) and Red Cross Conventions as they apply to that war. There is another point to the sadism and torture. Bureaucracy and organization may involve itself in such things almost antiseptically. That is a dangerous trend in government and should be stopped. An independent investigation (along the lines of the Warren Commission) of the activities and directives of American personnel and policymaking in regard to the conduct of the war would do much to restore responsibility in statecraft. Such an investigation would help set standards by which the various agencies of the American Government operate internationally. (The new CIA Director could benefit greatly from such a review.)

2. Under the 1954 Geneva accords an election was to have been held in July 1956 in South and North Vietnam to determine the type of government it would have as a unified nation. A conference of the 14 powers, similar to the Laos negotiation, but now with U.N. sponsorship, should be convened (provided for in article 4, Geneva accords of 1962) to negotiate a permanent cessation of all military activities. As evidence of its good intentions, prior to the convening of the conference, the United States should stop the bombings of North Vietnam. The United States, with the other great powers, should now join in guaranteeing the borders of the area as a member of the 14 nations conference. That conference would set the outlines for a confederated state of Vietnam which would come into existence after certain agreed upon conditions were met. The International Control Commission (ICC) or another agreed-upon body would act as the investigator-enforcer. (It should be recalled that this method was adopted in the Palestine-Israeli situation and has worked well.) A political amnesty in both North and South Vietnam would be declared and all elements of the population in North and South Vietnam would be free to seek political representation by democratic means. This would be enforced by the ICC under U.N. sponsorship. North and South Vietnam would be admitted to the U.N. as separate states. Once confederation was achieved the Vietnamese would have single representation.

3. The ICC could be greatly strengthened if it received its authority from the U.N., and became a responsibility of the U.N. Its task would be to investigate complaints, act as a police force, conduct the initial elections in Vietnam and make continuous reports to the U.N. about any border difficulties. Responsibility for serving on the ICC would rotate among members of the U.N. Payment for this activity should come from the great powers to the U.N. earmarked for

the ICC. Further, with U.S. support, the ICC should act to negotiate out the differences between Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam that have mounted over the past 10 years.

4. The situation in Laos will continue to deteriorate unless the United States undertakes diplomatic means to stop the war in Vietnam. To insure Laotian stability, the United States should lead in efforts which will give the ICC greater power and authority to act in the whole southeast Asian sector. The ICC should request, through U.N. good offices, troops from Burma, the Philippines, Nepal, New Zealand, Yugoslavia, and Algeria. They would police borders and serve as an inspection unit for arms control in the area. National responsibility for troops detachments would be on a rotational basis.

5. The United States, through the U.N. should offer aid to Laos, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand in fashioning a common market between themselves, with a customs and payments union, emergency funds to finance special quick payoff projects (United States and U.N. files are bulging with such projects) and a long-term economic development project such as the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) for southeast Asia. Indeed, it could use the Special Fund as its primary instrument for some of these projects. The Mekong River project, which is a striking plan for land and water development, has united Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam in this development activity. It is even said by those involved in the project that the Pathet Lao support the Mekong Delta project and that the North Vietnamese also would if it were extended into their area.

Correctively, a "planning bank" whose directors would be Cambodia, North Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, South Vietnam, the United States, France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, could direct the expenditure and planning of short-term projects in South and North Vietnam, and the Mekong project in southeast Asia. The planning bank could be funded by these powers under authority of the United Nations using the Economic Commission for Asia in the Far East (ECAFE) as its parent. The organizational structure of the planning bank would allow for inclusion of both donors and recipients as board directors. The People's Republic of China would be invited to join in one of these capacities.

6. The United States should now compensate for the bombings of Cambodian territory, the destruction of their villages, of total innocents, and of their land.

VI

The North Vietnamese are anxious for trade with the South. Except for food which they received from the Russians in 1955, the North Vietnamese would have continued the war in 1955 to obtain rice. They will do so in the future unless they are able to obtain rice from some source. The resumption of trade and the normalization of relations with North Vietnam is a small price to pay for stabilizing the situation in the Indochinese area. Like South Vietnam, North Vietnam has been under a crushing military and economic burden. Its leadership has been fighting for 25 years and is concerned that North Vietnam will lose everything in a war that could spread to their territory. Again, the North Vietnamese are concerned to keep control of their country from the Chinese and the Soviet Union. This can only be accomplished in the context of peace. In a widened military action the Chinese would move a large military force into North Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese position as supported by the Chinese and the Russians has been reasonably consistent since the Geneva Conference of 1954. Their demands flow from the Geneva accords themselves. As I have stated, on February 4, 1955, they proposed restoring normal road, rail, sea, air, and postal relations between the two zones, as was promulgated in the Geneva accords and general elections. The problem with the Geneva accords was that no nation which felt any responsibility for stability in southeast Asia cared to guarantee the agreements of that Conference. France was in no position to carry out for the whole of Vietnam a guarantee as enunciated in the accords, especially in the face of American objections. If a Geneva conference were held along the lines of the 1954 Conference with the difference being that the United States would join and guarantee the results, the probability is that Vietnam would maintain—or attain—an existence which would be independent of Communist China.

Barring the inability of the United States to control its appetite for military involvement, there is a reason for some cautious optimism. There are two strong political currents in southeast Asia. One is nationalism and the other is fear of Chinese domination. The direction of North Vietnamese and any future South Vietnamese leadership, assuming it is to have any sort of indigenous mass support, will be to achieve national political identity for their nations. This means that the local political and military leadership will work to lessen the influence of the great powers (United States, France, China, and the Soviet Union) in southeast Asia. They are aware that they cannot get very far by having outside troops prop up their regime or by being wholly dependent upon outside forces politically, diplomatically, or economically.

No doubt this attitude will cause the great powers some consternation, since historically they have used the region of southeast Asia as a pawn in their game. However, that age of international politics is over. Will Communist China abide by that view? There is no question that U.S. relations with China will soon enter a new stage. To no little extent what the United States does will drastically affect Chinese activity. If the United States helps in fashioning the political concerns of southeast Asia on real issues: water, food, and electric power, we will be in a better position of blunting Chinese power because the southeast Asian nations will have a reason for being independent. If we make it possible for China to participate in such projects peacefully we will have accomplished much in recognizing the legitimate interests of 650 million Chinese, and will have discouraged both their—and our—unreal interests. Settling the Vietnamese war can be used as an opening wedge for improving relations with the Communist Chinese in this next period of international affairs. The risks of that policy for the United States are incomparably less than a holy war with China; a war which can only result either in its nuclear demolition or a prolonged land war which the United States would probably lose on China's mainland.

The political outlines of action become clear:

(a) Investigate the conduct of the war as formulated and carried out by the United States and adopt the POW and Red Cross Conventions as it applies to the war;

(b) Convene a 14-nation conference under the aegis of the U.N. to arrange a cease-fire;

(c) Arrange for the guarantee of the borders of southeast Asia countries through the 14-nation conference;

(d) Allow the Vietnamese to work for a confederated North and South Vietnam, but admit them separately to the U.N. Whether the people of North and South Vietnam should have one government and one political system is their affair, not ours.

(e) Strengthen the ICC politically by making it responsible to the United States and militarily by fashioning a police force comprised of rotating detachments from nations in the U.N.—Burma, the Philippines, and New Zealand;

(f) Reinstitute the customs and payments union between the nations of the area and allow trade between North and South Vietnam;

(g) Compensate Cambodia for incursions on its people and property;

(h) Develop a planning bank drawn in such a manner as to provide for the inclusion of Communist China, involve the U.N. Special Fund and ECAFE as the instruments for short- and long-term economic aid to Vietnam and neighboring states.

St. Augustine lived his life in a debauched way before his conversion. If debauchery is a necessary prerequisite to redemption, then the situation in Vietnam is ready for the next step. We may be sure that no policy a government follows is holy. However, at least this policy would be in the American national interest.

MR. FOLEY OF THE LOS ANGELES TIMES DOES A SUPERIOR JOB OF REPORTING ON A SUBJECT THAT SHOULD BE OF INTEREST TO EVERY AMERICAN: TWO PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANTS FOR EACH MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Thomas J. Foley, of the Washington Bureau of the Los Angeles Times, has written a piece about the need for more adequate staffing by the Congress of the United States. I advocate each House Member being provided with two professional assistants.

Recently I made a speech on the subject and suggested that every Representative have two additional specialized employees: First, a lawyer qualified to evaluate proposed legislation; and second, an economist equipped to weigh the manifold problems of the American economy with all of their social ramifications.

I have read every word of Mr. Foley's piece and can take issue with none of it. In the speech I delivered on the subject, I stated that it would be necessary to have a fourth office building in order to accommodate all the Representatives with their new employees. Howls went up from one end of the country to the other about another House Office Building. The reasons I gave for needing such an office building, to keep pace with the growth of each Congressman's workload and the growth of the Nation, were lost in the catcalls. It took a good newsman like Mr. Foley, with a sense of journalistic responsibility, to come through with the excellent article I now offer for the RECORD:

CONGRESSIONAL BURDEN SHOULD BE RELIEVED

(By Thomas J. Foley)

WASHINGTON.—If one should hear someone say "Congress doesn't know what it's doing," it might be dismissed as a flip remark by a

citizen either shallow minded or disgruntled or both.

This would not necessarily be the correct judgment, however. In fact, to some who watch Congress work, it seems rather sound.

For the fact is that the legislative problems an individual Congressman faces from day to day are so complex, so far-reaching in implication and usually so expensive that he does not know enough of what he's doing. In many cases, far from it.

He is doing well these days if he knows the details of legislation before his own committee. Many don't.

All of this is meant not as a criticism of the Congressmen, most of whom are intelligent, industrious, and conscientious, but as a commentary on the times, how they've changed and what might be done about it in relation to improving the legislative process.

Sixty years ago or so, when the world was far away and the Federal budget was half a billion dollars, a Congressman's office was his desk in the Capitol Building.

Washington was remote and voters seldom bothered their man in Washington. Furthermore, the legislative problems the Congressman was called on to cope with were uncomplicated and only occasionally momentous.

Not so now. The momentous is commonplace. Last week alone, the House passed a $6 billion social security bill making many changes in existing provisions and adding a complicated health insurance program, while the Senate was passing an equally comprehensive school aid bill.

The Congress must also decide whether President Johnson is justified in spending $100 billion and if not, why not?

Far from being remote from the rest of the world, Washington now leads and finances most of it and actively opposes the rest of it in one form or another.

The sheer volume is killing. Some 13,000 bills were introduced in the last Congress, many of them duplications and most of them ignored, of course. But the House did pass almost 1,000, and two-thirds of them became law. Most Congressmen knew little more about them than what the proposals did in a general way.

Public hearings on the 1964 tax bill alone covered 4,000 printed pages in 7 volumes. The printed form of Appropriation Committee hearings each year take up an entire shelf.

Sometimes, the small, unpublicized bill is the one that most needs the careful legislator's attention.

As Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, said recently in discussing the problem, specifically the tax bill, in the House, "Who really knows what that legislation was all about unless they read it? How many sleepers are there in it? How many cases of petty and grand larceny are involved? Who really knows the answers to these questions?" The answer, of course, is, very few.

Besides the legislative problems, the Congressman must perform innumerable tasks for his ever-growing number of constituents. Washington is now involved in everyone's life to some extent or other, and a Representative must represent or go home.

At least one possible answer to the problem is an adequate staff. At present, it is inadequate, particularly in the House where, despite a recent increase, Congressmen are limited to 10 persons at a total cost of about $55,000 a year in salaries.

As Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has said, the number of persons on congressional staffs "totals fewer than the number of persons presently required to operate the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

Too often, a Congressman is unable to turn to anyone to get an objective point of view on a particular bill or issue. Too often, he is forced to rely on the word of private parties lobbying for or against the issue whose views have a place in his consideration but certainly not the only place.

He is allowed to pay one person up to $19,300 a year. But if he does this, he usually does not have enough left to hire enough other competent persons for his offices in Washington and in his home district.

But if a Congressman had more persons on his own staff to help him screen information and evaluate legislation—PATMAN suggests a trained economist and a lawyer—he would be better able to legislate intelligently.

Some Congressmen don't use all of the staff allowance that is allotted to them now. But they should.

There are drawbacks, of course. There is no assurance a Congressman will use the money to hire professionals.

Some feel that congressional staffs spend too much time now serving as campaign headquarters and that adding to them would only serve to increase the daily propaganda ground out and sent to voters at home under the franking privilege.

Some say Congressmen can rely on committee reports on legislation. But these often are too long or incomplete or too technical. Others suggest beefing up the Library of Congress functions for helping legislators.

Congress has always been skittish about building up its own staffs because of voter reaction that the Members are feathering their own nests. Nepotism scandals in recent years haven't helped in this regard.

But in its current effort to reorganize itself to deal with the world around us, Congress could well consider a modest increase in staffs as a start.

JOINT LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor today filed its report on H.R. 1153, which was reported from the committee on April 29.

H.R. 1153 permits employer contributions to joint labor-management programs for the promotion of product and product application or programs for the establishment of joint labor-management committees to resolve issues arising from disputes regarding the interpretation of collective bargaining agreements where such determinations are binding upon all parties concerned.

This bill was made necessary by several court decisions regarding section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act. Section 302 places restrictions upon certain payments by employers to employee representatives. Section 302 was drafted in the form of a general prohibition upon employer payments to employee representatives, including certain jointly administered trust funds. Certain jointly administered funds are specifically excepted from this general prohibition. Because of the nature of the drafting of this section, that is, a general prohibition and specific exceptions, some programs have been declared unlawful though the legislative history sets forth no public policy opposed to their continuance.

The law was amended in 1959 to allow the establishment of jointly administered trust funds for pooled vacations, holiday, severance, or similar benefits, or apprenticeship or other training programs. There was no public policy in opposition to these programs. In fact, public policy favored their development, but the drafting of the law required that the courts declare them unlawful until the law was amended.

The same situation exists today. No public policy militates against the establishment of joint labor-management product promotion programs or joint labor-management committees to settle disputes regarding the interpretation of collective bargaining agreements. These programs have existed in the construction industry for many years. They have been mutually beneficial to labor, management, and the public. The U.S. Government should not inject itself into free, voluntary negotiations between labor and management to prevent the establishment of these beneficial programs. It should be left to private negotiations to determine whether these programs should be included in collective bargaining agreements. The only interest that the Government should seek to regulate relative to these jointly administered programs, is the public interest opposing collusive or dishonest arrangements.

The purpose of section 302 was to prevent the recurrence of some irregular practices brought to light during the late 1950's in congressional hearings. To implement this purpose section 302 prohibits certain payments to employee representatives by employers and establishes certain safeguards for those employer contributions that are not prohibited. The payments that we seek to legitimize will be protected by the specific safeguards now contained in section 302, plus four additional precautions.

First. Payments must go to separate trusts.

Second. Funds cannot be commingled with other funds.

Third. Funds cannot be used to defray costs of programs that are employer functions or labor organization functions solely.

Fourth. Applicable provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act will apply to these funds.

In addition, the opinion of the National Labor Relations Board stating that these programs are not mandatory subjects of collective bargaining is reaffirmed in the bill. No one will be required to bargain on the establishment of the programs that this bill legitimates.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will soon have the opportunity to consider this proposal on the floor of the House.

INDUSTRYWIDE APPROACH TO GASOLINE MARKETING PROBLEMS APPLIED BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this week marks a historic turning point in the approach of the Federal Trade Commission to gasoline marketing problems. In the past, the work of the Commission has been confined to the investigation and processing of individual cases. The size and the complexity of the petroleum industry has, of course, made this most difficult. The fact that the Commission has recently dismissed almost all of its gasoline cases is strongly suggestive of what I have personally long considered the fact of the matter—that the case-by-case method of enforcement is not entirely adequate to the problems presented in this industry.

Chairman Dixon and the members of the Commission are to be commended for taking this important step. Their willingness to use the broad investigative powers of the Commission in the public interest is most heartening. The list of witnesses who will appear encompasses those engaged in production, refining, and marketing of gasoline at all levels. Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD at this point a list of the witnesses who will appear during the 7 days of hearings:

PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF APPEARANCES FOR HEARING ON MARKETING OF GASOLINE

MAY 3

A.M.: National Oil Jobbers Council, Inc.; Michigan Petroleum Association; Tidewater Oil Co.

P.M.: Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association; Rock Island Refining Corp.; Mr. Tracy Odell; Sunland Refining Corp; Mr. Gil Meyer.

MAY 4

A.M.: Mid-Continent Independent Refiners Association.

P.M.: Standard Oil Co. of Indiana; Shell Oil Co.

MAY 5

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.

MAY 6

A.M.: Texas Association of Petroleum Retailers; United Refining Co.

P.M.: Humble Oil & Refining Co.; Frontier Refining Co.; Independent Refiners Association; Champlin Oil & Refining Co.; Mr. Robert F. Forbes.

MAY 10

A.M.: Mid-America Gasoline Dealers Association, Inc.; Mr. Walter S. Strange; Central Illinois Retail Gasoline Dealers Association; Richfield Oil Co.

P.M.: Sinclair Refining Co.; Standard Oil Co. of Ohio; Socony-Mobil Oil Co.; Sun Oil Co.; Charles O. Porter, attorney.

MAY 11

A.M.: Continental Oil Co.; Gulf Oil Co.; Ryan Oil Co.; American Petroleum Refiners Association.

P.M.: Automotive Service Industry Association; Texas Oil Jobbers Association; Clinton Oil Co.; Attorney General of Minnesota; Tenneco Oil Co.

MAY 12

A.M.: North Dakota Retail Gasoline Dealers Association; National Oil Marketers Association; Cantelou Oil Co., Inc.; Dr. Charles M. Hewitt, professor, business law, and oil consultant, Indiana University; Florida Petroleum Marketers Association.

P.M.: Phillips Petroleum Co.; Union Oil Co.; Service Station Operators Association of Greater Hartford; Harry Waller.

I take particular satisfaction in this act by the Commission since it was a little over a year ago, March 12, 1964, when, at a press conference called for that purpose, I first called for the holding of such an industrywide investigation. At that time I stated: "An industrywide approach is imperative if this deplorable situation is to be righted." At the same time I also called for the promulgation of trade regulation rules for petroleum marketing. The Commission has been most scrupulous in not prejudging what the proper response to the evidence received at the current hearing should be. My subcommittee together with the entire petroleum industry will be watching with great interest to see what steps are taken subsequent to this public hearing. It is obvious that further steps of some nature will be required, particularly so since virtually all of the gasoline marketing cases before the Commission have been dismissed or otherwise disposed of in a period when marketing problems continued and, indeed, are intensified in many respects. It is unthinkable that further action would not be taken.

Under unanimous consent I insert at the conclusion of these remarks, the opening statement of Commission Chairman Paul Rand Dixon, together with the release issued by the Commission concerning the inquiry and the statement also issued by the Commission describing the procedure and purpose of the inquiry:

STATEMENT OF PAUL RAND DIXON, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AT THE PUBLIC HEARING RELATING TO THE MARKETING OF GASOLINE, MAY 3, 1965

On behalf of the Federal Trade Commission, I welcome you to this hearing which has been called for the purpose of affording all interested parties an opportunity to present their views regarding problems in the marketing of gasoline. In the notice announcing this inquiry, which appeared in the Federal Register on December 30, 1964, and which is a part of the official record in this proceeding, the Commission invited both oral and written comments in specified areas, which include (1) the general market structure of the industry, (2) pricing of gasoline at all levels of distribution, (3) the whys and wherefors of price wars, (4) competition between branded and unbranded gasoline and between integrated and non-integrated refiners, and (5) grades and qualities of gasoline. The notice also requested information on other matters relating to the marketing of gasoline.

The petroleum industry is undoubtedly one of the largest and most important segments of our national economy, which may be described as an economy on wheels. To illustrate the enormity of the industry I need only remind you that there are approximately 150 company refiners, some 30,000 terminal and bulk plant operators who make up the greatest portion of the wholesale segment, and over 200,000 retailers. The annual dollar volume of sales of gasoline at the retail level is estimated at $17.8 million. The automobile has long since become far more than a luxury item for the average American. He needs it to go to work, his doctor needs it to pay a home visit and truckers need it to deliver the food he eats. I could name any number of other areas in which gasoline is a required commodity. Thus it is evident that the public interest in the subject of this hearing is substantial.

We are here today in the spirit of cooperation. The information received during the hearing will undoubtedly increase our understanding in this field, and the mutual exchange of information in turn should benefit all segments of the industry and the consuming public.

We are not here today in the role of prosecutors. We are not interested in the course of this hearing in discussing private or Government litigated cases either past or present. By the same token we are not here to discuss pending litigation either before the Commission or the courts.

You can appreciate of course that in a hearing of this type certain ground rules must be established to assure an orderly proceeding. We have tried to make these rules as informal and flexible as possible. Persons desiring to express their views will not be placed under oath. You are requested when making oral presentations to confine your remarks to the time absolutely necessary to convey your point of view. When you rise to speak and are recognized by the chair please give your name and identify the organization or group you represent. This will be of assistance not only to the Commission but to the reporter. A stenographic record of this hearing will be made and arrangements for the purchase of copies of the transcript may be made with the contract reporter which is Ward & Paul, 917 G Street NW., Washington, D.C., or if you wish you may place your order with the reporter's representative who sits in front of me. The public record attending the hearing which includes all written data, views and arguments submitted pursuant to notice in the Federal Register, is available for review by interested parties in our Office of Legal and Public Records on the first floor of this building.

FTC INSTITUTES BOARD INQUIRY INTO THE PROBLEMS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKETING OF GASOLINE

The Federal Trade Commission will conduct an industry-wide inquiry into the competitive problems of marketing gasoline.

Subjects to be probed by the Commission are: (1) the market structure and competitive behavior of the various segments and levels of the gasoline industry; (2) the pricing of gasoline at all levels of distribution; (3) the causes and effects of so-called price wars; (4) competition between branded and unbranded gasoline and between integrated and nonintegrated refiners; (5) gasoline grades and qualities, with specific reference to the bearing of gasoline exchange agreements, additives, and octane ratings; and (6) other matters pertinent to competition in the marketing of automotive gasoline.

The Commission's objective is to acquire a thorough understanding of the highly complex competitive problems in the industry in order to determine the most effective and appropriate remedies.

In its statement announcing the inquiry, the Commission said it "intends to employ its flexible administrative powers of investigation and factfinding as may be found necessary to assure a complete, fair, and realistic understanding of the structure and dynamics of competition in the industry."

