

States of America, and ending Elwin T. Vanegas to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 10, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture preceding the prayer:

Ephesians 5: 8: Now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light.

Almighty God, as we turn to Thee in prayer, we beseech Thee that we may have the sincerity of a true faith and the fidelity of a loving spirit and be partners of the eternal Christ.

Grant that we may enter with Him in the joys that will cheer us and the trials that will teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Inspire us to yield our spirit eagerly to the guidance of Thy spirit that it may be touched to finer issues and trained for that higher service which always carries on faithfully and without fear or foreboding.

Help us to give a more far-reaching and wider expansion to the hopes of humanity, which our finite minds cannot explain and which are awed by a love and light which our hearts cannot fathom or comprehend.

Hear us in His name in whom Thy life and love were humanized that we might see Thy purpose and meaning. 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 bills of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;
- H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;
- H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;
- H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired;
- H.R. 3995. An act to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes;
- H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; and
- H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

- H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

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

- S. 125. An act for the relief of Armando S. Arguilles;
 - S. 133. An act for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.;
 - S. 313. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;
 - S. 402. An act for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty);
 - S. 409. An act for the relief of Betty Tinsang Chan Cho;
 - S. 442. An act for the relief of Carleen Coen;
 - S. 449. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialogowski;
 - S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;
 - S. 469. An act for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon;
 - S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution;
 - S. 579. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire;
 - S. 582. An act for the relief of Aleksandr Kaznacheev;
 - S. 584. An act for the relief of Ming Chup Chau;
 - S. 585. An act for the relief of Santiago Woo and Morjin Chee de Woo;
 - S. 586. An act for the relief of Maria Tsills;
 - S. 616. An act for the relief of Miss Choun Seem Kim;
 - S. 826. An act for the relief of Har Gobind Khorana;
 - S. 1039. An act for the relief of Andreina Viselli;
 - S. 1040. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Rafala Monarca;
 - S. 1064. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe;
 - S. 1084. An act for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang;
 - S. 1103. An act for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast;
 - S. 1104. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gezarian;
 - S. 1138. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson;
 - S. 1196. An act for the relief of Wright G. James;
 - S. 1197. An act for the relief of Angelino Martino;
 - S. 1209. An act for the relief of Specialist Manuel D. Racells;
 - S. 1388. An act for the relief of David Lee Bogue;
 - S. 1390. An act for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.;
 - S. 1405. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi;
 - S. 1468. An act for the relief of Dorothy Eyre;
 - S. 1498. An act for the relief of Nikolai Artamonov; and
 - S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiques of the Capitol, and for other purposes.
- The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:
- S. 339. An act to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Mon-

ument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that Senate Resolution 102, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965, transmitted to Congress by the President on March 25, 1965, failed in passage.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—"OVERSEAS PROGRAMS OF PRIVATE NONPROFIT AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 354, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 354

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs one thousand eight hundred additional copies of the report of that committee entitled "Overseas Programs of Private Nonprofit American Organizations."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. 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. 108]

Andrews,	Griffin	Resnick
George W.	Hagen, Calif.	Reuss
Ashbrook	Hanna	Roncallo
Bandstra	Harvey, Ind.	Rooney, N.Y.
Berry	Harvey, Mich.	Skubitz
Bonner	Hébert	Smith, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hungate	Springer
Burton, Calif.	Ichord	Stubbsfield
Carter	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Cheif	Macdonald	Toll
Clawson, Del	Martin, Ala.	Watts
Daddario	Martin, Mass.	Weltner
Dulski	Mathias	White, Idaho
Flynt	Pool	Willis
Gilligan	Powell	Wright
Green, Oreg.	Price	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7750, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through the first section of the bill ending on line 4, page 1. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART I

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this or any other Act to any foreign country which hereafter permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent, the damage or destruction by mob action of United States property within such country, should be terminated and should not be resumed until the President determines that appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence thereof."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 2, after "prevent" insert "personal injury to, unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life of United States citizens".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on reading this bill, I find on page 2 there is the provision that it is the sense of Congress that assistance to any foreign country shall terminate which hereafter permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent the damage or destruction of U.S. property within such country by mob action. The section further states that U.S. aid should not be resumed until the President determines appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence of certain acts against U.S. property. These acts, as the bill is now written, apply to damage or destruction by mob action of U.S. property, within that country. But the section does not protect the U.S. citizens themselves.

What my amendment does is this. It says that this section also will apply to the persons of U.S. citizens. This is how it applies to the persons. I put in the words "to prevent personal injury to, unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life, of U.S. citizens."

Therefore, the section will now read both as to the U.S. property damage as well as to the persons and rights of U.S. citizens. Under my amendment, the section will now read this way:

It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this or any other Act to any foreign country which hereafter permits, or

fails to take adequate measures to prevent personal injury to, unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life of United States citizens and the damage or destruction by mob action of United States property within such country, should be terminated and should not be resumed until the President determines that appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence thereof."

Now what often happens is this. Our U.S. citizens are detained without cause and they are imprisoned or held incommunicado. This has occurred many times. My amendment states that the President then can cancel aid or suspend the aid of a recipient country until the releases of detained U.S. citizens are made and until the President determines that proper measures have been taken by that country to protect the lives as well as property of U.S. citizens. I think Congress should provide for such cases that involve personal injury or unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life of U.S. citizens as well as provisions applying to damage to property. The lives, liberties, and security of U.S. citizens in every country wherever they might be, are certainly more important than damage to U.S. property, which certainly should be protected, too.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind concerning the intentions of the gentleman, in offering the amendment to the bill. His intentions are good. He is seeking to protect as many of our citizens and as much of our property as possible.