The initial step in this inquiry will be public hearings before the full Commission in room 532 of the FTC Building, Washington, D.C., commencing at 10 a.m., on May 3, 1965.

All interested persons, including but not limited to members of the public and of the gasoline industry, are invited to present their views orally on the above subjects at the hearings.

Written views may be filed with the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20580, not later than

April 5, 1965. If practicable, 20 copies of all written submissions should be filed.

Any person desiring to give an oral presentation at the hearings should so inform the Secretary by April 26, 1965, and state the estimated time required. The Commission may impose reasonable limitations upon the time allotted to any person or organization. Both the oral and written views will be available for examination by interested persons at the FTC Building.

The Commission's statement said, "The marketing of automotive gasoline to the public is a matter of direct and immediate concern to every American who owns a car, to the more than 100,000 independent retail gasoline dealers, to the producers, refiners, jobbers, and wholesale distributors of gasoline and other petroleum products, and to the Nation's economy generally. The Federal Trade Commission has a broad range of responsibilities with respect to the preservation of fair and free competition in such marketing. The Commission is responsible for the prevention of deceptive and misleading advertising of gasoline to the consuming public. It is responsible for preventing discriminatory and other monopolistic and anticompetitive methods and practices in the distribution of gasoline. Most comprehensively, the Commission, in the role of watchdog of the free competitive system, has a responsibility to scrutinize the competitive functioning of the gasoline industry and, if necessary, to take appropriate administrative action within its powers, and recommend legislative or other remedies to such competitive problems as may not be susceptible of effective solution under existing laws and procedures.

"The Commission has received a large number of inquiries, complaints, and petitions from various groups in the gasoline industry, from Members of Congress, and from members of the consuming public, with respect to competitive problems in the marketing of gasoline. It is evident both from these submissions and from the Commission's experience in this industry in enforcing the laws which it administers that a broad, comprehensive, and industrywide approach to the competitive problems of the industry is necessary, and that specific remedial measures required in the public interest should not be attempted before obtaining a solid factual foundation in regard to the competitive conditions of gasoline distribution. As the Supreme Court stated in a recent decision, proper and effective remedial action in this industry requires that the Commission make realistic appraisals of relevant competitive facts, and these facts are highly complex. The Commission has accordingly determined forthwith to institute an industrywide inquiry into the competitive problems of marketing gasoline."

A copy of the statement is attached.

STATEMENT OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ANNOUNCING BROAD INQUIRY INTO THE PROBLEMS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKETING OF GASOLINE

The marketing of automotive gasoline to the public is a matter of direct and immediate concern to every American who owns a car, to the more than 100,000 independent retail gasoline dealers, to the producers, refiners, jobbers, and wholesale distributors of gasoline and other petroleum products, and to the Nation's economy generally. The Federal Trade Commission has a broad range of responsibilities with respect to the preservation of fair and free competition in such marketing. The Commission is responsible for the prevention of deceptive and misleading advertising of gasoline to the consuming public. It is responsible for preventing discriminatory and other monopolistic and anticompetitive methods and practices in the distribution of gasoline. Most comprehensively, the Commission, in the role of watchdog of the free competitive system, has a responsibility to scrutinize the competitive functioning of the gasoline industry and, if necessary, to take appropriate administrative action within its powers, and recommend legislative or other remedies to such competitive problems as may not be susceptible of effective solution under existing laws and procedures.

The Commission has received a large number of inquiries, complaints, and petitions from various groups in the gasoline industry, from Members of Congress, and from members of the consuming public, with respect to competitive problems in the marketing of gasoline. It is evident both from these submissions and from the Commission's experience in this industry in enforcing the laws which it administers that a broad, comprehensive, and industrywide approach to competitive problems of the industry is necessary, and that specific remedial measures required in the public interest should not be attempted before obtaining a solid factual foundation in regard to the competitive conditions of gasoline distribution. As the Supreme Court stated in a recent decision, proper and effective remedial action in this industry requires that the Commission make realistic appraisals of relevant competitive facts, and these facts are highly complex. The Commission has accordingly determined forthwith to institute an industrywide inquiry into the competitive problems of marketing gasoline. The Commission intends to employ its flexible administrative powers of investigation and factfinding as may be found necessary to assure a complete, fair, and realistic understanding of the structure and dynamics of competition in the industry.

As the initial step in this inquiry, the Commission will conduct public hearings, to be held before the members of the Commission in room 532 of the Federal Trade Commission Building, Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street, commencing at 10 a.m., on May 3, 1965. All interested persons, including but not limited to members of the public and of the gasoline industry, are invited to participate in these hearings. Participants are invited to submit data, views, and argument on the following topics: (1) the market structure and competitive behavior of the various segments and levels of the gasoline industry; (2) the pricing of gasoline at all levels of distribution; (3) the causes and effects of so-called price wars; (4) competition between branded and unbranded gasoline and between integrated and nonintegrated refiners; (5) gasoline grades and qualities, with specific reference to the bearing of gasoline exchange agreements, additives, and octane ratings; (6) other matters pertinent to competition in the marketing of automotive gasoline.

All interested persons are invited to file written data, views, or argument concerning the subject matter of these hearings with the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20580, not later than April 5, 1965. If practicable, 20 copies of all written submissions should be filed. Any person desiring to present his views orally at the hearings commencing May 3, 1965, should so inform the Secretary of the Commission by April 26, 1965, and also inform the Secretary of the estimated time required for oral presentation. The Commission may impose reasonable limitations upon the time allotted to any person or organization. The data, views, and argument presented orally or in writing will be available for examination by interested persons at the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

THE LATE THOMAS H. FLAHERTY

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened to learn of the recent passing of my dear friend and former very distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable Thomas A. Flaherty, of Charlestown, Mass.

I have known Tom Flaherty for many years. He has been a warm friend of mine and I have been privileged to watch his magnificent, outstanding career in the Congress, in the State government of Massachusetts and in the government of the great city of Boston.

He was a man of exceptional ability and a true spirit of dedication, who devoted a large part of his life to laudable public service.

He was very well trained for his important tasks and served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives for 4 years prior to coming to the Congress from the 11th Massachusetts District to fill the unexpired term of the late very distinguished jurist, Chief Justice John P. Higgins, who had preceded him in the Congress.

As a member and chairman of the State department of public utilities he made many substantial and valuable contributions in this very difficult, regulatory field, which will long endure.

He also served as an assessor of taxes of the city of Boston under appointment of his friend, the able and distinguished mayor, Hon. John B. Hynes, and in addition he served with special distinction as Representative of the city of Boston here in the Capital of the Nation.

His entire life comprised a brilliant record of worthy, active civic interest and magnificent public service to community, State, and Nation, in peace and in war, and Tom Flaherty was highly esteemed everywhere he was known, and beloved, respected and admired by all who knew him for his endearing personal qualities, and the high character of his devoted public service.

I am deeply sorry to learn of his untimely passing, and extend to his beloved family, his gracious wife, his six distinguished brothers, one of whom is business manager of the Boston Globe, his sister-in-law and all his dear ones, most heartfelt sympathy for their sorrowful bereavement.

Congressman Flaherty made an impressive record in this House and his august presence and constructive, patriotic contributions will long be remembered here with great respect, warm admiration and deep affection. His blessed memory will always remain green in this great deliberative body.

May he find rest and peace in his heavenly home, and may he, like the once poor Lazarus, dwell in the House of the Lord forever.

THE LATE ELMER B. CLARK, AN OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in common with all Members of the House and many other friends and admirers, I was shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the recent passing of our beloved friend, Mr. Elmer B. Clark, who was one of our very able official reporters of the House debates.

Mr. Clark was deeply interested in and devoted to his work. He was extremely capable, painstaking, and dedicated in every sense of the word, and had the high honor of serving continuously since his initial appointment in 1938 under four distinguished Speakers of the House, Speakers Bankhead, Rayburn, MARTIN and MCCORMACK.

Elmer Clark was very well trained and educated, and was endowed with a brilliant mind and a wonderful personality. Born in Portland, Oreg., in 1903, he attended grade and high school in that beautiful city and graduated from the University of Oregon with an A.B. degree and was later admitted to the Oregon bar.

He also took up the study of shorthand and reported in the Circuit Courts in Multnomah County.

In the late 1920's he moved to New York City where he attended New York University receiving additional academic honors in the form of his masters degree from that great school.

He also had the distinction of being official reporter for the U.S. Customs Court and for various Government agencies and House committees.

His career has been one of faithful, outstanding service and complete dedication to his work. He was popular with and esteemed and respected by his associates, and by all in the House who knew him. He enjoyed the affection of all of us in the House, as well that of a wide circle of associates and friends.

He is survived by his devoted wife, Dorothy, and two sons, Donald and William, and a sister, Mrs. Virginia Robison.

This House will greatly miss Elmer Clark. He served us faithfully and well and he has left us an indelible memory of a gracious, considerate friend and a devoted, capable public servant.

I join his family in mourning his untimely passing, which came with such a shocking suddenness to those of us in the House and his other friends as well as his family.

I extend to his wife, and all his dear ones, most heartfelt sympathy for their irreparable loss.

I hope the good Lord will strengthen and encourage them to bear their deep sorrow with resignation and fortitude.

May Elmer Clark find rest and peace in his heavenly reward.

God love him.

GUARANTEEING THE RIGHT TO VOTE UNDER THE 15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the copy of a bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that earlier today the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the Judiciary, introduced H.R. 7896, and I, as the minority leader, introduced the bill H.R. 7897, which are clean bills with certain modifications of the original bills we introduced on the voting rights measure.

The bill H.R. 7897 follows:

H.R. 7897

A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.—(a) The phrase "literacy test" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, or (2) demonstrate an educational achievement or knowledge of any particular subject.

(b) A person is "denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote" if he is (1) not provided by persons acting under color of law with an opportunity to register to vote or to qualify to vote within two weekdays after making a good faith attempt to do so, (2) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law, or (3) not notified by any person acting under color of law of the results of his application within seven days after making application therefor.

(c) The term "election" shall mean any general, special, or primary election held in any voting district solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate to public office or of deciding a proposition or issue of public law.

(d) The term "voting district" shall mean any county or parish, except that where registration for voting is not conducted under the supervision of a county or parish, the term shall include any other subdivision of a State which conducts registration for voting.

(e) The term "vote" shall have the same meaning as in section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971 (e)).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.—(a) Congress hereby finds that large numbers of United States citizens have been and are being denied the right to register or to vote in various States on account of race or color in violation of the fifteenth amendment.

(b) Congress further finds that literacy tests have been and are being used in various States and political subdivisions as a means of discrimination on account of race or color. Congress further finds that persons with a sixth-grade education possess reasonable literacy, comprehension, and intelligence and that, in fact, persons possessing such educational achievement have been and are being denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote for failure to satisfy literacy test requirements solely or primarily because of discrimination on account of race or color.

(c) Congress further finds that the prerequisites for voting or registration for voting (1) that a person possess good moral character unrelated to the commission of a felony, or (2) that a person prove qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class, have been and are being used as a means of discrimination on account of race or color.

(d) Congress further finds that in any voting district where twenty-five or more persons have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color and who are qualified to register and vote, there exists in such district a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color in violation of the fifteenth amendment.

SEC. 4. APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINERS; PRESUMPTION OF PATTERN OR PRACTICE.—(a) Whenever the Attorney General certifies to the Civil Service Commission (1) that he has received complaints in writing from twenty-five or more residents of a voting district each alleging that (i) the complainant can satisfy the voting qualifications of the voting district, and (ii) the complainant has been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color within ninety days prior to the filing of his complaint, and (2) that the Attorney General believes such complaints to be meritorious, the Civil Service Commission shall promptly appoint an examiner for such voting district who shall be responsible to the Commission.

(b) A certification by the Attorney General shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The examiner shall examine each person who has filed a complaint certified by the Attorney General to determine whether he was denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote within ninety days prior to the filing of such complaint, and whether he is qualified to vote under State law. A person's statement under oath shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence and prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote. In determining whether a person is qualified to vote under State law, the examiner shall disregard (1) any literacy test if such person has not been adjudged an incompetent and has completed the sixth grade of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or (2) any requirement that such person, as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (i) possess good moral character unrelated to the commission of a felony, or (ii) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class. If applicable State law requires a literacy test, those persons possessing less than a sixth grade education shall be administered such test only in writing and the answers to such test shall be included in the examiner's report.

(d) If the examiner finds that twenty-five or more of those persons within the voting district, who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General have been denied the right to register or to vote and are qualified to vote under State law, he shall promptly place them on a list of eligible voters, and shall certify and serve such list upon the offices of the appropriate election officials, the Attorney General, and the attorney general of the State, together with a report of his findings as to those persons whom he has found qualified to vote. Service shall be as prescribed by rule 5(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The provisions of section 8 (d) and (e) shall then apply to persons placed on a list of eligible voters.

(e) A finding by the examiner under subsection (d) shall create a presumption of a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 5. CHALLENGES.—(a) A challenge to the factual findings of the examiner, contained in the examiner's report, may be made by the attorney general of the State or by any other person upon whom has been served a certified list and report of persons found

qualified to vote, as provided in section 4(d). Such challenge shall be made by service upon the Civil Service Commission as prescribed by rule 5(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Such challenge shall be entertained only (1) if made within ten days after service of the list of eligible voters as provided in section 4(d), and (2) if supported by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge.

(b) Upon service of a challenge the Civil Service Commission shall promptly appoint a hearing officer who shall be responsible to the Commission, or promptly designate a hearing officer already appointed, to hear and determine such challenge. A challenge shall be determined within seven days after it has been made. A person's fulfillment of literacy test requirements, if not disregarded by the examiner as provided for in section 4(c), shall be reviewed solely on the basis of the written answers included in the examiner's report required by sections 4(c) and 4(d).

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF A PATTERN OR PRACTICE.—A pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color is established (a) if a challenge to a finding under section 4(d) has not been made within ten days after service of the list of eligible voters on the appropriate State election officials and the attorney general of the State, or (b) upon a determination by a hearing officer that twenty-five or more of those persons within the voting district, who have been placed on the list of eligible voters by the examiners, have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote and are qualified to register and to vote. The listing of additional persons prescribed in section 8 shall not be stayed pending judicial review of the decision of a hearing officer.

SEC. 7. JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A petition for review of the decision of a hearing officer may be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the person petitioning for review, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous.

SEC. 8. LISTING OF PERSONS FOUND ELIGIBLE.—(a) Upon establishment of a pattern or practice, as provided in section 6, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint such additional examiners for the voting district as may be necessary who shall determine whether persons within the voting district are qualified to register and to vote. In determining whether such persons are so qualified the examiners shall apply the same procedures and be subject to the same conditions imposed upon the initial examiner under section 4(c), except that a person appearing before such examiner need not have first attempted to apply to a State or local registration official if he states, under oath, that in his belief to have done so would have been futile or would have jeopardized the personal safety, employment, or economic standing of himself, his family, or his property. Such examiner shall in the same manner as provided in section 4(c), certify and serve lists of eligible voters and any supplements as appropriate at the end of each month, upon the appropriate election officials, the Attorney General, and the attorney general of the State, together with reports of his findings as to those persons listed.

(b) Challenges to the findings of the examiners shall be made in the manner and under the same conditions as are provided in section 5.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall appoint and make available additional hearing officers within the voting district as may be necessary to hear and determine the challenges under this section.

(d) Any person who has been placed on a list of eligible voters shall be entitled and allowed to vote in any election held within the voting district unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with section 10. If challenged, such person shall be entitled and allowed to vote provisionally with appropriate provision being made for the impounding of their ballots, pending final determination of their status by the hearing officer and by the court.

(e) Examiners shall issue to each person placed on a list of eligible voters a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(f) No person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of the provisions of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such list to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

SEC. 9. APPLICATION AND PROCEDURE.—(a) Consistent with State law and the provisions of this Act, persons appearing before an examiner shall make application in such form as the Civil Service Commission may require. Also, consistent with State law and the provisions of this Act, the times, places and procedures for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning the qualifications required for listing.

(b) Notwithstanding time limitations as may be established under State or local law, examiners shall make themselves available every weekday in order to determine whether persons are qualified to vote.

(c) Times, places and procedures for hearing and determination of challenges under sections 5 and 8(b) shall be prescribed by regulation promulgated by the Civil Service Commission, provided that hearing officers shall hear challenges in the voting district of the listed persons challenged.

SEC. 10. REMOVAL FROM VOTER LISTS.—Any person whose name appears on a list, as provided in this Act, shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list. A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) he has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in sections 5 and 7, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner (a) not to have voted or attempted to vote at least once during four consecutive years while listed or during such longer period as is allowed by State law without requiring reregistration, or (b) to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote, provided, however, that in a State which requires reregistration within a period of time shorter than four years, the person shall be required to reregister with an examiner who shall apply reregistration methods and procedures of State law not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 11. QUALIFICATIONS OF EXAMINERS AND HEARING OFFICERS.—Examiners and hearing officers appointed by the Civil Service Commission, shall be existing Federal officers and employees who are residents of the State in which the Attorney General has issued his certification. Examiners and hearing officers shall subscribe to the oath of office required by section 16 of title 5, United States Code. Examiners and hearing officers shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work as examiners and hearing officers shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from their usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of sections 835 to 842, title 5, United States Code. Examiners and hearing officers shall have the power to administer oaths.

SEC. 12. TERMINATION OF LISTING.—The listing provisions of this Act shall be applied in a voting district until, within any twelve-month period, less than twenty-five persons within the voting district have been placed on lists of eligible voters by examiners.

SEC. 13. ENFORCEMENT.—(a) Whenever a person alleges to an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding his listing under the provisions of this Act he has not been permitted to vote or that his vote was not properly counted or not counted subject to the impounding provision, as provided in section 8(d), the examiner shall notify the United States attorney for the judicial district if such allegation, in his opinion, appears to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States attorney may forthwith apply to the district court for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including orders directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them (1) to permit persons listed under this Act to vote, (2) to count such votes, or (3) for such other orders as the court may deem necessary and appropriate.

(b) No person, acting under color of law, shall—

(1) fail or refuse to permit to vote any person who is entitled to vote under any provision of this Act; or

(2) willfully fail or refuse to count, tabulate, and report accurately such person's vote; or

(3) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any such person entitled to vote under any provision of this Act for voting or attempting to vote, or

(4) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any person for urging or aiding voting or attemped voting by persons entitled to vote under any provision of this Act.

(c) No person, acting under color of law or otherwise shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any person for exercising any powers or duties under section 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 of this Act.

(d) No person shall in any matter within the jurisdiction of an examiner or a hearing officer, knowingly and willfully falsify or conceal a material fact, or make any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or representation, or make or use any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry.

(e) Any person violating any of the provisions of subsections (b), (c), or (d) shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(f) All cases of civil and criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1995).

(g) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether an applicant for listing under this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

SEC. 14. INTERFERENCE WITH ELECTIONS.—(a) No person shall, for any reason—

(1) fail or refuse to permit to vote in any State any person who is qualified to vote under the provisions of the law of such State which are not inconsistent with the provisions of Federal law; or

(2) willfully fail or refuse to count, tabulate, and report accurately such person's vote; or

(3) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any such person for the purpose of preventing such person from voting or attempting to vote; or

(4) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any person for the purpose of preventing such person from urging or aiding voting or attempted voting.

(b) No person shall, within a year following an election, (1) destroy, deface, mutilate, or otherwise alter the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) alter any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise.

(c) No person shall knowingly or willfully give false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in a voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspire with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or illegal voting, or pay or offer to pay or accept payment either for registration to vote or for voting.

(d) Any person violating any of the provisions of subsections (a), (b), or (c) shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(e) The foregoing provisions of this section shall be applicable only to general, special, or primary elections held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate, Members of the United States House of Representatives, or Delegates or Commissioners from the Territories or possessions.

SEC. 15. RELIEF FROM ENFORCEMENT OF POLL TAX.—(a) Congress hereby finds that the constitutional right to vote of large numbers of citizens of the United States is denied or abridged on account of race or color in some States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in State or local elections. To assure that the right to vote is not thus denied or abridged, the Attorney General shall forthwith institute in the name of the United States actions for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any poll tax or payment, which, as a condition precedent to voting in State or local elections, has the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of such actions which shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code. It shall be the duty of the judges designated to hear the case to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date, to participate in the hearing and determination thereof, and to cause the case to be in every way expedited.

(c) Appeal from judgments rendered under this section shall be to the Supreme Court in accordance with 28 U.S.C. 1253.

SEC. 16. APPROPRIATIONS.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 16. SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

C. LEO DEORSEY

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply grieved by the untimely death of C. Leo DeOrsey.

As did all his countless friends, I knew him as a man with an astounding range of interests—business, politics, sports. He was eminently successful in them all.

But it was as a former neighbor of Leo's on Kerry Lane in Chevy Chase that I came to know him best, as a family man in the truest sense of the word. He was devoted heart and soul to his lovely wife Helen and to their children, Dorothy and Bob. I know that on his last vacation trip to Florida he took no telephone calls so that he could spend every moment in their company.

One of the finest and most accurate tributes to Leo was paid to him by another friend, Jim Gibbons, sportscaster, on WRC–TV, Monday night. Because it says what is in the hearts of so many of us who knew, admired and loved Leo, I am inserting it in the RECORD today:

Representatives of all the National Football League clubs, led by Commissioner Pete Rozell, are in town for the funeral of C. Leo DeOrsey tomorrow at 10 at the Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament. Many others from the sports field, the entertainment and the business world, are here to pay their respects to the memory of one of the bright lights of the Washington sports and business scene, extinguished by death last Friday night.

Leo DeOrsey was very much in evidence, whether in his capacity as executive vice president and director of the Washington Redskins, for his longtime friend, the ailing president, George Preston Marshall, or as adviser and consultant for many years to Arthur Godfrey, or to the seven astronauts, who will be pallbearers tomorrow, or for the hotel he owned, or the tax business he ran, or the many charitable contributions he gave.

He has been described as a two-fisted standup fighter. This I believe to be true, he was certainly never reluctant to state his position, or base his opinion, nor to lack courage to defend them vigorously.

He'll be missed for those colorful and firm opinions and those determined stands on baseball, or football, or almost any given subject. He'll be missed for his sharp wit and brilliant mind, but most of all to those who knew him well, he'll be missed as a warm friend.

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST COMMUNITIES SOLVE THE PROBLEMS ARISING OUT OF BASE CLOSINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a package of four bills dealing directly with the day-to-day problems faced by individuals, businesses, school districts, and communities as a result of the closing of various military bases. The June 30, 1968, closing of Truax Air Force Base at Madison, Wis., has thrust many problems onto the people of my district. These problems and the problems of other areas are not insoluble, but they will take the concerted efforts of individuals and governments, local, State, and Federal. What success we have in finding and working out solutions to these problems will be of value to other people and communities in solving their problems of converting military bases to peacetime uses.

Ironically, in Wisconsin the most immediate and troublesome problems arise out of the advance notice provided the communities of the 1968 closing.

For example, in 1962 a $4.6 million, 280-unit Capehart development was located and constructed adjacent to the city of Sun Prairie, Wis., a community of 4,008 located about 10 miles from Madison and Truax Air Force Base. The community, while divided over the wisdom of locating a facility there, recognized the need for the housing and wholeheartedly supported the development and the Air Force personnel who came to live in the houses.

The influx of federally connected students increased drastically as the units were filled, as the following table shows:

Students enrolled in Sun Prairie, Wis., schools

Year	Federal students enrolled residing on Capehart housing project	Federal students enrolled not residing on Capehart housing project	Total Federal students enrolled	Total non-Federal students	Grand total of all students
June 1962	0	203	203	1,251	1,454
June 1963	374	174	584	1,470	2,018
June 1964	445	214	659	1,692	2,351
February 1965	500	253	753	1,958	2,711

It was clear a new school was needed and Sun Prairie agreed to locate it adjacent to the Capehart development even though across a main highway from Sun Prairie itself in return for the purchase of the $20,000 site by the Air Force. It subsequently has spent approximately $30,000 on architectural and engineering costs. As a result, it is committed to constructing the new school on this site even though the Air Force reversed itself at the time the closing was announced and now refuses to pay the $20,000 for the site. Exhaustive efforts through the Office of Economic Adjustment in the Department of Defense and my office have not convinced the Air Force to live up to its commitment. It has refused even though it will save $42,000 on the cost of busing its children during the next 3 years by virtue of this location of the school.

Unfortunately, there may be no way to obtain these funds even though the Air Force will benefit by the school's location by more than twice the cost of the site. Certainly, there are two separate funds involved, but to the taxpayers who will be asked to make this up in a bond issue, it is a case of the Federal Government

failing to live up to its agreements. I am still working with the Air Force to determine whether some solution can be worked out.

This is one way in which the community may lose by virtue of the early announcement of the closing. Another results from the provisions of Public Law 815.

PUBLIC LAW 815

Under this law, Federal assistance is provided school districts for the construction of school facilities on the basis of increases in the number of students of parents who live or work on Federal establishments. When the students are permanent, the Federal assistance is designated to be equal to the cost of permanent facilities required for them.

On the basis of increases in the number of permanent students, Sun Prairie was determined during the summer of 1964 to be eligible for a $68,575 grant for school equipment and a $130,686 grant for school construction.

The November 19, 1964, announcement that Truax would be closed in June 1968 suddenly rendered these federally connected students temporary. By the terms of Public Law 815, assistance to school districts can only be in the form of temporary facilities or the cost of their equivalent. The law defines a temporary student as one expected to be in the community for 6 years or less.

Since it was less than 4 years from November 1964 to June 1968, the Office of Education determined all Truax-connected children to be temporary and reduced the two grants from $130,686 to $99,000 and from $68,575 to $8,000. My efforts were later successful in persuading the Office of Education to raise this $8,000 to $14,525, but the school district had lost a total of $85,736 in a matter of days.

The equities clearly require that Congress correct this situation.

Let us look for a moment at these equities. The Sun Prairie School District made timely application, was notified of the amounts reserved for its school and on that basis made necessary and legitimate commitments to provide a school adjacent to the Capehart site and a high quality education for each Truax connected student. What further disturbs me, however, is that the peak load of Truax-connected students will not be felt in the Sun Prairie schools until the 1965–66 school year which begins this fall. More facilities are needed now to handle these additional students. Yet the grants have been reduced and the taxpayers are now expected to make up in taxes for this loss.

In my view, the arguments over the relative amount of benefit the Federal Government will receive from the education provided federally connected students as compared with the long term benefit Sun Prairie will receive from the buildings to be built are immaterial.

It is a matter of good faith. Here the Federal Government has made assurances to Sun Prairie. In turn, Sun Prairie has relied in good faith on these assurances. It made a decision over the location of the school. It is to be located next to the Capehart development and away from the city itself. It has made assurances to its taxpayers about the cost of this school as against a smaller school to meet the educational needs of a growing but moderate-sized city. It further made irrevocable planning decisions.

Sun Prairie by virtue of the closing announcement not only is committed to a school plan in large measure designed to support a Truax-connected population, but it also has lost the promised funds to bring even that plan into existence. In short, it has the equivalent of a legal claim for reliance damages.

I believe the full amount of the grants should be restored. The cost of $85,736 is a small price to pay to assure other communities now being asked to support other bases that they will be treated fairly in the event their case is closed.

I am offering today a bill to do just that. In simple terms it says that any school district which was determined to be eligible for assistance under Public Law 815 prior to the base closing announcement of November 19, 1964, shall be paid such assistance, as if that announcement had never been made.

This is not a private bill, however. There are three other school districts in this country which have experienced the same problems. They are located in Waco, Tex., and Amarillo, Tex.

The Potter Consolidated School District in Amarillo had its grant reduced by $14,226 from $35,226 to $21,000. Two grants to two separate school districts in Waco, Tex., were reduced by $21,275 and $20,125. Accordingly, if these three grants were restored, the total cost of this bill, including the $85,736 lost by Sun Prairie, would be $141,362. In all cases, commitments have been made to which the local communities are bound. Significantly the schools built and equipped with these funds will be filled with students. I am not asking funds to build empty classrooms. Regardless of the base closings, the classrooms will be filled. I believe the Federal Government is responsible for many of these children being in and remaining in these respective communities and that it should live up to its promises made when it came to the local school districts with a request that the children be educated in the local schools.

PUBLIC LAW 874

Another area where the impact of the closings will be felt is the loss of eligibility of Federal payments in aid to school maintenance and operating costs under Public Law 874.

As the law now stands, a district is eligible for maintenance and operation assistance if it has in its school during any school year a specified percentage of its total attendance made up of federally connected children.

Nine school districts in my district have been receiving aid under Public Law 874 by virtue of the number of Truax-connected children in their respective schools. If the situation remains about the same as it was during this year, when the phaseout is completed in 1968, each of these districts will fail to meet eligibility requirements. As a result the amounts paid under Public Law 874 will be reduced or terminated. Several districts are already receiving reduced payments because of decreases in Truax-connected schools.

Despite this fact, it is probable that many of the same children will be enrolled in the public schools in these districts. Many families will chose to continue to live in the area and their children will continue to go to the same schools.

Other factors require consideration of legislation in this area as well. The Sun Prairie School District has an average daily attendance of 667 federally connected students, of which 652 are connected with Truax Air Force Base. That district's Federal assistance for providing education to these students is $182,495, of which $180,020 is for Truax-connected students. These figures show that 27½ percent of the average daily attendance is federally connected. A similarly large portion of the school district's budget is provided through Public Law 874 funds. Even though the withdrawal of many military dependents from the school system will have some effect on need for teachers, good management would require that a good staff should be kept intact. If the Public Law 874 funds are cut off too abruptly the school districts will have no choice but to fire teachers, which increased numbers of students in the future will require to be rehired in the following years.

The purpose of the bill I am introducing to amend Public Law 874 is to provide for gradual reduction rather than abrupt termination of Federal payments made to a local educational agency on account of a child who has left the area or whose parents have ceased to be employed on Federal property due to a termination of activities of the Department of Defense, such as a base closing.

Under my bill, a local public school district would continue to receive credit for each child in either of these categories for 3 fiscal years after the event which, absent my proposed amendment would have caused the loss of all credit for that child. However, the amount payable in the first fiscal year after the child's departure or change of status would be reduced to 75 percent of the full entitlement amount, to 50 percent the second year, and to 25 percent the third year. Thereafter all payments for a child in this status would cease.

Another part of my bill would liberalize the existing provisions for gradual reduction of payments when a school district falls below the 3 percent, or in some districts, 6-percent level of federally connected children in average daily attendance. At present, when a school district falls below the minimum percentage of federally connected enrollment for participation in the aid program, it receives, for each federally connected child in average daily attendance during the first year after that event the full formula amount, 50 percent of the full formula entitlement per child the second year and nothing thereafter.

My bill would revise this pattern to permit full formula payment for each federally connected child remaining in the schools the first year after failure to meet the percentage enrollment test, 75 percent the second year, 50 percent the third year, 25 percent the fourth year, and nothing thereafter. Hence, under my bill, a school district would benefit in two ways:

First, it could count for payments, children that had been, but no longer were, federally connected for a period of 3 years on a gradually reducing basis, even if not actually in attendance.

Second, it could, for a longer period than at present, continue to receive payments for remaining federally connected children, after it had ceased to meet the 3- or 6-percent average daily attendance test.

School districts affected by the closing of Truax Air Force Base, include Madison where 1,029 of 1,450 students will lose their federal connection, Sun Prairie where 652 of 667 students will lose their federal connection, Stoughton, Monona Village, and Cottage Grove, DeForest, McFarland, Springfield Elementary, and Lodi.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

A third bill deals with civil service retirement.

Under present law, a civil service employee, including a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, may retire voluntarily on full earned annuity at age 62 with 30 years of service. If retirement is involuntary and not for misconduct or delinquency, present law provides an immediate but reduced annuity if the employee has:

First. Twenty-five years of service regardless of age, or second, 20 years of service and has attained age 50.

If neither of these conditions is met, the employee is entitled to a deferred annuity commencing at age 62, provided he does not elect a refund of his retirement deductions.

Under ordinary circumstances these provisions are reasonable, even generous when compared with retirement programs of some private industries.

Civil service employees in military bases now being closed, however, face unusual circumstances. Most, if not all, of the civilian employees at a military base, such as Truax Air Force Base, are local people. Many have served the Government for many years. With the closing of the base, they are now faced with the choice of moving to another military or Government installation, which may be at some distance from what they have always considered home, or seeking other employment at home. Some are too old to build up much of a retirement program in a new job and existing civil service retirement laws make immediate retirement costly.

I am introducing legislation today which would, quite simply, eliminate the age qualification for full retirement benefits and would retain the length-of-service qualification. That is, a civil servant voluntarily or involuntarily separated would be eligible for full earned retirement annuity, regardless of his age, after 30 years service. He would be eligible for full annuity, regardless of age, after 20 years of service if his separation were involuntary—occasioned, for example, by the closing of a base and not for cause, misconduct, or delinquency.

It should be noted that existing civil service regulations provide that when an office or unit is changed or its functions transferred to another unit and an employee resigns or is separated solely because he is unable for family or personal reasons to accompany the office to its new location the action is considered involuntary.

It should also be noted that there is substantial difference between the "earned" annuity of an employee with 30 years service and that of an employee with 20 years service. The retirement formula, thus would encourage Federal employees to stay on the payroll to earn the higher retirement benefits even though they might be eligible for early retirement.

SMALL BUSINESS DISASTER LOANS

Small business disaster loans should be available for businesses which are displaced by a base closing.

Congress has recognized that the construction of a highway or other public project can displace a small business and be as much of a "disaster" as a flood or other natural cause. In 1961, Congress made businesses which were physically displaced by Federal projects eligible for disaster loans from the Small Business Administration.

Under this section of the law, an eligible business could obtain a loan, without collateral, for up to 20-year loans, at interest rates limited to average annual rate on all U.S. interest bearing obligations plus one-fourth of 1 percent—currently 3¾ percent—and with an amount of working capital included in the loan.

This program was set up to assist small business concerns physically displaced—forced to move—by Federal and federally assisted projects utilizing land condemnation.

The purpose of my bill is to make these loans available to businesses in areas where an actual or imminent loss in business opportunities is caused by the closing of a Federal installation, such as Truax Field.

The total saving to the Federal Government involved in the closing of Truax Air Force Base is set at $13,412,000. It will effect the withdrawal of 2,658 military personnel and 378 civilians.

Clearly, many small businesses will sustain a loss of business, and some closely tied in with the Air Force Base may even have to close up shop and consider moving to a new location.

Under my bill, these businesses would become eligible for small business disaster loans just as if they had been displaced by a Federal highway or suffered extensive damage in a natural disaster. They also would be eligible for planning information and assistance from the Small Business Administration.

In this regard, we are extremely fortunate to have a Regional Office of the Small Business Administration immediately available in Madison which can provide day-to-day advice and assistance.

In another respect, the long lead time the communities have been provided by the advance notice of the closing of Truax Air Force Base and others will provide us sufficient time to enact this legislation and provide individuals, businesses, school districts, and communities with needed assistance.

With these laws on the books any future base closings will not pose as great a problem for the communities involved.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I am delighted that the gentleman is expiaining this situation which I think is so unfair throughout the Nation. I could cite an illustration in my own district which naturally I would feel is even more aggravated, where we tore down a school building with the understanding that we would have this help. The building was completely torn down except for the gymnasium. And now we have to rebuild that building. The election was ordered long before we knew anything about the closing, and we issued the bonds. We feel there is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to go ahead and make the payment that they promised to make at the time we tore the building down. We are now rebuilding it and if the Federal Government does not make the payments of course those people will be saddled with a very substantial burden for a great many years to come. We think that is grossly unfair. The situation is very comparable to the one which the gentleman from Wisconsin is describing. I would like to point out that what the gentleman is describing does not relate simply to one isolated instance in Wisconsin but is repeated in at least four other instances over the United States, I believe, and in each one of them there is the same tragic situation of people having spent money relying on the promises of the U.S. Government and then one day, because we decide it is a saving of money to the Government—and I am not questioning that fact—but we say that we are going to close these bases at some date in the future. Now let us pay our obligations even though we close those bases. Let us pay our obligations to the communities involved.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am in full agreement with the gentleman. I appreciate his comments because the moral commitment involved here on the part of the Government of these communities and school districts it seems to me should be clear to all. And if it is not, I should think that through legislation we might be able to remedy the situation. The gentleman is correct. There are other school districts in the county—small in number of course—but in the gentleman's district which is in Waco, Tex., and Amarillo, Tex., as well, I understand the situation in those two places is somewhat similar to the one I have attempted to describe.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Amarillo is located in the congressional district in Texas that I have the honor to represent. I want to say at this time I think the efforts put forth by the gentleman from Wisconsin in this area are most commendable. I want to commend him at this time for what he is trying to do. I notice the gentleman takes the position that this is not a private bill. I think that too is commendable. But I do want to say this: even though it were a private bill and involved only the area that the gentleman represents, I think his bill would be a just bill and ought to be supported by the entire House of Representatives. The loss in the particular school district in Amarillo, the Potter County Consolidated School District, was not a great loss but it was a lot of money to those people out there—though, of course, on the basis of the Federal yardstick it was not a million dollars or a billion dollars, but as I say it was a lot of money to those people. Those people had committed themselves and have committed themselves to meet the requirements that had been created by this base.

They did so in good faith. I believe the Federal Government certainly ought to live up to its moral obligations. If it will not do that then we should create legal obligations on the part of the Government and do what the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to do. I want the gentleman to know I will support his bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] for his statement and his support. This is not only a matter of Public Law 815 but also Public Law 874, which in part provides for the lack of equity in terms of the school districts affected. I have been assured that there will be reasonably prompt hearings on the subject. I hope that the committee and the House will give this matter its very serious consideration.

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

STRAWBERRY GROWING INDUSTRY

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that the Federal Government has failed the strawberry growing industry. Crops are spoiling in the fields this very day. Strawberries are rotting on the vines as I speak these words.

The losses are enormous—as much as $1 million a week in my district alone. Every segment of our economy will be affected. A general business recession pervades the growing areas. It may spread far beyond the immediate growing areas.

Crops are spoiling because adequate harvest labor is not available. Congress, the administration, and the Labor Department are directly responsible because they have denied farmers the opportunity to import temporary supplemental farm labor where domestic labor is in short supply.

Only a few uninformed persons still claim it is possible to obtain domestic labor. The Labor Department, California Department of Employment, organized labor, and the churches all have failed in their recruiting efforts. It was clear to most observers, close to the scene, months, even a year ago that it is impossible to obtain competent domestic farmworkers in sufficient numbers to meet the need. Now that harvest time has arrived, we are confronted with an emergency situation.

We had firm and measured assurances from the Labor Department and the Governor of California that crops would not be permitted to spoil for lack of labor. The promises have not been kept. This is a breach of faith unworthy of any public official.

Facts on the problem have been in the possession of responsible authorities for months.

California growers pay the highest minimum wages and ambitious workers can earn $3 an hour at piece work. No farm laborer can earn any more for such work any other place in the world.

On an overall basis, the housing and living conditions provided by California growers are not equaled by the farmers in any other State or Nation, although there is room for improvement in some cases.

Experience has demonstrated that the unemployed from large cities in California and elsewhere will not work on the farms at any wage. Further, the few who have been recruited have been entirely incompetent in performing "stoop" labor.

California growers have complied with every regulation, tried every proposal, experimented with every suggestion, hired every able applicant, increased wages, improved housing and recruited as far as 2,000 miles away.

They have permitted workers in their fields who never before had seen vegetables and fruit growing and did not know the rudiments of tending specialty crops. Such labor often did extensive damage to the plants and vines, and their productivity was extremely low.

No other industry in any area at any time in our history has ever been treated so shabbily by its own Federal and State Governments. The Labor Department appears to have devised a plan to punish, bankrupt and ruin the California vegetable and fruit industry unless it agrees to help solve some of the social, economic, unemployment, and racial problems of the eastern big cities.

In response to overwhelming evidence that disaster is imminent, the Labor Department recently authorized the importation of 1,500 Mexican nationals and the employment of 1,000 Japanese and Philippine nationals already in this country. The latter, incidentally, have been idle for over 3 months because the Labor Department forbade them to perform the great amount of work to be done pending the ill-fated attempts to recruit domestic help.

Every shred of evidence indicates that at least twice the number of workers authorized are needed immediately. The usual red tape will prevent the Mexican nationals from working for a month or more—during which time it is estimated grom $5 to $10 million in crops will be lost.

Everyone in the industry importuned the Labor Department months ago to set up the necessary machinery for expediting the entry of farm labor from Mexico—in the event a subsequent decision were made to proceed. Regrettably, the Labor Department made no such arrangements and losses will be the greater due to delays now that it has decided belatedly to admit the 1,500 Mexican farmworkers, after all.

Strawberries are perennials and cost more than $1,500 per acre to bring to maturity. Spoilage of fruit can damage strawberry plants irreparably. Obviously, such losses will bankrupt many small family farms, and even some of the larger operations may be wiped out. The processing and distributing firms—employing hundreds of local domestic workers—also will be hard hit.

If Congress, the administration, and the Labor Department had listened to the people who presented facts instead of those who dealt in fiction and inflamatory statements, this catastrophe would have been averted. Administration and Labor Department officials should stand in a field where valuable crops are turning into garbage.

The fact that many workers in allied industries will soon be out of work is a particularly disturbing result. These people are facing hardships and poverty which have been inflicted by an administration which claims to be waging a war against poverty and unemployment.

Our Federal Government is directly responsible for an enormous waste of food.

Our Federal Government is directly responsible for increased prices of foods which are important to the nourishment of all our citizens—a heavy burden, especially for our less fortunate families.

MONROE DOCTRINE: TIME FOR AN UPDATING

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, many voices, at home and abroad, have been raised in criticism of our involvement in the Dominican Republic.

Before the Gulf of Tonkin incident, I was openly critical of the administration's "timidity" and apparent disposition to appease and placate the liberal

internationalists in our country and its fear of offending friends—and enemies—abroad.

Our commitment to more intense activity in Vietnam should have been made sooner, but I applaud the President for courage in difficult policy decisions which southeast Asia has required.

Since the Bay of Pigs, I have been critical of our pitiful brush off of Castroism and our abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine.

I commend the President for his reconstitution of the Monroe Doctrine in the Caribbean and I present to my colleagues an eloquent Newsday editorial with which I am sure most Americans will agree and subscribe:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE: TIME FOR AN UPDATING

"With the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other matter their destiny, by any European power, in any other light, as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States * * * It is equally impossible that we should behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference."—From the Monroe Doctrine.

When President Monroe proclaimed his doctrine he was thinking, first, of Russian efforts to bar fishing and navigating off the coast of Alaska, then a colony of the czar; second, of the former Spanish colonies in South America that had revolted and had set up governments of their own, however shaky. It was a resounding notice to foreign powers not to meddle in hemispheric affairs.

Now, some 14,000 American troops are either in the Dominican Republic or on their way there, and President Johnson frankly says his purpose is to avoid a second Cuba—a second Communist-oriented government such as the one in Cuba that is a thorn in our side. In a sense, he is relying upon the broad principles of the Monroe Doctrine, but that statement of American policy was based upon the world as it existed 133 years ago, not as it is now. Foreign intervention, in terms of fighting men and ships, has ceased to exist. The new mode is foreign subversion—first a local uprising, sparked by outside subversion; next, foreign "advisers," and finally foreign missiles, as was the case in Cuba. For these contingencies, the Monroe Doctrine is inadequate.

But what was promulgated by one President can be revised by another President, and that seems to be the great need if our Latin American policy is to match current events. The Monroe Doctrine needs updating. We still support the right of any nation in this hemisphere to choose the type of government its people want—bearing realistically in mind that with largely illiterate populations the choice cannot be made upon the same reasoned basis as in the United States. We also have the clear right, as shield and buckler of the hemisphere, to insure that no government uses its sovereignty as a cover for Soviet or Chinese communism, our deadly enemy.

In the Dominican Republic our first role is to save lives and restore peace; our second to make it clear, whoever takes power, that the constituted government must eschew foreign domination and the creation of a base of operation against the United States or its hemispheric allies. We shall have to stay, however, unhappy the prospect, until that result is achieved.

TO ELIMINATE WEAKNESSES IN WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to eliminate two weaknesses in the War Claims Act of 1948. Under existing law only U.S. nationals as of 1943 are eligible to receive compensation. Clearly this eliminates many deserving U.S. nationals who came here in 1944, or right after the war in 1945.

This legislation would extend this eligibility for compensation to U.S. nationals as of the date of enactment. In addition it would provide eligibility for servicemen of the United States and allied nations who were held as prisoners of war during World War II and imprisoned contrary to the standards of international law.

Mr. Speaker, I know of a great many deserving individuals who suffered great loss during the horrible years of World War II who are ineligible to receive compensation merely because of the establishment of an arbitrary date. They are individuals who have made outstanding contributions to our country.