However, I fear the gentleman would go just a little too far, when he talks about cutting off aid for unlawful arrests and imprisonment. Who is to determine what is unlawful and what is not unlawful?

I do not believe it is our intention, in amending the original law, which provides that in the event of destruction of embassies or property of the United States the President should have the right to cut off aid, to go that far.

When it is said, in the event an individual is unlawfully arrested, aid will be cut off, that is going a little too far. In order to determine whether there is an unlawful arrest it is necessary to have a trial and to have appeals and so on. Heaven alone knows where one will wind up.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We have had many U.S. cases of our citizens being detained and arrested, and injured abroad. I can point out two specific cases recently of British citizens who were aircraft pilots. They were in two African countries. They were stoned. They were held incommunicado. The consuls and ambassadors were denied access to them, and there had been no trial.

If we are going to protect U.S. property and give a right to the President to determine whether aid shall be given, because of damage to property, how much

more important is it to protect U.S. citizens from false arrest, from imprisonment, and from being held incommunicado. One does not need a trial. The President will determine when this situation shall exist in each recipient country.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. It is basic and fundamental in this legislation that the President has the right at any time, whether we suggest it in a preamble or not. The President has a right to discontinue aid. He can do that at any time he pleases. That is inherent in the legislation.

When we stretch this too far, it seems to me perhaps we may not attain the end we seek to attain.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If it is the case that the President has the power to terminate aid anyhow, in any event, including actions with respect to property, why is there a provision only for property and not with respect to liberty and human life as well? If it is necessary to have a provision for property, of course it is necessary to have a provision with respect to human life and liberty, against unlawful detention of our U.S. citizens without access by our Ambassadors or consuls.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I do not wish to labor the question too long. There was a tremendous furor as a result of the destruction of the Embassy in Egypt. That was wrong. The same thing happened in Indonesia. That was wrong.

To overcome those situations, we inserted the language as a warning to the people who are beneficiaries of our aid that they had better be careful or otherwise they will lose our assistance.

When we extend this to a situation which might become very difficult to interpret, I feel we are touching dangerous ground. If our citizens are held incommunicado, after the diplomatic conversations—and it appears as though the government which is the recipient of our aid insists upon refusing to release those individuals, I believe we can do quite a good deal if we wish to. Things have been done heretofore in connection with situations of that type, even going beyond the refusal of aid.

I do not believe that situation has application here. I believe it would cause more harm than do good, although I can appreciate the intentions of the gentleman, which I consider to be highly appropriate.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the purpose of the provision is to give notice that if these countries permit damage to U.S. property, then aid will be terminated or suspended, do you not think it is just as wise that if our citizens are hurt, killed, or held incommunicado the same suspension of U.S. aid will be done?

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

Mr. Chairman, why do we have to write into any law the basic policy that we will

take action when a U.S. citizen is killed? There is no doubt on this point. This amendment was designed solely to protect American property overseas. It is an important amendment. The danger here is if we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we are going to change emphasis from the protection of property and confuse what we are talking about. We will never be complacent about the loss of life. The danger is that there is some complacency about destroying our property. This amendment, in my opinion, destroys the effectiveness of the provision in the bill, which is designed to protect our embassies against mob violence. The committee spent a long time on this amendment. It is the same amendment that is incorporated in the bill reported by the Senate and will meet no opposition in conference. The gentleman's amendment goes entirely too far, I think.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. Is it not true we have not had any particular problem except in certain isolated instances with respect to personnel?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] mentioned two British pilots who it turned out were not U.S. citizens. I do not know why we should be writing legislation on the floor of the House here to protect citizens of other countries.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not also true our own Government acted promptly, with dispatch and firmness, wherever we had a problem arising involving American citizens?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that the reason for this amendment in the bill dealing with property is because we have run across a well-organized plan in which the Communists are involved, and we are trying to advise recipient governments that they cannot tacitly or indirectly let Communists agitate and tear up American property and still expect to get some aid under this bill. That is the purpose of this amendment, is it not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, it is.

Mr. FASCELL. And that is the difference between trying to protect property and American life.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If we are giving the Communists notice that the aid might be terminated if they tear up property, how much better would it be to give the notice likewise that if they damage or injure our citizens and imprison them or hold them incommunicado or if they cause the loss of life of U.S. citizens, then we give them notice also that the aid may be terminated. I feel if you do it just on property, it leaves

out the matter of human life. I might say to you I want prompt action on both the matter of lives and property, and if we are going to say it with respect to property, we should most certainly say it with respect to U.S. life as well.

Mr. MORGAN. Again I say to the gentleman—why do we have to write it into this bill? The President certainly has the authority, the desire, and the determination to protect any American life.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 2—Development assistance

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 8, insert the following:

"Title I—Development Loan Fund

"SEC. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development loans, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 202(a) by striking out "and \$1,500,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years, which sums shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year: *Provided further*," and substitute the following: "\$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, and \$649,292,000 for the fiscal year 1966, which sums shall remain available until expended: *Provided*""

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to existing law which, if adopted, would reduce the amount of this authorization bill by \$130,958,000; essentially a reduction of \$131 million in the Development Loan Fund. It may properly be asked how I arrived at that figure. The figure of \$130,958,000 is the total amount expected to be in the pipeline, as of June 30 of this year, for the following countries: United Arab Republic, Haiti, Cambodia, Indonesia, Algeria, Ghana, and Congo—Brazzaville.