I hope that the Judiciary Committee will act promptly to make these important changes in the War Claims Act. Similar legislation has been introduced in the other body and its sponsors are doing their best to secure action in that Chamber as well.

FIRM FOREIGN POLICY APPLAUDED

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, as one who does not often find himself in agreement with the policies espoused by President Johnson, I am most happy to offer him my wholehearted support in pursuing a firm stand as it relates to Vietnam as well as in the Dominican Republic.

The President's request for $700 million as standby funds in this crisis should, in my opinion, be unanimously adopted by the Congress. This not only is necessary but also will show the world that finally the U.S. Government stands behind its commitments; that finally the policies of weakness and vacillation have been abandoned; that the Monroe Doctrine has again, and properly, been reinvigorated; that Americans recognize the continuing dangers of communism and have learned a hard lesson from the Cuban failure at the Bay of Pigs.

Many of us, over the years, have advocated a firm stand in foreign policy, and we welcome the attitude now adopted by the administration.

We are not impressed by the bleating voice of the "peace at any price" segment of our society, whether they be professors, beatniks, malcontents, "comsympths," or merely misguided or misinformed.

Let this serve as notice to the world that the U.S. Government is sick and tired of appeasement for appeasement's sake and that she honors her commitments to the free world.

TO PROVIDE TIME OFF FOR RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain the objective of H.R. 7716, a bill I introduced last week, and to urge its support.

The bill is a simple and, I believe, worthwhile measure. It will cost nothing. Its sole aim is to provide Federal employees time off for religious observances on days not recognized as legal holidays.

As matters now stand, the Government requires its employees to be available for work any day of the week or year. The requirement is waived, of course, for such legal holidays as Christmas. The recognized religious holidays, however, are not always the same as those observed by, for example, Orthodox Jews. They are obliged to refrain from work on Friday evenings or Saturday. The result is that members normally charge off to annual leave or to leave without pay the time taken off for their religious observances. In some instances, members of the Orthodox faith decide against Government service because of this difficulty.

The bill I am sponsoring provides that a Government employee who takes time off to comply with the religious obligations imposed by his denomination be allowed to make up such time by arrangement with the department or agency concerned. In practice, this would mean that an Orthodox Jew would be able to arrange with his department head to have Yom Kippur off in exchange for working on Christmas Day or on other days after hours. I should point out, however, that the bill gives the department considerable authority in making such arrangements. It provides for this exchange only "to the extent compatible with the exigencies of the public business and the performance of essential services."

I am happy to join in bipartisan sponsorship of this measure with the

gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM]. I think this bill is deserving of passage because it will enable the Federal Government to give its support to the concept that devoutly religious groups should be not only allowed, but encouraged to pursue their beliefs.

GRAND CANYON "CASH REGISTERS" SHOULD RING UP "NO SALE"

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk in recent days both in and out of Congress about the Department of the Interior's scheme to construct the Bridge Canyon and Marble Gorge Dams as "cash registers" for the so-called lower Colorado River project. The current issue of Life magazine—May 7—contains a thoughtful editorial on this proposal. I think that after reading this editorial many of our colleagues will want to ring up a "no sale" on these so-called "cash registers."

As Life magazine points out:

So two big new power dams would be built at a cost of $750 million on the already thoroughly bedammed Colorado. Low interest rates on the capital investment, with no taxes to pay, would insure (or are supposed to insure) that the electricity they generate would be salable. These dams—unabashedly called "cash-register dams"—are the ones which would bracket the Grand Canyon, drowning long stretches of some of the finest canyon wilderness left to the United States.

The editorial concludes with a recognition that the Southwest wants and deserves more water by stating:

Admittedly Arizona wants and deserves more water, but the time has come to ask whether it ought not pay its own way instead of being subsidized by hydropower. So long as we continue to treat water as something outside normal controls of price and demand, there won't be much pressure to develop the new technologies of water procurement and conservation needed for the future. Besides, we haven't any Grand Canyons to spare.

Mr. Speaker, so that everyone in this House may have the benefit of reading this important editorial I am including the full text at this point in my remarks:

GRAND CANYON "CASH REGISTERS"

"Leave it as it is," said Teddy Roosevelt, peering into the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River. "You cannot improve upon it." That was in 1903. Since then, just about every possible "improvement" short of filling up the Grand Canyon has been visited upon the river: it is blocked by eight dams, a tunnel carries its water to Denver, an aqueduct carries its water to San Diego. Now a part of the Grand Canyon itself will be affected, if a scheme called the central Arizona project gets congressional approval.

This project is dramatically marked by the kind of economic myopia that afflicts most American thinking on the subject of water. Economist Kenneth Boulding describes this fault, which increasingly confuses practical efforts to deal with water shortages, as "the extraordinary extent to which water is not treated as a commodity." The economics of the central Arizona project show what this means.

Costing half a billion dollars, it is the politically potent part of a large regional water program involving all the Southwestern States. Its aim is to deliver, by means of long aqueducts leading into the arid farmlands of central and south Arizona, the share of Colorado River water granted to the State by the Supreme Court in 1963. The project would be partly paid for in the traditional Bureau of Reclamation way, by peddling hydropower, so that farmers can get the water below cost. But in this case no new storage dams are needed and hydropower is ordinarily a byproduct of storage dam installation.

So two big new power dams would be built at a cost of $750 million on the already thoroughly bedammed Colorado. Low interest rates on the capital investment, with no taxes to pay, would insure (or are supposed to insure) that the electricity they generate would be salable. These dams—unabashedly called cash-register dams—are the ones which would bracket the Grand Canyon, drowning long stretches of some of the finest canyon wilderness left to the United States.

By classic reclamation criteria, the plan is a good one. At canalside, in Pinal County, a farmer will be able to get an acre-foot of water (326,000 gallons, the amount needed to cover 1 acre to the depth of a foot) for only about $10, far less than the cost of getting it there. Of course, industrial users would have to pay more—$45 an acre-foot, but, after all, reclamation policy is designed to benefit farmers, not industries or swimming pool owners.

The catch here is that classic reclamation policy is wildly, even dangerously, out of date. It made good sense in the days when supplying cheap water was the only way to open up dry Western lands to settlement. But now the problem is not land reclamation but agricultural surpluses, which are encouraged, not controlled, by subsidizing irrigation water. Some Arizona water, for example, would go to irrigate cotton, a price-supported crop. Meanwhile, demand for industrial and municipal water—usually paid for at full value—grows and must be satisfied.

Water should be considered a commodity. "We rely too little on [the price system] in considering the water problems of the Nation," says Budget Director Kermit Gordon. Free or artificially low-cost water is bound to be wasted. In New York City, where most city water flows unmetered, wastage goes on despite annual conservation campaigns. Why then should there be any incentive for a farmer in parched southern California to conserve his Colorado River irrigation water, when he pays only $2.25 per acre-foot for it? The city of Los Angeles will be paying the unsubsidized price of $63 an acre-foot when it gets water from nothern California.

For half a century, Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, has been fighting to get Colorado River water into his State on terms at least as favorable as those given to other States. With this plan he may succeed. He has a champion in Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, who, faced with a personal conflict between widely proclaimed conservationist principles and loyalty to his home State and political base, resolved it in favor of Arizona.

Admittedly Arizona wants and deserves more water, but the time has come to ask whether it ought not pay its own way instead of being subsidized by hydropower. So long as we continue to treat water as something outside normal controls of price and demand, there won't be much pressure to develop the new technologies of water procurement and conservation needed for the future. Besides, we haven't any Grand Canyons to spare.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KANS., IS PERFECT LOCATION FOR FEDERAL GRAIN MARKETING RESEARCH LABORATORY

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, we have been trying to secure Federal funds for the construction of a Federal Grain Marketing Research Laboratory at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

A feasibility report from the Department of Agriculture clearly established the need for such a laboratory. Since Kansas is the Nation's leading wheat-producing State, and since Kansas State University offers unmatched facilities, equipment, and a grain research program, it is the logical location for an installation of this kind.

The National Association of Wheat Growers has supported the establishment of such a laboratory and has recommended that it be located at Kansas State University. A resolution to that effect was adopted at the annual convention of this association in January of this year. I quote that resolution:

MARKETING RESEARCH LABORATORY

Whereas the National Association of Wheat Growers believes that wheat marketing research is lagging behind production and utilization research, and that more information is needed regarding national and international marketing patterns: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national association action urge the establishment of a Federal Grain Marketing Research Laboratory, and that consideration be given to Manhattan, Kans., as a site for this Laboratory.

More recently, Mr. Ken Kendrick, executive vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, made a strong statement before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and has pointed out the need for an appropriation in the amount of $212,000 in the next fiscal year to be used for developing plans and specifications for this Grain Marketing Research Laboratory.

I wish to associate myself with these remarks and under leave to extend my remarks, place this excellent statement in the RECORD. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, next to livestock and livestock products, the food and feed grains constitute the greatest farm value and are the greatest source of farm cash receipts in agriculture. One-third of cash receipts from the farm marketings of all crops in 1961 was

derived from food grains and feed crops. In calendar years 1962–63 almost 39 percent of U.S. agricultural exports was accounted for by grains and grain products exclusive of feeds and fodders. The continued well-being of our grain, in both domestic and foreign markets, is heavily dependent upon solutions to a range of quality problems and upon our ability to market our products more efficiently.

The desirability of establishing a grain marketing research laboratory originated due to the accumulation of stocks of grain in the United States, high storage costs to the Government, and severe criticisms of quality of U.S. grain being delivered in foreign markets. It was considered that the progress made through research in crop production was not matched by similar efforts to improve our ability to identify and measure quality in grain, improve grading methods and equipment, improve our ability to protect quality in grain during marketing, and to improve the efficiency of transporting, storing, and handling grain as it moves from farm to market. These shortcomings are considered detrimental to our competing successfully, particularly in the export market.

Several years ago a study group of the Congress made firsthand observations of U.S. agricultural exports to Western Europe. Based on these observations the group stated that the primary reason for our failure to compete more effectively in the European market was a lack of quality, condition, and dependability of U.S. grain exports.

It is evident that research is needed to protect and maintain quality in grain during drying, conditioning, storing, milling, and transportation, whether from insect, pathological, or physiological causes, or of a physical nature; development of improved equipment, facilities, and work methods for efficient handling of grain during marketing operations; and adaptation of improved, statistically sound sampling methods and other equipment for identifying and measuring quality in grain as a basis for improving grade standards, grading methods, and sampling and grading equipment. The development of methods and procedures for controlling insects and pathological disorders should avoid the creation of harmful residues.

The time is opportune for emphasizing research of this type as a part of our goal to market high-quality grains, and with maximum efficiency. However, research facilities are not available to facilitate this diversified program of research. The establishment of a modern grain marketing research laboratory, having specialized laboratories and equipment, is essential where quality and handling research can be conducted in cooperation with the grain industry and other research agencies. Research results would provide a basis for improving official grade standards and grading methods, and provide the industry with reliable methods and procedures for protecting the quality of grain during drying, storage and transport, and in improving the efficiency of its handling and marketing operations.

The logical location for this Laboratory is Manhattan, Kans., where considerable milling, baking, and feed processing facilities have been established at Kansas State University through the cooperation of the grain industry. The logic of this location has been recognized by industry groups which have previously appeared before this committee and by representatives of experiment station directors of the North-Central States. Furthermore, the university has offered sufficient land for the Laboratory at no cost to the Government.

As indicated in the feasibility study, the total estimated cost for planning, constructing, and equipping the Laboratory is $3,385,000. This includes $212,000 for developing plans and specifications $2,438,000 for construction, and $735,000 for completely equipping the facility.

The National Association of Wheat Growers urgently and respectfully recommends that the 1966 appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service include $212,000 in order that the development of plans for this Laboratory may proceed.

The association appreciates this opportunity to appear before this committee.

NATIONAL MILK SANITATION ACT NEEDED

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced the national milk sanitation bill. This bill is identical to the bills I introduced in the 87th and 88th Congresses. If passed, this bill would amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce without unduly burdening such commerce.

The primary responsibility for the protection of public health through sanitary controls should and does rest with State and local authorities. However, no such authority has the right to obstruct the free movement in interstate commerce of milk and milk products through the use of unnecessary sanitary requirements or other health regulations.

At present, local communities have set up their own health regulations in regard to the shipment of milk. These local health standards, which originally were vitally necessary to protect the public from disease transmitted through milk, are now being used as trade barriers by local interest groups to block the free flow of milk without regard to quality and cleanliness. While at one time regulations which limited procurement of milk supplies to local areas made sense, today—with modern technological developments in refrigeration, transportation, and processing—it is possible to establish a uniform system of public health milk control providing for the free flow of safe milk nationwide.

The purpose of my bill is simply to fix one clear and uniform standard of purity for milk in interstate commerce. Milk which would attain uniformly recognized national standards of the highest quality—standards set up by the Public Health Service's tried and proven milk code—could not be discriminated against in local areas. This uniform standard would reduce some of the marketing expenses due to costly duplication of inspections, thus benefitting the consumers' pocketbooks while still protecting their health.

My bill would not necessitate the establishment of costly Federal inspection facilities. Dairy plant inspections would continue to be carried on by State and local health officers, using the uniform code, with the results then being certified by the U.S. Public Health Service. Milk from certified plants could move freely from State to State. This bill does not dictate the code to which municipalities must conform; indeed, they may set their standards lower than the Public Health Service Code. This bill merely prohibits municipalities from excluding milk which does meet the U.S. standard of purity and wholesomeness.

Mr. Speaker, the main benefit to the Nation and the dairy industry under my bill will be the future development of new markets. While the present pattern of marketing areas pretty well satisfies the milk needs of our present population as presently distributed, the rapid population increases, especially in the West, are creating whole new metropolitan centers. It would be ridiculous to set up expensive dairy operations around these centers on lands better suited for other purposes, while the section of our country which has a comparative advantage in dairying is not allowed to service the areas because of antiquated local protective restrictions.

Our farmers in the heart of America's dairyland produce milk of the highest quality and of sanitary standards acceptable under the standards set by the U.S. Public Health Service. These standards have been established by the health agency of our National Government and any standards more stringent than these are superfluous and must be construed as being in fact economic barriers in the free flow of milk from one State to another.

PATENT INFRINGEMENTS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—THE EROSION OF AMERICAN PATENT RIGHTS

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposal to amend our patent laws so as to further protect American patent rights from infringement by unlicensed foreign sources.

Purchasing agencies of the Federal Government until very recent years bought patented products only from the patent holders or their licensees. Now, certain procurement agencies of the Federal Government have begun to engage in the intentional violation of American patents, a practice which has now been applied to the products of many areas of American industry.

In the last half dozen years, several purchasing agencies of the Federal Government have bought tetracycline and other drug products covered by United States product patents, from unlicensed sources for use in the United States in direct and deliberate violation of these patents. Frequently, these sources have been located in Italy or have prepared

dosage forms from bulk drugs imported from Italy.

These Federal agencies have attempted to justify their actions by giving a new twist to an old statute—28 U.S.C. 1498. The owner of a U.S. patent, as the law is now interpreted, cannot put a stop to the Federal Government's deliberate violation of his patent rights—he cannot obtain an injunction from the court against the Federal Government, even at the end of successful litigation, and his right to claim damages in the Court of Claims is a very inadequate remedy. There is no similar legal loophole for local governments which violate patent rights.

When the statute was originally enacted, its sole purpose was to give an injured patent holder a right of action where none had heretofore existed. As the statute was amended in 1918, it contemplated at most the Government's having access to inventions during wartime emergency situations.

It was never intended to give blanket authorization for Government agencies to violate U.S. patents. The net result has been a serious erosion of the rights of U.S. patent owners.

The attempted justification for the violation of U.S. drug patents by Government agencies has been made principally on the ground that the prices quoted by suppliers of infringing dosage forms are often lower than those quoted by the U.S. patent owners and their licensees. Foreign and domestic patent infringers, however, have had to bear no research costs for discovering or developing the drugs covered by the patents they are infringing; and they are attempting to exploit readymade markets which they have spent nothing to maintain. In addition foreign producers of such products as tetracycline pay wages that are about one-fourth of the rates prevailing in the United States and, generally speaking, it may be assumed that they have lower production costs.

The Federal Government's purchases of unlicensed foreign-made drug products or unlicensed dosage forms made from foreign bulk drugs have been facilitated by the fact that some foreign countries provide no patent protection for either drug products or processes. As a result, foreign concerns have developed quite a business out of copying the developments, products, and inventions of the American drug industry.

The American system is strengthened by its patent structure, provided for by the U.S. Constitution to advance science by protecting inventors. More drugs have been discovered in the United States under the protection of a strong patent system than in any other country. Foreign countries with no product or process patent protection in the drug field have produced no important drug discoveries.

With respect to tetracycline products, it is important to note that the prices quoted by the manuacturer to Federal and local government agencies are less than 50 percent of the prices quoted when the product was first introduced and that prices to the trade generally have declined by about 43 percent.

Purchases of unlicensed drug products by the Federal Government are not in the public interest and may well be characterized as "penny wise and pound foolish." American drug research will be discouraged by such purchases, and this will eventually be detrimental to American health. Purchases of unlicensed foreign-made tetracycline or other drug products, or unlicensed dosage forms prepared from foreign-made bulk drugs, can cause loss of jobs by American workers as a result of displacement by low-paid foreign workers; encourage "dumping" of foreign-made products in the United States at prices lower than those charged in the regular foreign market; hurt the unfavorable American balance of international payments; and reduce tax revenues for Federal, State, and municipal governments.

There is an important issue at stake in the matter of governmental purchases of drug products for use in violation of U.S. patents. The laws of the United States have provided a strong patent system for the precise purpose of encouraging long and expensive research work of the very type which led to the discovery of tetracycline. We cannot stand aside while erosion occurs to patent rights which help to provide the funds necessary for the continuance of important medical research the kind of research that has made the United States the world leader in the discovery and development of lifesaving products.

Purchases of patented products by the Federal Government from unlicensed sources have extended to the products of many industries. The violation by various agencies of the Federal Government of patents issued by one of its own branches is a growing threat to research-oriented American industry. Its effect may well be to discourage research in many other industries, as well as in the drug industry.

The deliberate and indiscriminate infringement by the Federal Government of its own patents may not be illegal, but it is morally wrong. It hardly seems fair to have one agency of the Federal Government, namely the U.S. Patent Office, issue a patent to an inventor or a discoverer of a new product, and have another agency of that same Government, the Military Medical Supply Agency in the Defense Department, violate that patent. This, however, is exactly what is happening. Unfortunately, Federal legislation appears to be the only way to stop indiscriminate infringement and to keep deliberate infringement by the Federal Government within reasonable bounds.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the effort on the part of so many people to provide public higher education in the District of Columbia, particularly since I introduced legislation several years ago to use Howard University's faculty and facilities, with whatever expansion would be found necessary after appropriate study, for this purpose.

The President's proposals in this direction, with the goal of providing a public community college or a public college of arts and sciences, are commendable but they do not go far enough. Realistically, it must be recognized that the Congress at times has a certain unfortunate reluctance to appropriate freely for the District of Columbia. And piecemeal approaches to a problem, which will eventually involve millions of dollars, are no better than no approach at all.

In this case, the President has failed to present to the Congress any cost estimate for the construction of either proposed college. I personally believe it would be much better for the President to present to the Congress a full evaluation of these proposals, together with cost estimates, so that a concerted effort can be made at the earliest possible date to achieve these goals. Otherwise the proposals will be faced with the prospect of traveling the same road at least twice, or lack support because of vagueness in costs and plans, or even if authorized in principle, end up as paper programs and boards.

There should also be a realization on the part of the administration that no college is going to spring up overnight. We should concern ourselves with the present situation facing many college eligible District students, and we should make the best use of present institutions and programs that are educational assets to the community.

The distinguished Committee on Public Education in the District of Columbia, appointed by President Kennedy, suggested as a temporary approach that a noncompetitive scholarship program be provided. It is significant that the President made no reference to this important recommendation in his March 18 legislative proposal.

I am deeply impressed by the fact that the Committee recommended that "such a scholarship program should be put into effect immediately, rather than being deferred until after the college and arts and sciences has been organized." Just why this recommendation should have been passed over by the President is a mystery.

While I am not committed to this noncompetitive scholarship program myself, I do feel that thorough study should be made of some type of financial aid, and the sooner the better.

In an effort to be helpful to the President in this matter I make the following suggestions:

First, the President should submit to Congress a detailed estimate of costs and the means of financing his proposals for higher education in the District of Columbia.

Secondly, the President should have a study made of the costs involved in giving financial assistance to those District students who are of college caliber but

who would be unable to attend college without such help.

Thirdly, the universities forming the Joint Graduate Consortium should be invited by the President to develop, in conjunction with the appropriate public officials, a program and a plan for establishing a National Center of Graduate Studies in the Nation's Capital.

By making use of present efforts on the part of the universities in the Joint Graduate Consortium great savings could be made in time and money in meeting the need for public education in the Federal City.

These same universities could be involved by the President in exploring ways of developing additional undergraduate facilities in the District of Columbia, including the pregnant possibilities of sharing faculties and curriculum during the period of establishment of the proposed new public colleges and their growth into major educational institutions. I do not believe it is sound public policy to ignore these five universities in the development of such an important public education program, and I am convinced that the public welfare will only suffer if they continue to be ignored in this matter.

Included as part of my remarks are the following items for the information of my colleagues: first, the letter from President Johnson transmitting his legislative proposals to the Congress; second, a list of the members of the Committee on Public Education in the District of Columbia; and third, excerpts from the Committee's report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting to the Congress herewith a proposed bill to authorize the establishment of two public colleges in the District of Columbia.

A distinguished Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia, appointed by President Kennedy, has unanimously recommended to me the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District. As the Committee's report makes clear, both colleges are urgently needed.

The Committee's report stressed some of the benefits of establishing two such colleges in the District:

"Higher education for those to whom it was previously inaccessible produces consequences far beyond their own use of it. Availability makes a crucial difference in the motivation for learning at all levels and for all ages, generating hope and self-esteem among individuals and groups previously relegated to inferior status. Presenting models of successful escape from degrading conditions and providing trained leadership for those still struggling to emerge from an unfavorable background, higher education offers the best hope for community progress in our cities' battles against poverty, sickness, unemployment, and crime."

The bill would create immediately a Board of Higher Education to which would be assigned the responsibility and the authority to plan, organize, and operate these colleges. The community college would provide programs, generally extending not more than 2 years beyond the high school level, in both academic and vocational fields, with particular emphasis on the latter. The college of liberal arts and sciences would provide courses leading to bachelor's and master's degrees, with initial emphasis on teacher training. It would replace and absorb the present 4-year District of Columbia Teachers College.

The children of the Nation's Capital have been largely denied opportunities, available to high school graduates in the States, to continue their education beyond high school in publicly supported, low-cost educational institutions. Higher education should be made a universal opportunity for all young people—the Nation's Capital should set the pace, not lag behind. The Congress has abundantly demonstrated its concern with education, and I hope that the proposed bill will receive its prompt and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

In this letter the President calls attention to the distinguished Committee on Public Education in the District of Columbia, appointed by President Kennedy.

This Committee consisted of the following civic and educational leaders:

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Dr. Francis S. Chase, Chairman, dean, Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago.

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Thomas R. McConnell, chairman, Center for Study of Higher Education, University of California (Berkeley).

Mrs. Agnes Meyer, civil leader and author, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Samuel M. Nabrit, president, Texas Southern University.

Dr. George N. Shuster, former president, Hunter College, assistant to the president, University of Notre Dame.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, former director, Office of Science and Technology; dean of science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. James H. Case, Jr., Executive Director.

The Committee recommended first, that a noncompetitive scholarship program be provided for students. The Committee's report states—page 33:

A student who has been accepted for admission to the junior class of an accredited college or university equipped to provide the course of study he seeks should receive a grant in such an amount as is required to enable him to attend that institution. He should have unlimited choice among local and other institutions, subject to a demonstration that his choice is appropriate to his objectives. Moreover, in the judgment of the Committee, such a scholarship program should be put into effect immediately, rather than being deferred until after the college or arts and sciences has been organized. There should be no reluctance, therefore, to make the scholarship adequate in size and number. The principle that higher educational opportunities should be within economic reach of all should not be compromised by an inadequate scholarship program.

The Committee is aware that in most colleges and universities tuition charges do not cover the costs of education. In the absence of special provisions, the District might thus be imposing a financial loss upon existing institutions by utilizing a scholarship program to supply its own unmet needs. The Committee suggests, therefore, that a supplementary "cost of education" grant, remitted directly to the institution attended by the student, should also be considered. Consideration should also be given to the occasional use of noncompetitive scholarships for District students working for their first professional degree or their doctorate. Some subsidies are available from various sources for work at this level, but funds to supplement present provisions for graduate fellowships when necessary would insure full opportunity for all qualified candidates.

* * * * *

The Committee has held to the conviction that residents of the District need, and should no longer be denied, the opportunity enjoyed by all other residents of the United States: that of obtaining post-high-school education provided with public support.

Secondly, the Committee stated in its report—page 39—that the early development of a new institution or a new program to provide for high-level graduate and postdoctoral studies in the District is of the utmost importance both for the District and for the Nation. This recommendation, like the first one I have quoted, was not touched on by the President. The Committee's report states:

With the announcement of the five-university consortium in graduate study, the local institutions have taken a first step toward strengthening this vital phase of their work. Their plans and future development are properly the responsibility of the leadership and governing boards of the institutions themselves. In the spirit of lending encouragement to these institutions, we do, however, express the hope that a major effort can be undertaken to achieve within the District the resources of faculty, facilities and endowment that will be needed to provide ultimately for graduate study and research of high distinction. Substantial progress toward this objective may be achieved through cooperative action among the universities, but it will also most certainly require major efforts on the part of the individual institutions as well. We suggest that the goal we envisage represents an opportunity of great significance for those major agencies that provide funds for the advancement of education in the United States, including individuals, corporations, foundations and the Federal Government itself.

I include at this point in my remarks the following passages from the Committee's report—pages 35 to 39:

The Committee has been conscious, throughout all its deliberations, that its recommendations for meeting the needs of the Nation's Capital should be broadly applicable to other American cities as they seek to solve their own educational problems. If the Nation were now facing an era of contracting college demand, a case might conceivably be made for avoiding the creation of new institutions. Instead, we are entering an era of demand that will require unparalleled expansion of college facilities. Under these circumstances, no great city can evade its responsibility to its young people by demanding that existing private institutions absorb a great and growing number of students who perforce must look to them for educational opportunity. The appropriate response must be in terms of bricks and mortar for new basic educational facilities publicly financed at appropriate local levels. The Committee's recommendation that existing facilities and resources of specialized courses of study be utilized, at least temporarily, through a supplementary system of publicly financed, noncompetitive scholarships does no violence to this principle; complete reliance on such a scholarship system would.

Second, the Committee considered, in accordance with the terms of its assignment quoted at the beginning of this report, the possibility that Howard University might itself provide the services to be performed by

the comprehensive community college or the college of arts and sciences, or both. The Committee, however, rejected this possibility. It does not believe that Howard can or should be obliged to focus its attention primarily on District needs. Unless it were to move in a direction quite different from that defined both by its long tradition and its current aspirations, it could not expect to absorb a greatly increased number of students from the District. The Committee respects and approves the current efforts of Howard to contribute to the education of foreign students, particularly from the countries of southeast Asia and Africa. The attempt to impose on Howard a quite different mission—that of a university for the District of Columbia—would seriously impair Howard's capacity to discharge effectively the vital responsibilities it now carries with distinction.

It is particularly important, in the Committee's judgment, that Howard should not assume the role outlined for the community college. That college, for reasons discussed below, should be independent of any 4-year college or university. Here it need only be noted that the differences in purpose and function of the two institutions make them, as experience has shown, unsuitable for combining into a single organization.

D. HIGH-LEVEL GRADUATE STUDY AND RESEARCH

1. The need

It has often been pointed out that Washington has the unhappy distinction of being one of the very few major capitals in the Western World without a truly outstanding university. Many persons who have examined the educational resources of the District have emphasized the importance of developing in the National Capital a major new program of advanced study and research. Thus, for example, a paper prepared for the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia under the auspices of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., on "Training for Occupational Skills in the Washington Metropolitan Area," reaches the conclusion that "obvious gaps in the existing educational facilities are most conspicuous at two levels: the graduate or professional school programs and the junior college." The document continues:

"Limiting the discussion to the topic under consideration here—skill needs of the Washington metropolitan area—leaves out what is perhaps the strongest argument for expansion of higher education in the Nation's Capital: the desirability of having close to the councils of Government a major center of higher learning with the intellectual and technical resources, the prestige and the stimulation it would provide."

Strong areas of graduate study and strong professional schools may be found among the five universities located in the District, but we believe that the leaders of these five institutions would readily agree that the sum total of these areas of excellence does not yet add up to a distinguished and comprehensive program for graduate, professional and postdoctoral studies. For example, graduate work and research in engineering, the physical sciences and the life sciences must be further strengthened. In addition, graduate work in education is far below the national level at a time when demands for specialized educational personnel are increasing in the District as well as nationally.

The Committee is aware that the five local universities, in January 1964, announced a consortium in graduate education. This encouraging action can certainly contribute to the strengthening of the total resources of the District, but we believe that it is only one of several necessary steps. If an adequately comprehensive and truly distinguished program of graduate studies is to become available in the National Capital, large additional funds will be required.

The Committee envisages an array of resources for graduate and advanced studies that would involve further strength and capacity in such professional graduate schools as engineering and in the arts and sciences. It would require the basic research that must always be intimately associated with graduate study. It would also provide opportunities for postdoctoral studies—studies that are rapidly growing in the leading universities of the country. It would provide opportunities for inservice graduate study on the part of those who work in the District and wish to augment their professional training. And finally, it would certainly provide for opportunities in continuing education for mature professional people in order to counter the intellectual obsolescence which occurs in this period of rapid advance in so many fields.

Certainly it is anomalous that a paucity of graduate and professional schools should exist at the same time that the resources of the Federal Government in the Washington area remain relatively untapped by the educational community. Major Federal centers for research in the physical and life sciences are located either in the District itself or a short distance away. These include such installations as the National Institutes of Health, the National Bureau of Standards, the Naval Research Laboratory, the Smithsonian Institution, the Agricultural Research Center, and the Goddard Space Flight Center. In addition, there are included on the staffs of Federal agencies many of the Nation's foremost experts—often with years of experience at institutions of higher learning—in economics, law, statistics, accounting, social science and other fields. As plans progress for consideration of public support for additional graduate and professional education programs, maximum effort should be made to foster a close working relationship with Government laboratories and personnel. The Committee has no doubt that such an arrangement would be of mutual benefit both to the programs and to the Federal Government.

Not only does the District itself have need for vigorous programs of graduate study and research; so, too, does the Nation. There is widespread agreement that by 1970, the Nation should seek at least to double its output of doctorates in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics, and there are many other disciplines in which comparable expansion is indicated if national requirements are to be met. To increase the overall output of doctoral degrees to any such extent requires not only an expansion of existing centers of strength but the creation of new ones. It would be of great advantage to the Nation as a whole if one of these new centers of strength could be in the Nation's Capital.

To this national need and the argument in favor of having "close to the councils of Government a major center of higher learning with the intellectual and technical resources, the prestige and the stimulation it would provide" should be added the argument that the Nation's Capital itself greatly needs the industrial and research development that has been occurring in the United States wherever genuinely impressive resources in graduate study and research exist. Washington is still far from achieving its rightful place in this respect. In terms of the enrichment of employment opportunities for District and area residents, a new and significant element would be added to the intellectual, cultural, and economic life of this community.

President Kennedy said last year in his message to Congress on education:

"We need many more graduate centers, and they should be better distributed geographically.

"The distressed area of the future may well be one which lacks centers of graduate education and research."

The Nation's Capital should not be permitted to become such a distressed area through lack of adequate resources for graduate study and research.

NUCLEAR POWER COMES OF AGE

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days of crisis, it is heartening to hear a promise of hope and a tale of encouragement in the long history of man on this planet. For many years the word atom has cast a shadow of darkness across the globe, but today, thanks to the splendid work of the Atomic Energy Commission, atom is beginning to mean something new. Within the forseeable future people around the world will be able to light and warm their homes with the power of the atom. Areas now parched by a lack of water may find new life in the combination of desalination techniques with the power of the atom.

Electricity is the very life blood of our modern technological civilization. The Atomic Energy Commission is today playing a vital role in making that miracle of light and warmth available in ever increasing amounts to ever greater numbers of people in America and throughout the world.

It is because the AEC has done its job so well that today the word "atom" means something new. This Nation has been fortunate to have men of such high caliber as Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg to lead the development of atomic energy. Through his leadership, and that of his distinguished predecessors and associates on the Atomic Energy Commission, man has been able to turn a master of death into a servant of life.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to an address delivered in Miami yesterday by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission:

NUCLEAR POWER COMES OF AGE

(Remarks by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 33d annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute, Miami Beach, Fla., May 4, 1965)

In considering the title of my remarks for today—"Nuclear Power Comes of Age"—I reflected somewhat on the meaning of that expression. To "come of age" is usually thought of in human terms and suggests that a person has reached that time in his life when he is capable of taking his rightful place in society, of doing his share of the world's work, of being accepted as an equal among his people, and of assuming those responsibilities to society which go along with the new privileges granted to him. In those terms, and in terms of a new source of power introduced to society, I believe that nuclear power has come of age. Today I would like to discuss with you my reasons for this belief and try to predict something of the career that this new member of the energy society will pursue.

Now let me first make clear that the coming of age of nuclear power is not related solely to the position of its economic strength or its total power—no more so than a young man who first ventures out into

society comes of age as a result of the change in his pocket or the muscles under his shirt sleeves. His worth is to be proved by the job he does.

So it is with nuclear power. We at the Atomic Energy Commission feel—and I know that many of you in the electric utilities will agree—that during the past few years nuclear power has earned the right to become part of the power community and grow with its partners in that field in the important job of providing the American people with abundant and economical power.

I do not imagine I need to remind you of the tremendous job that lies before us in meeting our ever-growing needs for electricity. We, and the rapidly developing world around us, are entering an era when electrical power will be almost as essential to our existence as the basic necessities of life—food, water, shelter. Most of us take the convenience of our electric power too much for granted these days. The miracle of modern electricity (and I call it a miracle not as a scientist but as a consumer, in appreciation and awe of the incredible job that is being done by the utilities in supplying it)—the miracle of electricity is so woven into the pattern of our everyday life, its use such a habit, that we hardly realize what life would be like without it. In fact, most Americans alive today cannot recall living without it, and I daresay that a great many have never spent more than a few hours in their entire lives when they have been more than a few feet from some convenient source of electricity.

As most of you probably know, the National Power Survey report, recently issued by the Federal Power Commission, forecasts our need of 2.8 trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually in 1980. I am sure that this statistic means very little to the man on the street. But I know it means a great deal to you. Some of the talks you have already heard at this convention have indicated the enormous undertakings ahead in fulfilling this and other demands of our growing society and economy. (I was particularly intrigued with Mr. Rockefeller's use of the word "implosion"—a good nuclear expression—in describing the rapid population flow to urban areas in the United States and its resulting challenges. Surely consideration of this implosive urbanization, the development of the supercity or megalopolis, will be a major factor in planning for the fulfillment of America's power needs.)

In its plans for the future—which seems to have a way of arriving sooner in this day and age—the electric utility industry clearly is becoming more and more interested in nuclear power. This is apparent from discussions with representatives of the industry, from orders placed for nuclear powerplants, and from evidence of concern in some quarters over competition among energy sources. Undoubtedly many of you have heard about, or read about, or participated in some of the exciting history of the development of nuclear power. You may recall accounts of the first demonstration of the fission chain reaction for practical applications on December 2, 1942 in Chicago. I wonder if some of you may have thought about certain similarities between the development of nuclear power and that of a man. For example, nuclear power was given new freedom of development with the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954—just as it was about to enter its teens—and the decision for the construction of a large-scale nuclear powerplant in a reasonably typical utility situation on a strictly economic basis was announced in December 1963—at age 21.

Clearly there is more to learn before we can know if this newcomer to the power production industry can live up to current expectations. Most indications tell us it will, but favorable experience with plants now operating and other plants now committed for construction will do much to increase our level of confidence.

Nuclear power has come of age in a much broader sense than merely aging—it appears ready to make important positive contributions to man's future well-being. At this point in time it is perhaps worthwhile to contemplate the future. What can we expect as nuclear power matures? Projections into the future usually are helped by an understanding of the heritage and of the basic characteristics of the subject of those projections.

I doubt if it is necessary to dwell much on the origins or the heritage of nuclear power before this audience. The arrival of basic nuclear power technology in man's fund of knowledge was accelerated considerably by the pressures of war; by efforts carried out under a cloak of secrecy. The first public exposures to the massive release of nuclear power were strictly in terms of its awesome destructive forces. This history naturally has left lasting impressions—impressions unfortunately detrimental to many of the peaceful applications of nuclear energy, but impressions which education and time will erode.

While the assets in the development and production capability of the wartime Manhattan Engineer District were transferred to the civilian Atomic Energy Commission in 1946, the prinicipal occupation of the Commission for a number of years continued to be related to military defense purposes. It has only been during the past 2 years that it has been possible to approve significant reductions in the military production operations of the Commission.

Of course the dream of peaceful uses of nuclear energy flourished with the first realization of the technical feasibility of nuclear fission chain reactions back in 1942. While some civilian nuclear energy development projects, such as the experimental breeder reactor and aqueous homogeneous reactor experiment, were initiated prior to the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, it was not until that legislation permitted broader declassification and broader participation by industry that serious efforts really began major expansion. Since that time the transition from Government monopoly to industrial cooperation and completely privately owned plants has proceeded quickly and, in my opinion, very successfully.

Within recent years a broad range of technologies with apparent promise for civilian nuclear power production has been developed. These efforts have included the design, construction, and operation of experimental and prototype reactors. The operating experience of some of these reactors on utility systems has been an important part of our overall nuclear power development. Likewise the maximum assumption of financial responsibility and risk by industry has been and continues to be a valid element of providing incentives for the efficiencies and cost reductions essential to the achievement of economically competitive nuclear power. Through this process the industry has now reached a point at which certain reactor types in large capacity nuclear powerplants are being offered commercially under arrangements which make them economically attractive, in many sections of the country, in comparison with fossil fueled plants.

The course of nuclear power development naturally has been influenced by its military heritage—by our large capacity to enrich the fissile isotope of uranium in our gaseous diffusion plants—by the very extensive development of water moderated reactors for the Navy—and by the experience many companies gained in connection with these efforts. We now find ourselves, for the first time, with our military production being reduced and the demands of civilian nuclear power expected to assume the primary role in support of mining, isotope enrichment, and auxiliary service industries. Thus, as civilian nuclear power matures, it, quite naturally, is expected to assume greater responsibilities. The Commission has been proceeding for a number of years on a course intended to permit the nuclear power industry to flourish with minimum Government involvement. In fact, as I have often pointed out, the AEC is one Government agency which is in the unique position of slowly working itself out of a job. I should add, however, that new applications of nuclear energy demand that the AEC take on new jobs in other areas.

The most recent step we have taken in minimizing our involvement with private industry was our action relating to implementation of the legislation passed by Congress last year regarding private ownership of special nuclear materials. This legislation now permits, and by the early 1970's will require, private companies to own the nuclear fuel in their power stations. Previously it was required that this material be owned by the Government and leased for commercial use. As things stand now the sole remaining function for which private nuclear power is dependent upon the Government is the enrichment of uranium conducted in our Government-owned gaseous diffusion plants.

Nuclear power appears to be ready to pay some returns for the investment of approximately $1½ billion of tax money which has been spent on its development. Based on projected nuclear power growth rates and reductions in cost of power production estimates in our report to the President a little over 2 years ago, the returns will show the investment well justified. However, just as every young man's further training and experience must not be neglected, nuclear power also has certain developments which must be pursued if it is to play a major role in supplying our country's and the world's future expanding power requirements.

What are some of the current developments in nuclear power? In what direction is the AEC moving to try to assure that nuclear power fulfills its promises of abundant and economic power?

In answering these questions it might be appropriate to look back for a moment to the Statement of Objectives in the AEC's 1962 report to the President. Although we have advanced technically since that time, those objectives remain valid and are still serving as a guide for our civilian nuclear power program. The report stated that our overall objective was "to foster and support the growing use of nuclear energy" and to guide it in such directions "as to make possible the exploitation of the vast energy resources latent in the fertile materials uranium 238 and thorium." Specifically it called for the following:

1. The demonstration of economic nuclear power by assuring the construction of plants incorporating the presently most competitive reactor types;

2. The early establishment of a self-sufficient and growing nuclear power industry that will assume an increasing share of the development costs;

3. The development of improved converter and, later, breeder reactors to convert the fertile isotopes to fissionable ones, thus making available the full potential of the nuclear fuels; and

4. The maintenance of U.S. technological leadership in the world by means of a vigorous domestic nuclear power program and appropriate cooperation with, and assistance to, our friends abroad.

We believe that, with the excellent cooperation we have been getting from the country's nuclear industries and electric utilities, we are successfully carrying out our commitments to the first two objectives—to demonstrate economically competitive nuclear power and help establish a self-sufficient nuclear power industry capable of sharing development costs. In this regard

we have come a long way. It is particularly gratifying to me to compare the difference in attitude toward nuclear power between the time I first came to Washington and now. In those earlier days—only some 4 years ago—I recall the many conversations I had in which I tried to encourage an interest in the potential of nuclear power. Most people reacted pessimistically—or at least doubtfully—to my appeals. Today the situation seems quite reversed, as I now sometimes find it necessary to keep people from being overenthusiastic about the future of nuclear power.

We now have in operation and committed several of the light water reactors which should help demonstrate that nuclear power can safely and—to a fair degree at this point—efficiently and economically generate civilian electric power. A great deal of credit must be given to you and the others in the utility field who have helped pioneer this new energy source. I might add that I have personally come to know many of you and your plans for nuclear power through an extended series of meetings which my fellow Commissioners and I have had with representatives from utilities over the past few years. As you know our door continues to be open to all of you for the discussion of any matters of mutual interest. I feel that such discussion can be most helpful in the consideration of nuclear power. Certainly it is to our mutual interest, as well as to that of the public we serve, that any decisions made regarding nuclear power are based on the fullest information and understanding—particularly in matters involving safety and siting.

But while the position of nuclear generated electricity continues to improve, thanks to your help and that of the nuclear power industry, it is appropriate that we in the Government concentrate on our next objective. Consequently, we are shifting our interest and our efforts now toward developing those reactors which will be best suited to "stretch out" the low cost reserves of nuclear fuel, by making even more efficient utilization of the fuel they consume. Moreover, we realize that no new system—no matter what its importance to the overall fuel economy—will be widely adopted if in itself it is not economic. Therefore, cost remains an important factor in our reactor development thinking.

With all this in mind our major efforts now are being directed toward the third specific objective stated in our 1962 report—the development of reactor types known as "advanced converters" and "breeders." This is being done in two phases, with the development of the converters coming first, although there will be some overlapping of programs.

At this point I might explain briefly something of the technology of these reactors so that it will be clearer as to how they will fit into our pursuit of the most efficient and economic use of nuclear power.

As you probably know, when most of today's light water reactors, using uranium, are operated at their economic optimum, only a very small fraction of the latent fission energy contained in the uranium is used. Should we continue to develop and encourage the use of only these types of reactors, it would not be long (in view of projected power demands) before we would exhaust even the large supply of economic nuclear fuel resources known in the world today. However, it is possible to convert uranium 233 and our other abundant nuclear fuel source, thorium 232 (both of which we refer to as "fertile" materials), to fissionable fuels. This important conversion can be accomplished by transmuting, within reactors, uranimum 238 to plutonium 239, and thorium 232 to uranium 23. Plutonium 239 and uranium 233 are fissionable and can be used as rector fuel. The net effect is to "burn" indirectly the nonfissionable, very abundant, fertile uranium 238 and thorium 232. Most reactors accomplish this extremely productive transmutation to varying degrees and do so during the course of producing power. (Incidentally, of the new fuel produced some is "burned" in place and some is later extracted and reprocessed for future use.) Those improved converted reactor systems which produce almost as much new fuel as they consume we refer to as "advanced converters" or "near breeders."