I say that if you take the amount expected to be in the pipeline at the end of this fiscal year for each of those countries and total them you reach a figure just short of \$131 million which my amendment would take from the Development Loan Fund.

Not all of this pipeline money, not all of the money expected to be in the pipeline is development loan money. Over \$100 million is. The rest of it is in certain other funds, such as supporting assistance, contingency fund, and other programs.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to make any reduction in the dollar value of this bill, if we are to say to certain countries which have repeatedly flaunted us and

our assistance that we do not like that, that we resent their attitudes, then here is the way to do it.

Let me read to the Committee a copy of a letter that was printed in Time magazine dated May 21. It is signed Norodom Sihanouk, Chief of State, Phnom Penh, Cambodia. I shall read that letter published in Time magazine.

SIR: As an anti-American, I thank you for your rotten article devoted to my person in your issue of May 7. Your insult to a head of state and your odious lies dishonor not only your magazine but also your nation.

I assure you that I would much prefer to die from the blows of the Communists (who are certainly hostile to royalty, but who have no contempt for us) than capitulate before you, who symbolize the worst in humanity; i.e., racism, discrimination, injustice, death, and lies.

(Signed) NORODOM SIHANOUK,

Chief of State, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

Cambodia is one of the countries that would be affected if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, programs for certain of these countries are to be funded under this year's authorization bill. The President does have certain elasticity. Of course, he also has the contingency fund.

Mr. Chairman, all I hope to do through my amendment is to cut off the pipeline.

Mr. Chairman, I must point out to the Members of the Committee that that is my intent, but we cannot be certain that by naming countries specifically they will be denied loans under this Development Loan Fund. I am predicating it upon the basis that the Development Loan Fund is one sum of money. Even if we adopt this amendment, I must say in candor to the Members of the Committee that while I speak as I do, and others may speak as they do, the administration is not bound to cut it from these countries I have named.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if we use this yardstick in recommending the reduction in dollars, which we do, that the administration would respect what we are trying to do and would act accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, some might say that certain portions of this have already been earmarked, and that is also true. But, against some of those earmarkings there has been little disbursement or there has been very little action of any kind in some cases since 1963 and in many cases since 1962. In one instance, one portion of this deals with an allocation of \$55 million for a smelter which, in all probability, will never be financed under the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. Chairman, my point is that we can indicate our strong feelings with respect to those nations that turn from us and in the direction of communism, or turn from us and in the direction of

other great powers. We can indicate that we strongly disapprove of that. We can reduce the dollar amount of this bill by almost \$131 million and, at the same time for those who favor the legislation, it would not be a blow which would completely wipe it out.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman from Indiana has mentioned a \$55 million loan that we made for a smelter. I presume he is referring to the loan agreement with Ghana.

Is it not true that this loan was only dated June 1962, just over two years ago, and is a 50-percent matching loan undertaken with the Export-Import Bank for a \$110 million smelter, and that payments thereon were not to begin until January 1965?

Mr. ADAIR. But the point is that the funds have not been drawn against, or if they have been, they have been drawn against in a very small amount. My assumption is, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that I personally doubt that that smelter is ever built; at least, built under these financing arrangements.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, payments under the Export-Import Bank part of the loan have started in January of this year. Is it not also true that the loan cannot be drawn down until the product is finished and until it is delivered?

Mr. ADAIR. Drawing against loan is contingent upon the agreement under which the loan is made. There are different types of loan agreements and they specify when the drawings may be made.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, payment is made upon delivery is it not?

Mr. ADAIR. In some cases that is correct; in others, before.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The whole basis of the development loan was an agreement reached by this House as an answer to the feeling against backdoor spending some 4 years ago. As a result of our rejecting that type of financing, this authorization, this 5-year authorization, was entered into and agreed to by both sides.

This particular section we are now talking about, the development loan section, terminates this year, and while it is true there have been some abuses, and there have been some changes today and since 4 years ago, nevertheless the agreements that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] refers to are agreements that are in the pipeline as a result of contracts entered into several years ago. There is no assistance in this year's program to Cambodia. If we have heard objection to this type of financing, the committee can make our objections effective at the next go-around of the bill. However, since this has been entered into it does involve long-range commitments. These commitments were conditioned upon the fact that we did not need backdoor spending.

I might say that the people on this side and people on that side of the aisle objected to backdoor spending 4 years ago. This agreement is running out, and I think it would be inequitable and wrong for us to terminate or go back on our word in the last year of the authorization which this body advocated.

It may well be that we should take the action that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] mentioned, and I concur with him and agree with him on the item of Cambodia; but the fact of the matter is this House has given its word and its authorization that we would see these agreements through. The so-called pipeline involves agreements and contracts entered into previously. There have been no new ones entered into with Cambodia either this year or last year. To terminate and go back on our word now would be a breach of faith on something the House has already agreed to—it would not affect Cambodia but it would affect and drastically hurt many of our allies who are complying with their part of the agreements. Adoption of this amendment would seriously impair the credibility of the United States.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I heard the gentleman from Indiana state when he made his remarks that in the pipeline for Cambodia there was a development loan. We examined the pipeline figures presented in the minority report which sets forth the views of the gentleman. Cambodia is listed, but there is no reference to development loans.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. I do not think I said that. I said my figure of \$131 million basically was reached out of development loan funds. But there were other funds involved, such as contingency funds and supporting funds.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am glad that the gentleman has answered our distinguished chairman. But that is the point. All of these loans are in hard dollars, repayable in hard dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in discussing the foreign aid pipeline, I tried to make it clear that we must keep in mind the distinction between unobligated funds in the pipeline and unexpended funds in the pipeline. I pointed out from personal experience how a firm in my district was able to benefit through a contract with Greece where there were some unexpended funds. The company sold a conveyor belt to that country.

I want to mention another example: There is another company in my district that participates in our aid program, the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. That company builds turbines, generators, and other equipment which it takes a long time to manufacture. When a hydro-

electric dam or a steel mill is to be built under the aid program, it takes a while before the project is completed. When our country grants a loan to another country, payment is not made to the recipient country, and then to the company manufacturing the equipment in question, until the delivery of such equipment is completed. Therefore, a company like the Allis-Chalmers Co. does not get paid immediately and the development loan funds are not expended until the delivery of the equipment is completed. Now the gentleman from Indiana knows this. Am I accurate in this regard? Am I stating the case properly insofar as unexpended funds are concerned? Does that delivery have to be made before payment is made?

Mr. ADAIR. It depends upon the terms of the development loan agreement. These agreements do vary.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman know of any case where payment has been made under a development loan before a delivery was made?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. As one example, Chile received a \$40 million loan for a development bank in one lump sum, prior to subloans to local borrowers.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And is that why we have unexpended funds?

Mr. ADAIR. That is one reason. But there are other and more cogent reasons. There is too much in the pipeline that is not being used and agreements are not being drawn and projects are not being completed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Well, on projects that are not being completed, of course, there will not be any payments, but that is a very small portion of the program. I do want to point out the danger of the gentleman's amendment. When we turn to loans rather than grants, we lengthen the pipeline. But we also gain the repayments of loans. The record of repayment of these loans is very good. Of the assistance given by this country of \$110 billion, \$30.3 billion consisted of loans and as of the end of fiscal year 1964, repayments of principal and interest on those loans amounted to \$11.4 billion.

Loans extended by AID and predecessor agencies amounted to almost \$10 billion for development loans, Alliance for Progress loans, supporting assistance loans, and food-for-peace undertakings.

Now of this total of development loans, \$2 billion has been repaid. \$1.3 billion was in dollars, U.S. dollars, and the remainder \$687 million dollars, in foreign currencies.

Defaults on development loans amounted to only \$2.5 million and occurred in only four countries. This was one-fortieth of 1 percent in relation to the loans extended. I think this is an excellent record.

I do not believe we should cut the program where we are making a great impact among countries—our allies as well as the developing countries in the world. This would be a mistake. This would be a great mistake and I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. They have not defaulted on these loans for two reasons. In the first place, many of them have a 10-year grace period before any payment is made. In the second place, they are not going to default on these loans as long as we keep pumping the money in back to them to pay on the maturity of the loans—if they can be called loans. But most of them have not had a chance to default.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there were principal repayments of \$775 million in American, United States, hard currency dollars. Payments of interest amounted to \$558 million again in U.S. dollars.

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

Mr. Chairman, every year since we authorized the Development Loan Fund on a long-range basis in 1961, there has been an attack of this kind upon the Fund. We have been successful every year in fighting off the attack. At the end of fiscal year 1966, the present authorization for the long-range Development Loan Fund comes to an end. During the markup of the bill, I told the committee that we should take a new look, make a new approach and try to develop a new type of long-range Development Loan Fund. You will remember that this is a program that is paid back in hard dollars. The Development Loan Fund was established under President Eisenhower in 1957, repayment in soft currency was authorized. In the new authority governing the Development Loan Fund initiated when we rewrote the Mutual Security Act in 1961, we established a dollar repayment type of development loan.

The administration already has authorization for this fiscal year of \$1.5 billion. They did not request that amount of money. They came here with a request for a little more than half of the \$1.5 billion. They requested \$780 million.

Most of this money goes to the countries around the world who are making real progress like Turkey, Colombia, Nigeria, India, and Pakistan. It is a very important part of the program.

The money is screened carefully. It goes only to the most effective governments, which we feel have a chance to stand on their own feet. AID has done a very careful job of screening and intends to do a very careful job of screening this fund.

This would be a very severe cut. It would damage the program.

The author of the amendment is not giving adequate attention to our obligations, to our definite loan commitments. He wants to penalize countries with whom we have firm loan agreements, with whom we have signed contracts, as well as curtailing the new appropriations.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a

very important point with respect to the long-term commitments, as well as pointing out the fact that the amount of authorization requested is only a little more than half of that which was authorized by the committee and by the Congress.

Is it not true that the committee and the Congress have worked quite hard to shift this program from grants to loans?

For example, in 1953 and 1955, 6 percent of all programs were loans, yet in 1966, 69 percent of all programs will be in loans. The department has worked hard to follow the mandate of the Congress, so in the past few years we have seen a shift in emphasis from grants to loans, and from loans repayable in local currencies to loans repayable in dollars, with a substantial increase in the minimum interest rates on the dollar-repayable loans.

The very same people who helped to make the shift in emphasis now want to turn around and cut off the commitments made under the programs which have been very wisely handled by the administration.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. In addition, we increased the interest rates on the development loans. The loans are repayable at a 2½-percent interest rate and are good, firm loans.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Does it not come down to this: If we are to have a loan program we must fulfill the commitments made with respect to loans?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct. We must fulfill the commitments, where we have firm contracts. We cannot make cancellations of funds now in the pipeline.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not true that if cuts were made along the lines of the Adair amendment, those cuts would not affect contracts already entered into, such as with Cambodia, to which the gentleman objects, but could affect any loans we might now be making to countries such as Korea or other nations which have been making real and constructive progress? Reductions would have to be made to our closest friends and allies who are today making progress. It would effect new loans, not old loans. Therefore, the matter of Cambodia would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows: Page 2, line 9:

TITLE II—TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

SEC. 102. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as

amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "\$215,000,000" and substituting "1960" and "\$210,000,000," respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "treatment, education," and substituting "education".