It is also possible to develop—and we have already begun to do so—reactors that through the conversion process produce more fissionable material than they consume. Here again the net effect is to "burn" indirectly, but in this case almost completely, the nonfissionable uranium 238 and thorium 232. These reactors are called "breeders." If, at this point, you are not already thoroughly confused, I might mention that we have a variety of terms for reactors of different conversion efficiency in this general class, such as "low-gain or self-sustaining breeders," and "high-gain breeders," all of which are clear to us in the nuclear power field, but which sometimes make our reports appear like documents from the American Kennel Club. In fact I would not be surprised if someday we refer to a breeder reactor of which we are particularly proud as "best of breed." (Actually the classification of breeders is helped if one remembers that "high-gain breeders" produce appreciably more fissionable material than they consume; "low-gain breeders" produce slightly more than they consume; and "near breeders" produce almost as much as they consume.)

But getting back to the principles of the advanced converters and breeders, I think it is clear how significant their technology can be to the future of nuclear power and to the future of the electric utilities. In essence it holds the key to unlocking the tremendous energy stores in the nonfissionable but extremely abundant isotopes uranium 238 and thorium 232. By allowing us to make the most efficient use of our nuclear resources this new technology gives us promise of a vast supply of economic power until such time, probably still far in the future, when we will be able to harness the thermonuclear energy of controlled fusion and have in addition as an almost limitless fuel source the heavy hydrogen atom found in common sea water.

In line with our long-range program to develop economic converters and breeders (and consistent with the third specific objective in our report to the President) we are concentrating first on the development of what we consider the best types of advanced converters. This is the next logical step because we are closer to understanding and perfecting the technology of these thermal reactors—that is, reactors in which the neutrons are slowed down by a moderator before they produce fission in other atoms or are "captured" by the fertile atoms to make them fissionable. Also we will have to rely on the simpler and more exploitable technology of these near-breeders and low-gain breeders in order to buy the time we will need to develop the more difficult, large, economic, high-gain systems of the future.

Three types of advanced converters in which we are currently most interested are: the high temperature gas cooled reactor; the heavy water organic cooled reactor; and the large seed and blanket variation of the well-developed pressurized water reactor. The development of these reactor systems should offer us both technological and economic advantages.

Because both the high temperature gas cooled and the heavy water moderated, organic cooled reactors have high neutron efficiency they also have great potential for becoming economically competitive, near-breeder systems using the thorium-uranium 233 fuel cycle. As their technology is developed, and more is learned about their operation, both these systems may offer the further potential of low-gain breeding.

These two reactor systems offer the potential of low-cost power, not only at present uranium prices but at ore prices several-fold higher. It appears that the gas technology will have special significance in the development of gas cooled fast breeders. The heavy water moderated technology seems especially well suited for the larger reactors needed for dual purpose electricity and desalting plants. We might note also that the heavy water systems have the important advantage of fuel flexibility, since they can be fueled with natural uranium, slightly enriched uranium, or thorium.

Using the well-known light water technology, the large seed-blanket reactor, the third advanced converter in which we are interested, appears to have the almost immediate capability of breeding in the thorium-uranium 233 fuel system. This reactor prototype will also pioneer in the development, testing, and establishment of standards for many important new engineering concepts, such as a large spherical pressure vessel erected in the field—so important to the future of large water-cooled systems.

These are some of the advantages of the advanced converter prototypes we plan to develop.

While I cannot go into great detail on our breeder program at this time, I would like to say a few words about it. One important effort in this program will be toward the development of fast reactors. A fast reactor is one which does not employ a moderator to slow down the neutrons, and is of interest because it has an even more favorable neutron economy than that of thermal reactors which slow down the neutrons with moderators. Both fast and thermal reactors can be so designed and built as to be breeder reactors. But a thermal reactor is limited by nature to low-gain breeding, while a fast reactor is capable of being a high-gain breeder. High-gain and low-gain breeders can also be distingiushed by their fuel cycle. The thorium 232/uranium 233 fuel cycle is the only one which offers promise of breeding in thermal—that is, low-gain—breeders. The fast reactor—high-gain breeder—is most efficient with the uranium 238/plutonium 239 fuel cycle. Uranium 235, the only fissionable isotope found in nature, is, of course, necessary to initiate any of these fuel cycles, although once begun, a breeder reactor is self-sustaining. Thus in the early breeder reactors uranium 235 may be used in the first core in place of the uranium 233 or plutonium 239. Such initial operation of the reactor in a sense converts the uranium 235 to uranium 233 or plutonium 239 through the fertile material thorium 232 or uranium 238.

An important question is how fast a breeder reactor can become independent of uranium 235 and can supply enough excess fissionable uranium 233 or plutonium 239 to refuel itself or to fuel subsequent, additional reactors. At present, the fast reactors, since they are capable of being high-gain breeders, are the only ones which show promise of reasonable short doubling time—that is, the time it takes the breeder to produce enough new fissionable material in excess of its own needs to fuel a second reactor of equal size and power output.

In considering the different types of advanced converter and breeder reactors, it is difficult to predict which types will eventually find the widest use. Most likely many types will play important roles in the evolution of nuclear power. In the more distant future a combination of types will probably fit into the overall economy. There are many possible "systems" combinations of reactors and fuels and fuel cycles, including various

possible combinations of uranium 235, uranium 233, thorium 232, plutonium 239, and uranium-238, and therefore it is difficult to predict now which will be most efficient from a combined economical and fuel utilization point of view.

As I have pointed out earlier, in carrying out all phases of our civilian nuclear power program we always have economics foremost in mind. Since utilities, whether publicly or privately owned, have a primary mission of producing electric power for their customers as cheaply as possible, the rapidity of growth and the level of use of nuclear energy to produce electricity will depend primarily upon its ability to compete economically with other sources of energy. In many cases, strictly local situations will exert the greatest influence upon a utility's decision as to what kind of powerplant it should add next to its system. But there are also certain special economic factors pertinent to the evaluation of a nuclear plant. As you know, size is important, with increased size favoring nuclear power. As recently as 1959 the AEC was projecting nuclear power costs on the basis of reference designs of 300 megawatts electrical. We now often use a capacity as large as 1,000 megawatts electrical for reference designs and economic analysis. This trend to larger plant size is of course consistent with the overall trend in the power industry. The advent of large interconnected power pools, which accelerated the increase in acceptable powerplant capacities, has proved to be a trend favorable to the economic promise of nuclear power. However, in discussing the trend toward larger reactors let me point out that we have not overlooked the importance of continuing the development of efficient smaller reactors. There are many areas in the world where such reactors will serve an important function for years to come.

Quite naturally, nuclear power has achieved its initial commercial interest in this country in areas of relatively high fossil fuel costs. As the economics of nuclear power improve to become commercially attractive in broader areas of the country, the regional differential energy cost will be essentially removed as a handicap to economic progress. This factor alone can have very important effects on the distribution of economic development in various regions of our Nation and in various nations of the world.

The rather drastic decreases in nuclear power costs which have been related to increasing plant capacity have provided a basis for interest in still larger plants which might become justifiable by multiple applications—that is, generation of electricity coupled with use of process heat for desalinization of water or other applications.

In September of last year Secretary Udall and I submitted a report to the President—"Program for Advancing Desalting Technology." As you know, this is an area in which President Johnson takes particular interest. This report was released by the President on October 26, 1964, as a program planning guide. The power reactor development activities contemplated by this program represent logical extensions of activities underway as part of our program for the development of civilian nuclear powerplants for generation of electricity. The emphasis in this program will be in the areas of coupling of power and desalting installations, the scaling up in plant capacities, and in cooperative studies of power and water needs in specific situations. The program plan provides for the operation of a 1,000-megawatt thermal (350-megawatt electrical) power-only reactor prototype by about 1970, and for the operation of a second dual-purpose prototype of approximately 3,500 megawatt thermal capacity by about 1975. Both prototypes would be constructed and operated in cooperation with industry and the utilities. It is expected that there might be substantial participation by a utility in the first prototype and even greater participation in the second.

Thus, the technology and the economics would be developed sufficiently to permit the initiation of even larger power-desalting reactors in the mid-1970's for operation by about 1980 if such needs materialize.

Studies which we have already done indicate that within the next few decades nuclear installations will be able to produce fresh water and electric power at costs which may be attractive in many parts of the world. Certainly, as nations develop and increase in population, the natural water resources will become inadequate in more and more geographical areas of the world. The availability of reasonably low cost power and water could open up new frontiers for industrialization throughout the world. These developments could contribute to increased flexibility in man's exploitation of earth's resources for his greater comfort and dignity.

In pursuing these undertakings and in our other programs of international cooperation in nuclear power, I believe we are successfully fulfilling our commitment to the fourth and final objective stated in our 1962 report to the President—that of maintaining "technological leadership in the world by means of a vigorous domestic nuclear power program and appropriate cooperation with, and assistance to, our friends abroad."

Surely the development and distribution of nuclear power for generating electricity will have a significant effect on the lives of many people around the world. Industrialization abroad, particularly in the emerging, developing nations, will call for substantial blocks of power in areas where power has been previously very limited. American industry will be called upon to export much equipment and technological skill and training to this end. This is a whole area of endeavor in itself which I cannot discuss in the time available to me here—but needless to say this area should prove to be a most worthwhile undertaking.

The atom has come of age—and fortunately in an age when it can be of greatest service to man. But it needs your guidance and your support if it is to fulfill its greatest promise in maturity.

I urge that, as individuals, and as an industry, you continue to keep yourselves informed of technology advances, continue to exercise fair judgments in the choice of energy alternatives to fulfill your management responsibilities, continue to be alert in ways to apply new technologies or new modes of operation to improve user service, and continue to recognize the importance of sharing your knowledge and skills for the benefit of man in all corners of the world.

I can assure you that the policies of the Atomic Energy Commission will continue to embrace close cooperation with you in the utilities field in the development of the civilian uses of nuclear power. And I strongly believe that the results of that development will be of great value to a growing America, and lead to significant improvements in the well-being of all men seeking to create a better life and a better world.

FOREIGN AID DISCUSSION

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] 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. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the bipartisan group that has been sponsoring the weekly foreign aid discussions, I am very pleased to announce that Vice President HUMPHREY will join us this week in a discussion of the current questions on foreign aid. William Gaud, Deputy Administrator, AID, will also be with us.

The discussion will be Thursday, May 6, at 3 p.m. in the Speakers dining room.

I hope my colleagues will be able to join us at that time.

CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] 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. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, throughout Mexico each year, the 5th of May celebrates a great Mexican victory over the French in 1862. The holiday is not to be confused, however, with Mexican Independence Day, the 16th of September, which commemorates the day in 1810 when Martin Hidalgo, a parish priest, issued a ringing declaration of Mexico's freedom from Spanish rule.

Mexico's revolt against Spain was complete by 1822, but internal dissension and European efforts to reacquire Mexico plunged the vast nation into almost continuous chaos. Thus it was that Mexico's first liberal regime, under Benito Juarez in the early 1860's, encountered serious difficulties both at home and abroad.

A great number of self-exiled Mexican conservatives informally assembled at the French Court and appealed successfully to the imperialistic intentions of Napoleon III. Napoleon acceded to their wishes, occupying the Mexican port of Vera Cruz with the aid of the British and Spanish. Their pretext was the collection of debts and the restoration of order to insure the safety of their numerous citizens plying commercial and mining trades throughout Mexico.

A large force of French, Spanish, and British arrived in Vera Cruz in December 1861. The United States was deep in the throes of the Civil War at the time, which made support of the Mexican government impossible, even against such a clear transgression of the spirit and letter of the Monroe Doctrine.

By April 1862, the Spanish and British withdrew their forces, now fully aware of France's greater intentions. Six thousand French soldiers, under General Laurencez, marched toward Mexico City to the victory they were sure would be theirs against a motley, volunteer force of Mexicans equipped merely with muskets which had been captured from the French at Waterloo.

The French confidence was unwarranted. On the 5th of May, the Mexican forces hurled them back at Puebla—a strategic city almost equidistant from Vera Cruz and Mexico City, often the scene of important battles in Mexican history.

Although the French lost nearly a thousand soldiers and much pride, they were able in succeeding years to capture

the Mexican capital. Their stay was brief, however, for by 1867 Maximillian, whom they had placed upon a contrived Mexican throne, was executed.

The significance of the Cinco de Mayo celebration is the fact that the spirit and indominitable independence of the hearts of the Mexicans who turned the French away on that day lives on.

They eventually liberated their great nation from foreign domination and achieved a justifiably strong sense of national consciousness and pride. The United States has a neighbor of which we can be extremely proud and we join them, today, in honoring the courageous band of defenders who fought and won on this day in 1862, as well as those who died in this defense.

Also, we are proud of those Mexicans who have chosen to come to the United States, and their dependents, for the great contributions so many have made to our society, displaying the same strength of character as their forbears did on the 5th of May.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR FLOOD VICTIMS

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] 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. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster, and I ask that it be referred appropriately.

The Second District of Iowa as well as many others throughout the Midwest and the Nation have been ravaged this spring by severe natural disasters, floods, tornadoes, and earthquakes. In recent weeks I have had occasion to work very closely with residents of numerous cities and towns along the Mississippi River which have experienced incredible losses from floods of recordbreaking proportions.

I have been privileged to witness an amazing spirit of determination and unselfishness on the part of community leaders and volunteer workers in these areas. Without the unmatched generosity and tireless efforts of these people, as well as the splendid cooperation received from the agencies of the Federal and State Governments the losses would have been nearly irreparable.

In spite of these efforts and the substantial governmental assistance, great difficulties remain from the people in these affected areas. While the terms of Public Law 81–875 have generally proven satisfactory to meet the needs of States and communities afflicted by the loss of public property, there is in many instances insufficient protection for individual citizens suffering heavy property losses. As a result there are serious problems of unemployment, low morale, personal financial failures and uncompensated business losses.

It has been my observation that our existing modes of relief are inadequately tailored to meet the substantive and administrative needs of a major disaster such as the one we have recently experienced. I have, therefore, introduced this bill which I feel establishes certain necessary guidelines for a complete study of the sufficiency of our disaster legislation. It is geared to provide additional assistance to the farmer, businessman, and property owner whose holdings have been suddenly torn from them by a severe natural disaster.

In general terms this bill would give Federal officials the authority to loan money used for restoration of property for longer periods of time, up to 40 years, at interest rates as low as 3 percent in major disaster areas. Additionally, discretion would be given to postpone initial repayments of principal and interest for a period up to 5 years where the possibility of severe financial hardship exists. These provisions would apply to loans insured by the Farmers Home Administration, the Small Business Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Veterans' Administration.

The bill would also provide a fund to refinance loans secured by one- to four-family homes which are not insured or guaranteed by any Federal agency. The financing of this disaster fund would be on a 75–25-percent matching basis for Federal and State Governments, with liberalized credit terms similar to those established for loans insured by the Federal Government.

In addition, the bill includes further assistance in the areas of: Providing shelter for disaster victims; extending the time for compliance with farm programs where necessary; expanding the use of civil defense communications systems to expedite disaster warnings; providing assistance in school construction, and meeting school expenditures in disaster areas; liberalizing Federal participation in highway reconstruction; and reimbursing expenses incurred in providing flood protection.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have in recent months given careful study to our program of foreign aid. I support this program as being both just and in our national interest to provide the encouragement and financial assistance of a great nation to those developing nations who are also prepared to undertake measures to help themselves. I do feel, however, that first and foremost we must be willing to provide sufficient encouragement and assistance to those areas where it is vitally needed in our Nation to help them recover from major unexpected disasters. This is particularly true where, as during the recent floods, these people have demonstrated such courage and willingness to help themselves to the maximum extent possible. Certainly the maintenance of a sound, dynamic economy at home is fundamental to our efforts to assist others abroad.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES EXTENSION AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] 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. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965 are essential to maintain the public health in three important areas: vaccination programs, migrant worker health, and community health services.

H.R. 2986 would extend the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962 for an additional 3 years. Immunization programs are vital to our Nation's health because they enable us to prevent a number of diseases that we cannot cure. Our success in wiping out dread diseases such as polio, diphtheria, and whooping cough depends upon reaching the largest number of people possible. Under the Federal program substantial progress has been made in achieving a higher level of immunization against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, and whooping cough and community programs have been developed which will maintain this level.

The amendments also contain a provision for Federal assistance to the States for a measles vaccination program. Most people think of measles as just another childhood disease but it can be highly dangerous. There are over 400 deaths a year from measles and many others suffer permanent mental or hearing damage. A Federal program along the lines of existing vaccination programs is needed because of the high cost of measles vaccine and the lack of public awareness of the dangers of measles.

The Community Health Services Amendments will also extend for 3 more years the current program of grants for health services for migratory workers. Migratory workers are the lost children of this country. Because they move with the seasons they are often ineligible for health services that communities provide to their resident medically indigent population. At the same time they are one of the population groups most in need of health care because of their low income, ignorance of good health practices, and poor living conditions. Under the Public Health Service program 60 projects have been set up to provide medical treatment for illness or injury, immunizations, casefinding and treatment of communicable diseases, prenatal and postnatal care, and other preventive and curative services. This program is extremely important to the well-being of about 1 million migrant agricultural workers and the country as a whole benefits from any reduction in the number of people carrying communicable diseases.

H.R. 2986 also provides for an extension of the program of grants to the States for general health services, mental health services, radiological health services, dental health services, and health services for the chronically ill and aged. The extension is limited to 1 year because a study of these services is now underway in the Public Health Service and a review of legislative needs is being

undertaken in cooperation with the association of State and territorial health officers, and the State and territorial mental health authorities. Their recommendations will be reviewed by Congress next year.

The recent passage of this legislation by the House of Representatives is just one more step in the direction of a healthier and happier society in this Nation. It marks once again the determination of the United States to act against the enemies of mankind, whether they are natural or manmade, and eradicate them from the face of the earth.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LX

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the March 17, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune concerning the proposal for a New York State sales tax.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," as follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: TAX UNIT MEMBER PLUGS A WAGNER LEAK

(By Alfonso Narvaez and Barry Gottehrer; of the Herald Tribune staff)

One of the 15 members of the temporary commission on city finances charged yesterday that Mayor Wagner was trying to use the special commission as a rubberstamp in his call for passage of a State sales tax.

The member, who opposes the sales tax, reportedly made his charges before the monthly meeting of the commission yesterday. According to him, a report by three members on the controversial tax has brought about a split among commission members.

At issue is the five-page report sent to the mayor last month—in which the three came out in favor of the tax. The report, later leaked to the press, created the impression, according to at least three memoers of the commission, that the commission itself favored the tax.

ERRONEOUS

Charging that the report gave an "erroneous impression," one member of the commission, who wished to remain anonymous, said yesterday: "It is a question of whether the commission is duty bound to call the shots the way it sees it or to play patsy for Mayor Wagner and provide him with a backdrop of leading names in the community who go along with what he wants."

At least two other members of the commission, which reportedly have met two times previously without reaching agreement on the sales tax plan, maintained yesterday that the earlier report was solely the personal opinion of Earl B. Schwulst, chairman of the commission and of Bowery Savings Bank; Wallace S. Sayre, vice chairman; and Dr. Joseph D. McGoldrick, secretary.

The report, issued at the request of city hall and delivered in time for the mayor to take with him on his trip to Albany March 1 to appear before the State legislature's finance committees, added fuel to rumors of an alleged "deal" between Mayor Wagner and Governor Rockefeller.

It has been reported that the mayor had agreed to lend his support to the Governor's proposed 2 percent statewide sales tax in exchange for the Governor's support of the mayor's choices for leaders of the State senate and assembly last month.

Mayor Wagner and Governor Rockefeller, however, have repeatedly denied reports that any deal took place.

Despite the fact that a letter accompanying the report when it was sent to the mayor was written on Bowery Savings Bank stationery and stated that the report "was not a report of the commission as a whole, although it reflects the views of a number of the members," the general impression "leaked" to the newspapers was that it was a report by the commission.

"I don't think the mayor would deliberately try to mislead the public," Mr. McGoldrick, commission secretary, said yesterday. "We made the fact quite clear in our letter that it was our personal view."

Though the mayor made it clear to Albany newsmen that the report presented the point of view of only three members of the commission, the earlier press leak, out of the mayor's office, did not make this clear at all.

A spokesman for the commission conceded yesterday that the report, signed under the names and commission titles of the commission's 3 top members, would give the impression that the 3 were speaking for all 15.

NOT MY VIEWS

Mr. Schwulst said that only seven members, one short of a quorum, showed up at the meeting in his office yesterday, and that the report and "the differences of opinion" were discussed only briefly. He said that "it was probably a mistake" issuing the report under their commission titles.

"There are differences of opinion among the members, but there is no split," he said. "The commission, as such, is reluctant to take a position before they study the matter thoroughly."

Mr. Schwulst added that he "would not be willing to serve on a commission if I thought I would have to give the mayor an opinion he wanted."

Jacob S. Potofsky, a commission member and the general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, has publicly criticized the three-man report. "The views in the report are the views of the three officials who signed it and in no way do they reflect my views," he said.

The only official statement by the entire commission on the sales tax appeared in its interim report issued November 30. In it, the commission called for exploration of a statewide sales tax, but made it clear that the sales tax would have to be one "with rebates to the city (and other local jurisdictions) at rates now collected."

In this way, the city presumably would continue to collect the equivalent of the 4-percent sales tax it now collects.

Under Governor Rockefeller's tax plan, a 2-percent sales tax would be created statewide, which would allow New York City to levy an additional 3 percent on top of that. According to critics, the city, under the Governor's plan, would lose the equivalent of 1 percent in sales tax revenue and the consumer would be hit with a full 5-percent tax on personal services and beer in addition to retail sales. (In 1963–64, the 4-percent sales tax brought $417 million to the city.)

As partial compensation to the city, the Governor has recommended that revenues from the State stock transfer tax be rebated to the city. He also said he would increase the city's share of State highway revenues.

The statewide sales tax proposal has been under fire from business and consumer groups since it was first outlined.

The Citizens Budget Commission has said that "the 5-percent tax would create some of the very poverty which the city, the State and the Federal Government are now determined to combat.

The CBS said that the city was still suffering from the effects of a sales tax boost from 3 to 4 percent in 1963, and suggested that the city reduce its expected expenditures instead of increasing its sales tax.

Lawrence Lachman, president of Bloomingdale's, said, in representing the Metropolitan New York Merchants Association, that a 5-percent sales tax would only accelerate the decline of retail industry in the city.

The temporary commission on city finances was created in 1963 with the purpose of figuring out what the city must do to head off an expected expense budget deficit of $350 million in 1966.

A GAME

Late last fall, one of the mayor's aid gave his own experienced view of the power and potential of this—and any other—special commission set up by the mayor.

"It's all a game," he said. "We know we have fiscal problems and we know what we have to do—raise existing taxes or put in some new ones. But, most of all, we know that we must get more Federal and State help.