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, \$18,000,000" and substituting "1966, \$7,000,000".

TITLE III—INVESTMENT GUARANTEES

SEC. 103. Title III of chapter 2 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guarantees, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows:

"(b) The President may issue guarantees to eligible United States investors—"

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "\$2,500,000,000" and substitute "\$5,000,000,000."

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed \$25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed \$10,000,000".

(B) In the third proviso, immediately after "\$300,000,000" insert the following: ", and guaranties issued under this paragraph (2) for other than housing projects similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration, shall not exceed \$150,000,000".

(C) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b) strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c): "(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships, or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations: *Provided*, That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private homeownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free

labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and is not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than \$6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$450,000,000: *Provided*, That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further*, That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 5, line 15, after the word "free", insert "non-Communist dominated"; and on page 6, line 16, after the word "free", insert "non-Communist dominated".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which I hope will be accepted by the Committee. All it does is it says if you are going to set up this new housing project in the Latin American country program, which I incidentally strongly support, and you are at the same time going to make funds available for "the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America"; and then on page 6, line 14, paragraph (4), "housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and co-

operatives." I say that we should certainly not permit funds to be made available to any union that is dominated by the Communists.

It is common knowledge, the record is replete with evidence of Communist attempts to infiltrate, to take charge of, to take over certain labor union movements in Latin America. I do not think anyone in this House would want the administration or anyone else to have discretion to provide assistance to labor unions if, in fact, it is shown that they are Communist dominated.

I may have some reservations myself as it relates to providing foreign aid money for the purpose of requiring and encouraging the formation of labor unions in the first instance as a necessary adjunct to the use of Alliance for Progress funds. This has gone on all over Latin America. It is common knowledge that one condition for Alliance for Progress funds, among others, is that the labor union movements in those countries shall be encouraged. But that bridge has been crossed. If you are going to do that, as it relates even to labor union-sponsored housing projects, then I say make certain that these labor unions are not Communist dominated. That is all this amendment does, and I should hope the Committee would accept it.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman explain what he means by the phrase "non-Communist dominated"?

Mr. CRAMER. Not necessarily. I know what the gentleman's question is. This is common terminology that has been used in other similar efforts; "non-Communist dominated" as it relates to "non-Communist-dominated countries." This is common terminology used in such restrictive foreign aid language. That is where it came from.

Mr. YATES. What does it mean?

Mr. CRAMER. It means exactly what it says. If there are a number of Communists in a union and thus by their number or otherwise they dominate the union—no money. That is what it means. That is what it says—"non-Communist dominated" just like a country if it is "non-Communist dominated" can get aid, but not otherwise. You cannot spell it out further. It would be wrong to attempt to spell it out further. This simply applies the same test to labor unions that is applied in other instances. I cannot imagine how the Committee would not accept it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. How is the Administrator to know what is a non-Communist-dominated union?

Mr. CRAMER. They do not have any trouble determining what is a non-Communist-dominated country; they will have no difficulty determining what is a non-Communist-dominated union. Now, I hear constant suggestions that the administration be given authority to exercise its discretion. Here it is. It decides whether a union is non-Communist-dominated. If it is, they get the

money; if not, they do not. If someone on the floor of the House wants some money to go to Communist-dominated unions, let them vote against the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not think money should go to any Communist union, but the terms of reference in this amendment are not that simple. The fact of the matter is that on page 5, line 15, we point out that they must be free labor unions. Therefore, if a union is Communist-dominated it cannot possibly be a free labor union. The language of the amendment is redundant, it is surplusage, and it is not necessary. We are in agreement on the desired net result. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman define what "free" means? If "free" means the same as "non-Communist-dominated," why would the gentleman object to defining it further with my amendment so there would be no question about it?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Everybody knows what it means.

Mr. CRAMER. What does it mean?

Mr. GALLAGHER. It means non-Communist-dominated.

Mr. CRAMER. It also means everybody may join it, does it not, including the Communists? This amendment defines it further and excludes Communist domination.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No; it means non-Communist dominated. I would imagine that a free labor union means a free labor union not dominated by anyone, including the Communists.

Mr. CRAMER. Suppose it is intended to mean to apply only to non-Communist-dominated unions? If the gentleman wants to make sure it does, and he agrees, he should support my amendment to make sure.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I support the gentleman's intention and the gentleman's intention has the support of this bill. Therefore, it is not necessary.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I understand the word "free" to mean it is not dominated by anyone.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly right. The chairman has made a good point on that, and, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of the foreign aid program? Is it to win friends, to keep the peace, and to keep communism from spreading? All we have to do is to take a quick look at the world situation today to realize that if this is the purpose of

the foreign aid program it has been a dismal failure.

During fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1964 we have distributed over \$110 billion of the American taxpayers' dollars and the dollars of still unborn generations among some 110 foreign nations—friends as well as enemies. During the same period of time, the recipients of our aid have purchased over \$10 billion of our gold—thereby contributing greatly to our serious gold shortage problem. We have seen many countries go behind the Iron Curtain in that time and many more still receiving our aid—though claiming to be neutral—hue to the Communist line, permit our embassies and our flag to be attacked and desecrated, vote with the Communists more often than they do with us in the United Nations, and interfere with efforts to bring stability and peace to the world.

Each year, the Congress reaffirms its intent that American tax dollars are not to be given to such countries—but no such denial of aid is actually written into law. Thus, Congress abdicates its constitutional control over the purse strings and leaves the final decision up to the President. Nasser tells us to "go jump in the lake," but we continue to provide aid—and \$29,973,000 remains in the pipeline from previously authorized and appropriated amounts for aid to the United Arab Republic. Sukarno stated a few months ago:

We are rich enough to do without American aid. Indonesian resources are so, so rich; our need is only to dig out our own resources. To * * * with American aid.

Yet, \$17,193,000 of American dollars remain ready for the use of Indonesia even without the present bill. Ghana and Algeria have embraced Red China and are adding to the troubles of the Congo—but a total of \$75.5 million remain from previously appropriated funds for their use in fiscal year 1966.

These are just a few examples of what I consider to be the misuse of American tax dollars. In addition, the entire program is replete with waste, extravagance, and mismanagement.

It has been widely reported by the administration and by the news media that this current foreign aid request has been cut to the "bare bone"—and if you merely look at the total of \$2.04 billion provided in this authorization bill you might be inclined to agree. On checking a little deeper, however, one finds that the total is quickly increased to \$3,367,670,000 by amounts previously authorized—and this is just the start. This present bill authorizes an unlimited amount for southeast Asia—with the President having full control over what is actually to be spent. In addition, there are other separate foreign aid programs such as the Peace Corps, food for peace, Inter-American Development Bank, International Development Association—bringing the total amount provided for foreign aid for fiscal year 1966 to about \$6 billion. Then, of course, the United States spends still another additional \$3 billion annually for military expenditures abroad which come under the Defense Department budget. Finally, we have to add the sum of \$6.2 bil-

lion of unexpended foreign assistance funds previously authorized and appropriated and in the so-called pipeline for use in fiscal year 1966. And, I would remind you, we are providing all of this money at a time when we are faced with a serious balance-of-payments problem, a gold shortage, and a national debt of some \$318 billion which greatly exceeds the combined debt of all other countries of the world—and then we are called upon to increase our military expenditures to help protect South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic from Communist aggression.

There are approximately 22 different U.S. agencies involved in giving foreign aid to over 80 countries now—and over 71,000 individuals, including participants, are on the foreign aid payroll. Can such a widespread program result in efficiency and value received for each dollar spent? My answer to that question is an emphatic "No."

Certainly, I feel that some aid to friendly foreign nations is necessary, if provided on a selective basis and at the grassroots level. On the other hand, I feel very strongly that the very survival of the free world depends upon our remaining fiscally sound—and that we cannot continue to attempt to support the world without going bankrupt. I concur completely with the views and recommendations contained in the minority report on this bill, H.R. 7750.

My vote against this bill will serve as indication of my strong protest against giving aid to unfriendly nations and against the waste and extravagance in the present program—as well as my equally strong demand for a completely new look at the entire foreign aid program.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] has made the strongest argument for this amendment that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] could possibly ask for. As a matter of fact, it is a stronger argument than the gentleman from Florida made in behalf of the amendment himself.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that we are trying to read into the language of the bill that "free" means "non-Communist," certainly is stretching definitions substantially and I see nothing inconsistent with the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida and the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] supports it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite understand the use of definitions of those opposing this amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I know the gentleman's record is known to be violently anti-Communist, as are all of the people in this House of Representatives.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was in committee when this language was prepared and following his leadership on some of these matters we felt that "free labor unions" meant that they would not be Communist dominated

and therefore this language as contained in the bill covered not only Communists but anyone who would try to take over a union and keep it from being a free labor union.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as I see the virtue of the amendment of the gentleman from Florida, it spells out more concretely the position of the House than does the language of the bill. We have to recognize the fact that we went through a period in the United States in the early and late forties where there were necessary efforts made to remove Communist control of unions. We recognize that unions are normal targets for Communist infiltration and to specifically emphasize that we will not provide funds to be used by Communist-controlled unions I think is a logical extension of the position of the Congress and a logical implementation of this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] should be approved.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that the tin miners union in Bolivia, which has its own militia, is a free union, with or without Communist membership?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would presume not but, perhaps the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] might wish to apply his definition.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has raised a very good point. We want free unions. We want them to be free of Communists and free from rightists. That is the reason why we should have this affirmative language against the establishment of any militiamen, militiamen of the right or left, Communists, or extreme rightists.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, our affirmative language as contained in the bill covers it all.

I appreciate the contribution which the gentleman from Iowa has made.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I have not heard whether the gentleman from New Jersey thinks the Bolivian tin miners union is a free union.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, I do not.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think we should explore all of these matters.

Mr. GROSS. You would not exclude them, however, under the language of this bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If they were dominated by any militiamen, they would be excluded.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The language of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] would more specifically exclude

the use of funds to Communist-controlled unions.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. I have just looked up the definition of "free" and it says, "Unrestricted and unconfined." Communists can join an unrestricted, unconfined union and that is why my amendment proposes to prevent, prevent the moneys contained in this fund from going to unions that are Communist dominated. That is all it does. But the word "free" does not do it.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wants to do it, he should be applauding the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman has a lot less confidence in the word "free" than I have. A "free" union means that no one dominates it, including Communists, and including the kind of people who march down in Bolivia who do not benefit from this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 52, noes 80.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. CRAMER.