"But by setting up these commissions, the mayor gets the bankers and the business leaders, many of them Republicans, involved. If they should ever come up with something new, then all the better. If they don't—and they rarely do—it's their failure—not the mayor's. And then, who says that he has to do anything with their proposals?"

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXI

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 18, 1965, concerns an attempt by New York City's business community to solve some of the problems faced by the city.

It is part of the series appearing in the Tribune on "New York City in Crisis."

The article follows:

TWELVE AT THE TOP HOLD A CRISIS MEETING

(By Barrett McGurn)

A businessmen's drive to cope with the many mounting problems of New York City got underway yesterday with an organizational meeting attended by a dozen of this city's foremost banking, utility, insurance, department store, and chamber of commerce presidents and board chairmen.

They met in the name of 70 heads of New York's and America's largest firms which had agreed that business had to take a hand in solving long-range problems affecting factory jobs and other phases of the city's life.

The businessmen, leaders of companies with many billions of dollars of assets, outlined strategy to stop the flight of factories which has cost New York City between 81,000 and 100,000 jobs in 6 years. The latter is an estimate of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, the main force behind the reform drive. The former is the figure which the New York City Department of Commerce and Industrial Development concedes.

The representatives of New York's commercial life met at an undisclosed place after a preliminary conference at 3:30 p.m., in the office of the Turner Construction Co., 150

East 42d Street. Henry Chandlee Turner, Jr., president of Turner's, skyscraper builders, is president of the Commerce and Industry Association.

Also at the meeting was Walter F. Pease, a member of the law firm of Shearman & Sterling, president of the 197-year-old New York Chamber of Commerce, a cosponsor of the drive.

Those at the meeting are members of a committee of 14 which the city's business leadership has established. The committee includes the presidents or board chairmen of R. H. Macy's, the Chase Manhattan Bank (New York's largest), the Irving Trust Co., the New York Life Insurance Co., the Ford Foundation, the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, the New York Telephone Co., the Seamen's Bank for Savings, the Downtown Lower Manhattan Association, Helmsley & Spear, Inc., who manage the Empire State Building and other properties, the Brooklyn Union Gas Co., and Abraham & Straus.

The businessmen pooled a knowledge of finances, of New York City real estate including property available for development as industrial parks, an awareness of cultural trends reflected in the activities of the Ford Foundation and a vested interest in the well-being of a city whose prosperity or decline intimately affects department stores, utilities, business firms, and other New York investments.

The business representatives faced a crowded agenda during the course of a 90-minute meeting. Some of the problems were these:

Whether to "take over" the city's year-old industrial development corporation, of which Commissioner of Commerce and Industrial Development Louis Broido is head, and whether Mr. Broido would allow such a "take-over." Mr. Broido would like to stay as president of the job-seeking corporation. It is the bulk of his city department's work. Mr. Broido also would like to limit business to a 50–50 control after the example of Philadelphia's successful bootstrap operation.

Whether to hire one of the executive directors of another of America's 1,600 community industrial development corporations, several of which have helped reverse downtrends in New Haven, Hartford, Boston, Chicago, Kansas City, Atlanta, Seattle, and other cities.

How to go about analyzing the reasons why factories have drained out of New York ever since World War II, withdrawing work opportunities from high school dropouts, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and others who tend to become jobless relief seekers and, sometimes, police problems.

Whom to tap as directors and officers of an industrial-revival drive, a campaign designed to expand the number of city taxpayers and consumers, and, eventually, to cut back on rising municipal tax rates.

The businessmen said nothing at the end of the meeting, beyond expressing satisfaction. They will have a statement today.

Commissioner Broido, a $1-a-year man and former executive vice president of Gimbels, meanwhile reported one more tentative success in his own effort to combat the blue-collar job drain. He said that a weekend raid on an unnamed southern State made it almost sure that a furniture factory with 600 employees will move to the industrial park which the board of estimate provisionally has approved for a 96-acre area in Flatlands, Brooklyn.

Mr. Broido told the southern operator that his high-quality furniture has the 16 million residents of the New York metropolitan area as the likeliest market. He insisted that New Yorkers are more productive workers and that New York State's $100 million fund for factory development may provide a 30-year 3-percent second mortgage at half the usual 6-percent interest charge. The loan, coupled with a normal banker's first mortgage for the first 50 percent, should make Flatlands' real estate costs competitive with the cheap but far away Southern site, Mr. Broido reasoned. The southerner, Mr. Broido said, seemed convinced.

At the same time, however, a two-way factory traffic continued. Manuel Hochberg, of the Regal Metal Products Corp., 848 Stanley Avenue, Brooklyn, told the Herald Tribune that he was very much interested in the stories about factory flights and wanted to know where they were going so that he could follow.

He said high taxes and lackadaisical laborers lured only temporarily from city relief rolls had convinced him to leave. Mr. Broido's staff will be in touch with him to urge him to stay.

But Peter J. Woods, president of the Mohawk Mocs Shoe Co., of Mohawk, N.Y., said he has a 20-man operation and is willing to come to New York City if he can get help with sales. He has a manufacturing system requiring no particular skills on the part of labor. Mr. Broido's aids will try to assist him too.

C. LEO DeORSEY

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] 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. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to know him was to love him. C. Leo DeOrsey was the kind of man that everyone needed as a friend. I know that my life has been richer, by knowing him, and I know that there are many who will miss him.

I did not know Leo DeOrsey in a business way; I knew him only as a friend and the kind of man who endeavored to befriend everyone he met. His gratuitous work with the seven original astronauts of this country was indicative of the very nature of this man.

I wish that I could have known him a lot better and associated with him more as he brought joy to those who did. He will be greatly missed, Mr. Speaker, in sport circles and legal circles, but his memory will live for a long time in the hearts of many.

A CONGRESSMAN'S WORKLOAD

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] 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. DENT. Mr. Speaker, years ago Abraham Lincoln, in an effort to still the conflicting voices of those among his constituents who wanted both his appearance at every local function as well as his attendance to the duties of his office, made the following observation:

If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

It has ever been thus and will continue to be so, especially so during these days when our Federal Government has laws affecting the daily lives of our people, our every aspect of national life: labor, management, industry, marketing, education, relief, retirement, job training, antipoverty, Appalachia, and clean streams, flood control, and almost every phase of every minute of our daily existence.

There seems to be some confusion on the part of some of our people as to the amount of work a Congressman does.

For the record I would like to give this week's schedule insofar as I personally have my calendar marked. Following is this week's House Calendar of legislative proposals before the membership:

Monday: Consent Calendar, suspensions, seven bills:

H.R. 908, Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho.

H.R. 500, providing for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr.

H.R. 6926, improvement and modernization of Government employees' life insurance program.

H.R. 5640, jury commissions for U.S. district courts.

H.R. 5167, amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5184, for the relief of the port of Portland, Oreg.

H.R. 5283, inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court of the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska.

H.R. 2986, Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965. Open rule—2 hours debate.

Tuesday: Private Calendar:

H.R. ——, 1966 appropriations, Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

H.R. 2985, Community Mental Health Centers Act Amendments of 1965. Open rule—3 hours' debate, making the committee substitute in order to be considered.

H.R. 5401, Interstate Commerce Act amendments. Open rule—3 hours' debate, making the committee substitute in order to be considered.

Wednesday: H.R. 7657, authorizing defense procurement and research and development.

Thursday: H.R. 7717, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Friday and balance of week: H.R. 2984, Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965. Open rule—3 hours' debate, making the committee substitute in order to be considered.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Aside from and added to the above schedule, I have a committee meeting of my Select Subcommittee on Education Tuesday and Wednesday, a meeting with my committee staff and Congressman

ROOSEVELT's committee on pensions and welfare benefits for employees of unions and management associations.

On Thursday, we have a subcommittee meeting on the poverty bill and on Friday an executive meeting of the full committee to write up the poverty bill.

Wednesday morning at 11 I appear before the Rules Committee in behalf of my small mine safety bill which I hope to pass after years of trying.

Also on Wednesday, my labor subcommitteee goes before Rules in behalf of the joint promotion bill for building trades and contractors.

In between bills on the floor and hearings, I have to squeeze in visits and interviews with constituents, representatives of the many organizations interested in special or specific bills before our committee or the House.

This is about the same, week in and week out, with a rare occasion when we can get away from Washington on special problems that have to be investigated before legislation is offered for a House vote.

Probably the greatest drain on time and the health of the Members are the "special events" schedules that cause the Members to spend so much of their time attending the many and conflicting dinners, luncheons, breakfasts, forums, conferences, and so forth.

Most of us have to take our mail home to read and answer at night, in the morning before going to the office, and on weekends.

For the RECORD, I would like to give the list of special events for this week, many of which are at the same time many blocks apart and absolutely impossible to attend.

SIGNIFICANT NEWS EVENTS SCHEDULED FOR THE WEEK MAY 3 THROUGH MAY 10, 1965

MONDAY

Top administration leaders speak at 2-day meeting of Civil Service Commission field managers, Civil Service Commission offices, 19th and E Streets NW., 8:30 a.m. Monday speakers include Vice President HUMPHREY, Budget Director Gordon, Poverty Director Shriver, Education Commissioner Keppel and Civil Service Chairman Macy.

First patients move into the new veterans hospital.

Members of the American Trial Lawyers Association admitted to practice at Supreme Court session, 9 a.m.

Supreme Court meets for decisions, 10 a.m.

National Conference of State Executives on Aging continues, Shoreham, 9 a.m. Morning speakers include HEW Secretary Celebrezze, Assistant Secretary Wilbur Cohen, and Donald Kent, Director of the Office of Aging. Charles I. Schottland of Brandeis University speaks at 1:30 p.m. followed by afternoon and evening clinics.

Four-day conference of the AFL–CIO Building and Construction Trades Department opens at the Washington Hilton:

At 10: Addresses by AFL–CIO President Meany, Speaker MCCORMACK, Labor Secretary Wirtz, House GOP Leader FORD and Senator KUCHEL.

At 2:15: Addresses by Vice President HUMPHREY, Senator MCNAMARA, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Senator JAVITS and Representative FRANK THOMPSON.

Federal Trade Commission opens hearings on gasoline marketing practices, 532 FTC Building, Seventh and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., 10 a.m.

Three-day meeting of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association opens at the Shoreham, 10 a.m.

Monday schedule includes noon luncheon address by Agriculture Secretary Freeman and 2 p.m. panel on dealing with Congress and Federal administration agencies by Members of Congress.

Air Force chiefs arrived for Inter-American Air Force Chiefs Conference, Andrews AFB, 3:40 p.m. Headquarters are at the Shoreham and State Department.

President Robert Gerholz of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce guest on Westinghouse "Washington Viewpoint" broadcast.

Artists from the Metropolitan Opera National Company presented to the President's Cabinet in informal program, State Department Auditorium, 8:30 p.m.

Pennsylvania's Democratic State Committee sponsors the first Democratic victory gala ever to be held in their State in the Hershey Sports Arena, at Hershey, Pa., at 8 p.m., e.d.t. Guests include Pennsylvania's delegation of Democratic Congressmen and their wives, State senate and house members, and two new fiscal officers—Auditor General Grace M. Sloan and State Treasurer Thomas Z. Minehart.

The 113-member Pennsylvania Democratic State Committee meets to review a heavy party program, including plans for the 1966 campaigns, in Harrisburg at 10 a.m., e.d.t.

Woman's National Democratic Club annual meeting schedule:

11:30: Memorial service and laying of wreath honoring President Woodrow Wilson in Bethlehem Chapel of Washington National Chapel. Memorial tribute by club president, Mrs. Irvin A. Hoff.

12:30: Luncheon at clubhouse.

1:30: Meeting and installation of incoming officers.

Attorney General Katzenbach addresses the opening session of the 3-day meeting of wardens of all Federal penal and correctional institutions at the Skyline Inn, South Capitol and I Streets, at 9 a.m.

House Ways and Means Committee opens 2 days of hearings on proposed cut in duty-free imports of tourists.

Senate Finance Committee continues on health care legislation.

House Government Operations Subcommittee meets on Public Health Service.

TUESDAY

President Johnson may meet with Democratic congressional leaders.

Vice President HUMPHREY addresses dinner session of the National Conference of State Executives on Aging, sponsored by Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Aging, at the Shoreham, 7 p.m.

Four-day meeting of the League of Women Voters opens at the State Department; Sargent Shriver speaks at opening session.

Senators RUSSELL LONG and EVERETT DIRKSEN speak at Shoreham convention of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Members of Congress guests at National Press Club special cocktail buffet.

House Judiciary Committee resumes on voting rights bill.

Senate Banking Subcommittee continues on public works and economic development act.

Senate Republican policy committee meets.

House Foreign Affairs Committee expected to report foreign aid bill.

House Government Operations Subcommittee resumes on drug safety.

House Commerce Committee meets on cigarette labeling.

House Rules Committee considers armed services procurement, and coffee bills.

Commerce Deputy Secretary Eugene Braderman addresses University of Arizona Foreign Trade Seminar; Tempe, Ariz.

Commerce Assistant Secretary J. Herbert Hollomon speaks before Boston Patent Law Association; Boston, Mass.

Dr. Dale Jenkins of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration addresses the biological sciences group of the Special Libraries Association; National Academy of Sciences, 6 p.m.

WEDNESDAY

President and Mrs. Johnson entertain the diplomatic corps at White House reception.

Administration officials brief meeting of approximately 200 mayors from medium-sized cities.

Gen. Paul McConnell, Air Force Chief of Staff, speaks at National Press Club lunch.

Four-day meeting of college-age Republicans (National Student Leadership Seminar) opens at the Sheraton Park.

Members of the District of Columbia League of Republican Women hold election-luncheon at the Mayflower.

Special showing of the late Chester Dale's collection of paintings held at the National Art Gallery.

Three-day electronic components conference opens at the Marriott Twin Bridges Hotel.

Senate Judiciary Subcommittee considers nomination of Fred Vinson, Jr., to be Assistant Attorney General, and Don Young to be Ohio judge.

House Rules Committee considers NASA authorization and coal mine safety bills.

HHFA Commissioner William Slayton addresses American Public Power convention; Los Angeles, Calif.

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall speaks at North American Fisheries conference; Washington, D.C.

Commerce Coordinator Daniel Goldy addresses council on trade; Durham, N.C.

HHFA Commissioner Philip N. Brownstein addresses Texas Mortgage Bankers Association convention; Corpus Christi, Tex.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, addresses luncheon meeting of the National Conference of State Executives on Aging, at the Shoreham.

THURSDAY

Two-day meeting of the Business Council opens at the Mayflower.

Labor Department issues preliminary figures on April employment.

Ceremonies for presentation of AAA School Safety Patrol decorations to 13 youngsters.

Delegates attending meeting of the National League of Women Voters meet with Members of Congress.

Senators MORTON, SCOTT, CARLSON, and DOMINICK among speakers at the GOP Student Leadership Seminar.

Two-day briefing session of the Federal Bar Association on U.S. taxation of foreign income opens at the Shoreham.

National Planning Association holds 12:30 p.m. luncheon news conference on the dollar cost of our national goals at the Madison.

Commerce Administrator Nick Johnson addresses American Society of Mechanical Engineers banquet; New London, Conn.

Agriculture Administrator Norman Clapp speaks before North Arkansas Electric Co-op; Chicago, Ill.

HEW Under Secretary Ivan Nestingen is guest speaker at Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society anniversary ceremonies; Buffalo, N.Y.

Commerce Under Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., addresses American Women in radio–TV; New York City.

Assistant Postmaster General Richard Murphy addresses Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner; York, Pa.

Majority Whip RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, discusses the tax program of the 89th Congress at the Woman's National Democratic Club luncheon, 1526 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 12:15 p.m.

FRIDAY

More than 200 survivors of Nazi concentration camps open 2-day meeting on the 20th anniversary of V-E Day.

Two-day Middle East Institute Conference on "The United Nations and the Middle East" opens at Georgetown University.

Mrs. Johnson flies to New York to participate in a "Salute of Spring Planting" ceremony at the New York Public Library.

Governor Romney and Senator JAVITS among speakers at GOP Student Leadership Seminar.

Assistant Postmaster Richard Murphy addresses convention of National Association of Letter Carriers, Trinidad, Colo.

Commerce Assistant Secretary J. Herbert Holomon speaks at Cornell University; Ithaca, N.Y.

HHFA Commissioner William Slayton speaks at seminar on urban renewal; New York City.

SATURDAY

District of Columbia area military installations hold open house in observance of Armed Forces Week.

Twenty-five thousand safety patrol boys and girls march down Constitution Avenue.

Representative GERALD FORD speaks at closing session of GOP Student Leadership Seminar.

Commerce Secretary Joann Connor addresses Business Council dinner; Hot Springs, Va.

HEW Under Secretary Ivan Nestingen addresses Democratic fund raising dinner; Hillsville, Va.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, is keynote speaker at annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner; Presidential Arms, 1320 G Street NW.

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, receives the 1965 citation of the advisory board of the Patridge School and Rehabilitation Center at its annual open house at Gainesville, Va., between 2–4 p.m., for his legislative leadership in medicine, health, and education.

SUNDAY, MAY 9

Mother's Day.

Frankly, many of us who have full schedules simply can't attend and therefore leave it to the organizations, etc., to understand.

Even this list doesn't include small gatherings of smaller groups at the homes of Members, Government officials, and foreign embassies.

Frankly, Washington could easily qualify for occupational hazard insurance for overeating, overdrinking, heart attacks, nervous breakdowns, and above all, frustration, short tempers, doubletalk, and alibis.

While this is going on, don't forget the thousands of letters from folks from everywhere in and outside of a Member's district who believe in "writing the Congressman" on everything from medicare to Vietnam, streets and sewers, bank loans, Government contracts, school loans, and on and on.

One thinks of Lincoln and finds that as long as he tries, his friends understand without explanation, and his opponents never pay attention to facts because their minds are already made up.

One thing you can be sure of—there's never a dull moment for a Congressman who has to campaign every second year.

DANTE ALIGHIERI—POET OF VISION

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] 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. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the middle of May—the exact date is not known—is the birthday of Dante Alighieri. In order to commemorate the contributions he has made to the arts and to literature, the Postmaster General of the United States has designated a stamp in his honor. The stamp will go on sale in post offices throughout America on July 17. It was designed by Douglas Gorsline, New York City artist who also designed last year's Shakespeare commemorative stamp. Gorsline's design simulates the style of early Florentine allegorical paintings. For his likeness of Dante, the artist turned to the painting of an unknown 16th century artist which hangs in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Dante is shown wearing the laurel wreath symbolic of poetry. Above him an angel unfurls a banner on which is inscribed "700th Anniversary." Lower left are flames, an allegorical reference to hell, which the poet visited in his poem, "The Divine Comedy."

It is my pleasure to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, April 25, 1965. The editorial follows:

POET OF VISION

About the middle of May 1265, in the city of Florence, Dante Alighieri was born, and now, 700 years later, all the world is celebrating the anniversary of his birth. Recently the Catholic University of Washington held a series of lectures and a symposium as "Homage to Dante." On May 1, the Library of Congress will hold another symposium. Before the year is out, colleges and universities throughout the world will pay their tribute to a poet who wrote with vision and wisdom for all men and for all time. Dante is as universal a poet as Shakespeare.

Literate people everywhere know Dante's great poem the "Commedia," which by the 16th century had already attained such fame that men rechristened it "Commedia Divina." It has been called a summation of the learning of the Middle Ages, but it is more than that, for Dante's poem is not a fossil from the past but a vital work with beauty and wisdom for us today.

The author was no cloistered recluse believing in art for art's sake, no long-haired escapee from contemporary problems, no poseur who wrapped the profession of poet around him like a cloak. Dante was a participant in the political affairs of his time, and he suffered for his beliefs and actions. In a turn of fortune's wheel, Dante's political faction lost power in Florence and the city exiled him on pain of death. Henceforth Dante was obliged to wander from city to city in Italy, but he continued to combine his literary labors with political debate and action.

Dante dreamed of a united Italy without warring factions, of a whole world of peace and harmony ruled by law. His vision of united nations contemplated a rule of justice under the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. But Dante's dream vanished with the death of the Emperor Henry VII, and peace has remained an illusory hope that poets and others must continue to cherish.

"The Divine Comedy" is not an easy poem to read, for it is filled with learned allusions, historical facts, and theological and philosophical commentary, besides depths of allegorical meaning. Yet Dante is never obscure for obscurity's sake. Unlike third-rate poetasters, he does not have to hide a poverty of ideas under a mulch of verbiage.

Dante reserves his greatest scorn for fugitives from responsibility, the "lukewarm" who decline to participate in anything. For them he made a dreary place in the vestibule of hell, for hell itself would not have them. There—

"United in a tumult, whirling on
Forever through the air of timeless gloom,
Like sand and borne onward by the circling wind"

those too cowardly to commit themselves even to evil must spend eternity. They are those "Who lived with neither infamy nor praise." In our world, when so many fearful or cynical souls spend their time in negativism, we might turn back to Dante for robust wisdom—and for a vision of the condign punishment designed for do-nothings.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS: OUR CONTINUING COMMITMENT

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. speaker, while nearly all of us, as American citizens, live in hope that all peoples in all nations will one day be free, even at the cost of revolution against tyranny, we all to often find ourselves rooting for an underdog who has already been corrupted by the greatest tyranny in the world today—communism.

The headlines of this past weekend have told a tragic story of a bloody, confused, and entangled revolt in the Dominican Republic. At first, before the facts had been gathered, it might have seemed almost like a replay of a dozen other coups which have clouded the history of the Caribbean and Latin America in general.

The facts have shown otherwise.

The young army generals, loyal to Juan Bosch, were swept from control of the rebelling elements. Today, it seems clear, the continued harassment and the sporadic outbreaks that have sabotaged all our early efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement are the work of skilled, Communist-trained insurgents.

Much has been written and said about this Nation's decision to intervene in the Dominican fighting. It has been condemned by those who say we have no business on the island at all. It has been praised by those who would have us carry our own role even further, becoming not only a protector and a persuader but an active combatant for the soul of the island and its people.

There is a middle ground in this debate, a ground upon which true patriotism and true reason can commune.

That ground is the foundation of America's role in all conflicts where the liberty and free will of a people are threatened—not just in those conflicts in which American property or citizens are threatened.

The commitment we have here is allied to our commitment in Europe and the Pacific in World War II, in Korea in the 1950's, in Vietnam this year and for nearly a decade past.