So the Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 72, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Committee amended the bill as introduced to extend the highly promising guaranty program for oversea housing, both in Latin America and in other areas of the world.

This program, which was initiated by the Congress 4 years ago, has developed into one of the best examples of assistance in the foreign aid program. Financed through private investment rather than U.S. Government funds, it serves as an excellent vehicle for private enterprise in this country to cooperate with private sectors in other areas of the world. It provides much needed housing on a self-liquidating basis, similar to our FHA program in the United States and serves that segment of the economy which is not in need of subsidized housing through public housing institutions.

On my trips to Latin America, I have visited several of these programs and was impressed that they are providing a meaningful demonstration of the goals of

the Alliance for Progress. Nothing means more to people, in all parts of the world, than the ability to purchase and live in their own homes.

The committee this year set aside \$150 million from the authority under section 221(b)(2) of the act to continue that type of pilot or demonstration project that has been guaranteed under the program during its initial 4 years. Prior to this year AID had set aside \$50 million for guaranties outside Latin America. This new set-aside will provide an expanded program throughout the world and it is hoped that this program, slow in developing over this past year, can be put upon a firm basis this coming year.

AID requested \$100 million of guaranty authority for new types of categories to be guaranteed under the Latin American program in section 224. The committee felt strongly that the program, as intended by Congress and developed so successfully to date, should be continued and strengthened. Therefore, the committee increased the authority available under section 224 by an additional \$100 million above the AID request to continue to carry out the guaranty of privately sponsored pilot or demonstration projects similar to those insured by the FHA.

It is understood that this continuation of the program under section 224(b)(1) will be supported by not less than this additional \$100 million.

It is of the utmost importance that the housing guaranty program as created by Congress be continued on its present basis. The new authority will provide an opportunity to experiment with other approaches to the guaranty program, but the program as now conducted should be continued.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 7, line 2, strike out "\$450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$425,000,000".

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It merely reduces the authorization in this section of the bill from \$450 million to \$425 million. This saving of \$25 million could be used to support the veterans' facilities that the President wants to close, as he says, for reasons of economy. All Members of the Congress are, of course, greatly interested in this proposed closing of our veterans' hospitals and domiciliaries and the transfer and consolidation of some of the regional offices. The plea of the President was that we must save money and that by shutting down these facilities and by these proposed consolidations, we could save \$25 million.

Now that sounds good if you only look at one side of the ledger. But when you look at the other side of the ledger and you look at this foreign aid bill, you will see that here you are providing American dollar guarantees for housing for our so-called allies.

This reaches a point of great disturbance. When we spend money on our own veterans, I say that our veterans not only deserve it but also appreciate

it. But when we spend money in South America, Asia, Africa, or any other portion of the world, those people do not appreciate it and they do not deserve it in many instances.

So if all the Members of Congress who have appeared before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the subcommittee on hospitals, and expressed so much concern about the closing of these hospitals will take heed, I say this is an opportunity to stand up and be heard, an opportunity for you to express your feelings and sentiments, an opportunity for you to say to the President of the United States, "We are taking \$25 million off this foreign aid program and giving it to you so that we can continue to keep our hospitals open."

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his amendment to the bill. I cannot think of a better place to save \$25 million, and dedicate it to the veterans of this country for their hospitalization and care.

Mr. FINO. Not only that, but they appreciate it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we are all touched by the gentleman's concern for the veterans of this country. All of us here today certainly join in that concern with the gentleman from New York. It is too bad that his amendment would not do what he believes it would do, because, under this particular section, what we are talking about is a limit or ceiling on the issuance of guarantees, and this has nothing to do with the appropriation of money.

Therefore, worthwhile as the efforts of the gentleman from New York might appear to be, in actuality they would not accomplish any of the things he has talked about. What would occur is that there would be a reduction of \$25 million in one of the most successful programs we have had in stemming the tide of communism in Latin America by providing private initiative, private institutions, private homeownership throughout Latin America. I do not believe I need to dwell on the value of private homeownership in a developing area like Latin America.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I am very happy that my colleague from Florida has made this statement. It was as a result of many remarks by him to me that I was happy to sponsor this amendment in the committee. I agree that there is no money involved, and this involves the ceiling. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentlewoman. It was her amendment that increased the ceiling for this program.

This was one subject which received very thorough consideration by the committee. The ceiling was lifted because

of the tremendous success of the program.

Since the amendment would not accomplish what the gentleman from New York seeks to accomplish, and because it would do damage to a very important part of the program, I believe the amendment should be defeated unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Sec. 104. Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended by striking out "in fiscal year 1965" and substituting "in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966".

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to note that no amendments have been offered to reduce the authorization for the Alliance for Progress. This surely reflects the concern of this House that the United States press forward toward fulfillment of the goals of the Alliance without delay.

Undoubtedly, the tragic and costly conflict in the Dominican Republic has lent emphasis to the need for the Alliance for Progress. We have witnessed in recent days the losses of life, revolution, and the destruction of many of the normal services required by the people in Santo Domingo. The continued existence of the Dominican Republic as a free country has been threatened in recent years by political instability and a lack of adherence to constitutional processes. Inevitably Communist leaders, including those trained outside the Dominican Republic, seek to exploit this instability and the many other problems facing the people of that republic. Whatever the degree of control and influence achieved by them in this recent revolution, the threat of a Communist government emerging from the revolution now appears to have abated.