Our only alternative is to close up shop as an international power, to seal ourselves off from the world and its unfortunate problems, to cast aside the mantle of leadership handed down to us by those generations who, without total

understanding of the greatness of their own role, were willing to fight to preserve this Nation and its strength.

What we have done in the Dominican Republic is a renewal of a pledge—a pledge to ourselves, our children and to those who live, as we do, in the prayerful faith that peace can, indeed, be made a reality.

No one, it seems to me, has summed up the case for our Dominican intervention better than the brilliant columnist and reporter, Charles Bartlett, whose comments on this issue appeared in last night's Washington Evening Star.

I consider it a privilege to call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Bartlett's column and insert it as part of these proceedings:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 4, 1965]

THE CASE FOR DOMINICAN ACTION

(By Charles Bartlett)

Much of the liberal instinct to protest the American intervention in the Dominican Republic is being stifled by an awareness that President Johnson had no sound alternatives to the course he has followed.

The authentic leading South American liberals are largely silent in the chorus of protest. Johnson has taken great pains to make them understand that on the evening of April 27, the Dominican Republic was a power vacuum in which many lives were imperiled and many efficient, purposeful, and guerrilla-trained Communists were at work.

One proof of this vacuum will be found in the efforts of the coming days to piece together new leadership for the country. Even after the dust settles, this necessary leadership will be hard to find. An almost total lack of the caliber of men who make leaders is one tragic consequence of 31 years of brutal dictatorship.

Charges that the United States has resisted the return of Juan Bosch, the poet liberal whose incompetence as an administrator permitted his deposition in 1962, are unfounded. Bosch himself, through timidity or indecision, chose to stay in Puerto Rico instead of asserting himself in the chaos that his followers had created. His failure to take command will not strengthen his cause in the new era.

The Dominican generals, including Elias Wessin y Wessin, proved in the testing moments to have the clay feet of men who matured in a corrupt society. Since none of them rose to the occasion, some suspect the Dominicans may turn toward Joaquin Balaguer, the old man who remained as President immediately after the Trujillo assassination in 1961. He represents a compromise between the new taste for democracy and the old reliance on authority.

If there was no leader in Santa Domingo to whom Johnson could look confidently on the evening of April 27, there were several on whom he could look with concern. The postmortem debate on whether the Communists could have captured the Government if the Marines had not landed has already begun. Fortunately the intelligence readings were excellent and they indicated in advance that the potential was there.

The ominous Communist asset was the training in guerrilla tactics that had been imparted in Cuba to at least 18 of the insurgents. In the fluid situation which prevailed in Santo Domingo, these paramilitary experts, led by a resourceful Spanish Communist named Manuel Gonzalez Gonzalez, had a splendid chance to prevail.

Criticisms of Johnson for resorting to gunboat diplomacy in these circumstances must be weighed against the private laments of many South American liberals in 1961 that President Kennedy did not snatch triumph from disaster at the Bay of Pigs by dispatching American soldiers to finish off Fidel Castro. Critics also must ponder the presumption of responsible Venezuelans and Bolivians that American troops will arrive, if all other hope is lost in chaos, to save their governments from the Communists.

The criticisms must be further weighted against the gratitude of Juan Bosch in mid-November of 1961 after American naval forces frustrated the return to the Dominican Republic of the wicked Trujillo uncles. Bosch hailed this fleet intervention, which stopped just short of Marine landings, as an act "that could save many lives and many troubles in the near future."

The little-known record of this country's dogged efforts since 1961 to implant democracy in the barren Dominican soil is one pledge of Washington's virtuous intentions. From the moment that Trujillo was killed, leading Dominicans have leaned heavily upon American guidance in the tricky transition from dictatorship. All the leverage of Washington's good offices has been applied to encourage constitutional government.

The break with the habits and attitudes of 31 years does not come easily. Henry Wells, a political scientist who helped to construct the machinery for the 1962 election, observed after the voting of a Dominican official that everything had gone smoothly. "These people are very well disciplined," the man responded.

The future will be no easier than the past in the Dominican Republic. One American policymaker said the decision to send Marines into Santo Domingo was "like arresting your mother." As the Communists try to make the most of the tender days ahead, this country's composure will rest upon its case that the decision was unavoidable.

BARING BILL TO REPEAL RETAILERS AND COMMUNICATIONS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] 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. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills for the repeal of the Federal retailers excise taxes and the excise tax on amounts paid for communication service.

The President, in his state of the Union message made reference to a cut in excise taxes. In this regard I am in complete agreement with the President.

The retailers excise taxes were adopted in 1941 as an emergency tax during World War II. To continue this tax I feel inflicts irreparable damage to many small retailers and manufacturers.

Furthermore, the present retail excise tax structure is incongruous with our national tax philosophy. These levies are regressive, working the greatest hardship on those least able to pay, namely, those in the low income brackets.

In the case of the excise taxes on communications, we levied our first national excise tax on long distance telephone calls in 1932. The tax was extended and increased during World War II when such taxation served a dual purpose of producing revenue and reducing the load on our heavily burdened communications network.

Thirty-five years ago the telephone was perhaps a luxury. In most areas of our Nation, those were the days of the party line. Quite obviously, this is no longer true. Consumer savings on phone bills would pour new money into our economy.

No other utility service in the American home is taxed in this manner by the Federal Government. It is time we recognized a simple truth the American businessman and the consumer he serves have known for a long time, namely, that the telephone is not a luxury and should no longer be treated that way.

FIESTA SAN ANTONIO, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, 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 SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the most unique annual festival of any in America, in my opinion, is the Fiesta San Antonio, held each year in my hometown of San Antonio. The weeklong series of parades, galas, and festivities is widely celebrated as the most beautiful, joyous, and spectacular of its kind. It includes the "Battle of Flowers," a parade of floats decorated by flowers which is indescribably magnificent and which is a worthy herald of the new spring season. The Fiesta Flambeau is a spectacular night parade and is undoubtedly the greatest illuminated parade in the world.

Fiesta San Antonio is a wonderful example of the blended Latin and Anglo cultures which has been accomplished in the Alamo City. The city itself is situated on the ancient Camino Real, the Kings Highway, which existed before Texas was a sovereign Republic or a State.

The fiesta begins each year with the traditional and historic pilgrimage to the Alamo where ceremonies are conducted formally opening the week of festivities. This year, Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier, commanding general, 4th U.S. Army, delivered the pilgrimage address. With unanimous consent I am inserting this patriotic and inspiring speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PILGRIMAGE ADDRESS AT THE ALAMO, APRIL 19, 1965, LT. GEN. ROBERT W. COLGLAZIER, JR., U.S. ARMY, COMMANDING GENERAL, 4TH U.S. ARMY

It has been many years since my initial participation in San Antonio's fiesta. Even before that I became imbued with the sincerest respect and deep reverence which all Texans have for this, their most historic shrine.

The details of the great drama which unfolded at the Alamo, and the worldwide significance of absolute heroism displayed here in 1836, have remained ingrained in my memory. Who, having been here once, could ever forget?

Thus, it is a great personal honor to have been selected to make this traditional address, and to join with you again in paying tribute to those heroes who fell here and to the equally heroic Texans at San Jacinto who vindicated the sacrifices made at the Alamo.

Those assembled at the Alamo on that fateful day nearly 130 years ago came from many widely scattered areas of the world. Most of them were from States of the Union, but many came from foreign lands. They joined with the Texans in one of the world's greatest recorded efforts to win and preserve freedom. All—all of them—native and adopted Texan alike—showed the world they preferred a valiant death to the ignominy of oppression and tyranny.

Col. William B. Travis addressed to the people of Texas, and to all Americans, what has been called "the most heroic document in American history."

He wrote, in part: "I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours, and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken.

"I have answered the demand with a cannon shot and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender or retreat. I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible, and die like a soldier, who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country. Victory or death."

Today, this struggle against oppression and tyranny is still being waged by men who are willing to make the supreme sacrifice to insure that freedom will live and progress through future years.

In keeping with that gathering, over a century ago, of heroic fighting men, valiant Texans of today are joined with other guardians of freedom throughout the world—on the alert, with weapons at the ready. They are prepared to continue the struggle against despotism whenever and wherever called upon to do so.

Indeed, these Texans are laying their lives on the line in one remote, but very important area of the world—the Republic of Vietnam. Some have made the ultimate sacrifice in the battle against oppression there. It has been my sad but proud responsibility, in less than 1 year since assuming command of the 4th U.S. Army, to present a number of medals to families whose heroic husbands and sons have died in the steaming jungles or the marshy rice fields of that faraway Asian country. These sons of Texas echo, by deeds, Colonel Travis' determination never to surrender or retreat.

This determination to resist, to die for our country, for our ideals, and for our honor is the "spirit of the Alamo." And this spirit of dedication and determination never has faltered. Your husbands, sons and brothers displayed it in the fighting of World War II at Salerno, Guadalcanal, the Rapido River and in Normandy—and on Pork Chop Hill and the Pusan Perimeter in Korea as well as countless other battles since the siege of the Alamo.

The "spirit of the Alamo" cannot be attained by decree; it cannot be ordained. It is not easy to achieve. It requires love of country, love of freedom, love of honor and courage; the willingness to suffer, the willingness to sacrifice, the willingness to die so that others may live in a society which has the freedom to determine its own destiny.

Without the "spirit of Alamo" our country could have perished long ago. And today this spirit is undergoing one of its greatest challenges.

So I say we can take pride in being Texans and in honoring our fellow Texans today—those who shed their life's blood within these hallowed walls in 1836—and who are now shedding their blood thousands of miles from home. Typical of Texas, they also are typical of America. They are willing to suffer hardship, danger, even death itself—that freedom shall be won, protected, and advanced. They believe in making those sacrifices, to the end that the world will be led into an era in which no man need fear, or suffer, tyranny—either from his own or a foreign government.

They "remember the Alamo."

ISRAEL'S DAY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] 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. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to pay tribute to a small but courageous nation of the Middle East—Israel—a young nation which is celebrating its 17th year of existence.

The new Zionist State, the Republic of Israel, was proclaimed May 14, 1948, as the British evacuated Palestine. Immediately after this proclamation was made, the first de facto recognition of this new nation was made by the United States through the then President, Harry S. Truman.

Historic Palestine was the home of the Jewish people from 1200 B.C. until conquered by the Romans in A.D. 70 and expelled after A.D. 137. The modern Zionist movement for a homeland in Palestine, led by Dr. Chaim Weizmann caused the cabinet of Great Britain to give its support in the Balfour Declaration, November 2, 1917. Under the Palestine Mandate, about four-fifths of historic Palestine was detached in 1922 to form Trans-Jordan, now the kingdom of Jordan. When the Nazi persecutions began in Germany, great numbers of Jews set out for Palestine. The U.N. General Assembly voted November 29, 1947, to partition Palestine into two independent states by October 1948, the Jewish and Arab nations.

A separate enclave of Jerusalem was to be administered by a governor appointed by the U.N. British troops were to be withdrawn and the separate governments elected. On May 15, 1948, the British departed from Jerusalem, and the Republic of Israel was born with Israel taking charge of the new city in Jerusalem and the Jordanians holding the old city.

Israel, a parliamentary democracy, is a flourishing country thanks to the hard work of the Israelis and to the generous public and private assistance from the United States.

Where once there were barren deserts, there is now prospering farmland. Since 1955 the total cultivated area has been increased from 412,000 to more than 1 million acres, of which 350,000 are under irrigation. Citrus fruit is the most valuable agricultural product, and the other principal crops include wheat, barley, olives, figs, tomatoes, bananas, cotton, melons, grapes.

Israel possesses a vast amount of mineral resources among which are limestone, sandstone, gypsum, copper, iron, phosphate deposits, natural gas, and potash. These are being exploited to the fullest extent in order to maintain the economy of this young country.

Israel's overall economy has grown rapidly since 1954 and industrialization is proceeding at a rapid rate.

A great part of the development of Israel can be attributed to the nation's educational system. The country has compulsory education from the ages 5 to 14, with 1 year of kindergarten and 8 years of elementary schooling. After elementary school, vocational training is provided in such subjects as carpentry, tool and die making, electronics, home economics, dressmaking, and secretarial work.

To maintain proper defense forces, Israel requires that men serve for a period of 2½ years and women 2 years in the armed forces. Its military equipment is of the most modern design, and its air force uses modern aircraft, mainly of French types.

Israel today, just like our own land of America, heralds the coming of a greater tomorrow. Her flag, two horizontal blue bands on a white field, with the Star of David composed of narrow blue bands in the center of this field, flies proudly among the banners of free and independent nations.

At this time, when outside influences wish to impose their rule upon many small nations, we should pay tribute to Israel as an enduring light among nations, a living symbol of the triumph of freedom that declares its belief in freedom and the brotherhood of man.

Our ties to this democracy have been close and we, here in America, can share in a little bit of glory of the Israelis who were given the opportunity to turn a bleak land into a fruitful garden.

There is no question, as these 17 past years have shown us, that this small nation has made remarkable strides forward. This 17th anniversary seems an appropriate time for the people of the United States to extend their heartiest congratulations to the people of Israel for the achievements they have attained in their short years of existence as an independent nation. I wish this young nation will continue to enjoy peace and find success in all its endeavors, and to grow and prosper as a democratic nation.

I join with my colleagues in saluting and congratulating this brave State of Israel and hope that the United States and other freedom-loving nations will give Israel every possible assistance in maintaining her rights as a sovereign nation. To this Israel is entitled. On this there can be no hesitancy or compromise.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM EXTENSION IS NECESSARY

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] 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. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the extension of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from Montgomery, Ala., to Panama City, Fla.

This proposal would correct an oversight in the planning of this magnificent transportation thoroughfare. It takes

only a glance at the overall plan for the interstate system to see that the entire fast growing area of northwest Florida has been neglected insofar as a north-south interestate highway. The area in the vicinity of Panama City, Fla., is experiencing tremendous growth and I feel that the highway traffic in this area more than justifies this move.

Traditionally the tourist from the west enters Florida in a few distinct areas, and the route we are speaking of is one of those. The interstate that I propose in this bill would follow generally the existing U.S. Highway 231.

It would lead the traveling public into one of the most storied and historic areas of Florida. It makes sense when you look at the map, for this one section is somewhat of a missing link in the overall picture. As now constituted, the interstate system eliminates this growing area with access north and south and this relatively short stretch would tie in compactly with the overall program.

It is my hope that this proposal will be given due consideration by the Congress. It is vital to the people of northwest Florida for their sound economic growth and an adequate avenue north and south between the Montgomery, Ala., and Panama City, Fla., areas.

THE NEW MEDICARE TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Califlornia. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 Representative YOUNGER, of California, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Post entitled "Payroll Tax Up—Medicare Could Slow Economy." The article itself refers to Treasury Secretary Fowler's first speech in office in which he urged that the excise tax bill be held within prudent limits. In his prefatory remarks, Mr. YOUNGER refers to Secretary Fowler's statement on medicare in his appearance on "Meet the Press" on March 25. The implication is that the Secretary's position on excises indicates fear of a possible depressive effect on the economy next year as a result of the medicare tax provisions.

Moreover, Mr. YOUNGER seems to have misinterpreted the Secretary's comments on medicare on "Meet the Press." To correct the RECORD, I would like to quote the colloquy that occurred on "Meet the Press" between Mr. Rowen and Secretary Fowler regarding the medicare tax:

Mr. ROWEN. Then beginning the first of next year, the economy is faced with a big increase in social security taxes which will take about $5 billion out of the economy at an annual rate. Do you think that there is any offsetting factor in the way of a tax or spending stimulus that we will need to counteract that?

Secretary FOWLER. Well, first I should like to say that I think the great gains that will be achieved for those who need the help in the medicare and related programs far outweigh any of the risks that might be entailed in the impact that you mention in the first part of next year. However, I do think that it behooves us all to watch closely this impact. I would hope that the passage of the excise tax measure that I have referred to would help meet that particular situation and that the on-going programs of increases in capital expenditures that have shown steadily that they are going beyond the targets forecast a year ago, would also be helpful.

AMERICANS MUST KEEP THE LINE ON PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during these critical days—while our Nation is involved with maintaining and executing its commitments to the world, American business, labor, and industry must also keep their commitment with the American people to keep the lines on prices. The fight against international aggressors must not distract attention from the mounting tide of pressures for indefensible price rises unrelated to need.

In the Wall Street Journal of yesterday—Tuesday, May 4—it was reported that major U.S. producers of copper increased their price by 2 cents a pound. The domestic price rise means an almost certain increase in the price of fabricated copper products. Every citizen of America will feel the impact of this price increase which results from tight supply and mounting demand—rather than increased production costs.

The same issue of the Wall Street Journal reported that the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. is increasing the cost of tires by 1 percent to 2½ percent. Although the price advances were ascribed to higher labor and material costs according to Mr. O. E. Miles, Goodyear executive vice president, it is extremely difficult to reconcile these price increases with the first quarter report of the company made public today. This report stated that sales and earnings in the first quarter of 1965 were the highest for any quarter in the company's history. Sales of $497 million were up 8 percent over the similar 1964 quarter. Net income was $22,173,000 or 62 cents a common share, compared with $19,974,000 or 56 cents per share. How then can Goodyear lead the tire producing industry into a round of price increases in the face of unprecedented earnings which increased by over 10 percent per share in the first 3 months of this year.

Yesterday the truck industry including General Motors, White, and the Mack Truck Co. also joined the scramble toward higher truck prices, up to 3 percent higher. The higher prices came at the same time that industry representatives were telling Congress that there would be no price increases if the excise taxes were reduced or eliminated on motor vehicles including trucks.

It thus appears that the business sector is taking advantage of the international crisis to push prices upward. These procedures are a disservice to the Nation—particularly in these critical times.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, for May 6 and 7, 1965, on account of official business to attend the Board of Visitors, Air Force Academy.

Mr. ASPINALL, for Friday, May 7, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COOLEY, for 60 minutes, on tomorrow, May 6, 1965, vacating his special order of today.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. BANDSTRA), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. BANDSTRA), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. BANDSTRA), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, May 6, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and 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. BENNETT his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. STRATTON his remarks today in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENNINGS and to include a speech made by Henry Fowler.

Mr. BROWN of California (at the request of Mr. BANDSTRA) to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on House Joint Resolution 447.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on House Joint Resolution 447 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BANDSTRA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. SWEENEY.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 6, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1054. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1055. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting correspondence relative to arrangements of procedure in connection with the requirements for an audit and submission of the annual financial report for fiscal year 1964 of the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1056. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of overpayments of rentals for automatic data processing machines, George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1057. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for the operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1058. A letter from the executive vice president, the American Society of International Law, transmitting a report of the annual audit of the American Society of International Law for the period April 1, 1964, to March 31, 1965, pursuant to section 9 of the act of September 20, 1950 (64 Stat. 869); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7597. A bill to establish the veterans reopened insurance fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725; with amendment (Rept. No. 285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriation. House Joint Resolution 447. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 225. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program; without amendment (Rept. No. 287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2414. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4421. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 290). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 1153. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; with amendment (Rept. No. 291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7717. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 292). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 7896. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 7897. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7898. A bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 7899. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage, and the like, and furs and fur-trimmed coats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7900. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 7901. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 7902. A bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 7903. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect of June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 7904. A bill to provide that amounts paid for music program service shall be exempt from the Federal excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7905. A bill to provide that commemorative stamps shall bear an inscription showing the year of issue; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7906. A bill to prohibit the use of mail covers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7907. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 7908. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway between Montgomery, Ala., and Panama City, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7909. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7910. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7911. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the deportation provisions thereof inapplicable to any alien admitted for permanent residence prior to his 14th birthday or to any alien who has continuously resided in the United States for 10 years immediately following his admission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7912. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7914. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7915. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of New Brunswick, N.J., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7916. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on polyethylene imine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7917. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 7918. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Missouri River between Bismarck, N. Dak. and Mobridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7919. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National

Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 7920. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to limit button blanks to crude forms suitable for manufacture into buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 7921. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 7922. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 7923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 7924. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7925. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 7926. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Division of Predator and Rodent Control from the Department of Interior to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 7927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7928. A bill to eliminate certain restrictions on the assignment of Government field personnel to duty in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7929. A bill to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 7930. A bill relating to payments for school construction in federally affected areas affected by proposed base closings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7931. A bill to provide for a more gradual reduction in payments to local educational agencies pursuant to Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as a result of the termination of Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7932. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for retirement on full annuity upon voluntary separation after 30 years of service or upon involuntary separation after 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7933. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7934. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway between Montgomery, Ala., and Panama City, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 447. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 448. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Res. 367. Resolution to stop the transfer of the Naval Training Devices Center at Sands Point, N.Y., pending an investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Res. 368. Resolution to stop the transfer of the Naval Training Devices Center at Sands Point, N.Y., pending an investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

245. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to legislation to insure the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

246. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the construction of a service road to Kalaupapa on Molokai Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 7935. A bill for the relief of Evangeline Keramidas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7936. A bill for the relief of Tsin-Shai Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7937. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselelectric Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 7938. A bill for the relief of Maria D'Ascola Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 7939. A bill for the relief of George M. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 7940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Grosz and her son Laszlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 7941. A bill for the relief of Peter K. Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 7942. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vasiliki Zaharias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7943. A bill for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 7944. A bill for the relief of Iskandar Habib Sleiman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7945. A bill for the relief of Higinio Jose del Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7946. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ruben Zabaleta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 7947. A bill for the relief of Spylios Zervogiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 7948. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tse Lee Mai Oy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Buy It, Fly It"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, May 1, the Fleet Reserve Association commenced their successful and commendable Operation Red, White, and Blue for the fifth year. The idea was first conceived by Parker J. Stahnke, FTC, U.S. Naval Fleet Reserve, a member of the La Mesa Branch 139, Fleet Reserve Association, in my congressional district. I believe that the significance of May 1 as their starting date is greater this year than ever before. May 1 is known as May Day. The international distress call for oceangoing vessels is also May Day. The celebration of the Communist world occurs May 1.

The flag I have had flown to present them was flown over the U.S. Capitol as a symbol of our determination to thwart the aims of aggression everywhere. I am hopeful that the Communists will find our May Day, devoted to creating greater respect for our flag, a "May Day" signal of distress for aggressors who futilely hope to divide and conquer the free world.

It is fitting and appropriate that we regularly observe Loyalty Day on May 1, as it gives us an opportunity to recall just what the history of our glorious flag has been and why it is important that we fly the flag, not only from public buildings but from private flagstaffs as well.

To me it is a source of pride that the people of San Diego County have purchased 250,000 flags. The Fleet Reserve's nonprofit program, I know, was largely responsible for stirring up inter-