What now remain are hunger, unemployment, disease, poverty, ignorance—and sometimes—despair. It is these afflictions, common to so many people of this world, to which the Alliance for Progress is addressed. Although the Alliance is less than 4 years old, it has begun to take hold. The idea that governments must act to bring about social reform, broadened educational opportunities and improved fiscal and administrative procedures has won increasing acceptance in Latin America. Economic growth, social justice and the development of strong democratic institutions must go forward hand in hand, primarily through the efforts of the people in these countries themselves but with the margins of help which the United States can provide through the Alliance for Progress. Freeman can, in ways that Marx, Stalin, and Castro never dreamed, meet the just aspirations for a better life for the people of this hemisphere through cooperation, sacrifice, and a willingness to change the ways of the past.

Mr. Chairman, the aims of the people of the Dominican Republic are the aims of people everywhere. They seek to shape their own destiny through the right of self government. They seek peace, stability, and security. They seek increasing economic opportunities for themselves and broadened educational opportunities for their children.

The people of the United States share these same goals. The goals of both peoples are in keeping with the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

That is why I strongly support the actions being taken by President Johnson in the Dominican Republic to restore constitutional government to that nation. That is why the United States must give its full support to the Dominican Republic as it seeks to climb out of the pit of despair and to move along pathways illuminated by the bright hopes of the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at this section where we are concerned with the Alliance for Progress it is a time to express that the greatest aid we export is still our ideals.

The tragic events of the past 4 weeks draw all of our attention and all of our sympathy to the people of the Dominican Republic. They have had 4 weeks of conflict, death, destruction, and personal deprivation, including hunger.

I am proud that President Johnson, the U.S. Government, and the people of the United States, acted promptly and decisively in that crisis in the Dominican Republic.

We saved lives by evacuating more than 4,000 foreigners, including more than 2,000 U.S. citizens. When responsible authorities in Santo Domingo said they were no longer able to provide reasonable protection, we moved them out.

We sought to preserve democratic liberties in Santo Domingo. When the public order broke down and civil war and political maneuvering for position produced chaos which skilled Communists tried to exploit as a means to power, we acted to thwart the Communists. We sought a cease-fire. We sought to restore the conditions in Santo Domingo to normal. We sought to find a basis for a single civil government. We sought to restore favorable economic conditions.

We acted within the Organization of American States. For each one of the actions that we have taken to solve the Dominican crisis and to restore normal conditions there, we had the necessary two-thirds majority of the meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers of the OAS. For many actions—of a humanitarian nature—we have had unanimity in the meeting of consultation. A majority of the American Republics have sent supplies of food and medicine or medical personnel to help the Dominican people.

This tragedy in the Dominican Republic has given this hemisphere a most valuable tool for keeping the peace in the future. I refer to the Inter-American armed force, which was established by the OAS Meeting of Consultation and which is now on hand in Santo Domingo. This force is under the command of a distinguished Brazilian, General Pannasco, and so far, six nations—the United States, Brazil, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua—have contributed forces to it. Others will contribute forces too. When their work of keeping peace and order is finished, the IAF will leave the Dominican Republic. But the IAF may stand as a shield of peace and democracy for the generations to come.

Finally, the people of the United States and the Dominican Republic want the same things.

We both want peace, prosperity, and progress.

These desires and hopes of both our peoples are identical with the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

The people of the United States should, and I believe will, give full support to the people of the Dominican Republic in restoring normal conditions and resuming the paths set forth by the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise during this annual debate on the foreign aid legislation to lay before the House a suggestion which I have supported for many years.

That is the separation of the economic and military aid portions of the foreign aid bill. I am a strong advocate of the military program being placed in the Department of Defense's annual request to Congress and this being worked upon by the appropriate authorization and appropriations committees in the defense field in the House and Senate.

This suggestion merely means that military authorities in Congress would be studying this program from beginning to end with the same careful scrutiny and austere standards now given our \$50 billion annual domestic defense expenditures.

For the last decade the Department of Defense has had this view that the economic and military items in the foreign aid bill should be separated. This position was never more forcibly presented than in March of this year when Secretary of Defense McNamara testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary McNamara testified:

I believe it is a mistake to lump together the economic aid and military aid in a single bill. I do believe that it confuses the public. There is no question in my mind but what military aid is far more comparable to the other items of the defense budget than it is to the economic aid, and it ought to be considered in relation to the defense budget.

I have criticized the foreign aid program of our Government in the way it has been directed, and this criticism is felt by millions of Americans and by a large portion of Congress.

It makes sense to me, and to all Americans, I believe, to support with military aid the friendly, freedom-seeking nations on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc. They are under threat of the Communist bloc and they represent the majority of all military assistance in the foreign aid bill.

However, the economic portion of the aid bill is subject to serious question and debate and criticism. We need only to look at one prime example: Indonesia. Every schoolboy knows President Sukarno told the United States where it could go with its aid. This sort of situation puts in doubt the whole aid program.

This creates a distortion of what our aid program has accomplished through the years. There has been in fact much mismanagement and not enough control on our dollars at a time when we need great control on all funds leaving this country. The foreign aid program is a tremendous financial outlay and a great drain on the country's fiscal strength. In this respect, I believe the discussion to curtail all foreign aid in the next several years is well founded, and should be seriously considered by the Congress and the President.

If this should happen, we would still need to help those friendly allies in training and equipping armies for the defense of the free world.

There is no better time than now to separate the economic aid from the military aid in the foreign aid legislation, and I urge that this action be taken by the President and the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 3—International organizations and programs

SEC. 105. Chapter 3 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 301(c), which relates to assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East, by adding at the end thereof the following: "Contributions by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East for the calendar year 1966 shall not exceed \$15,200,000."

(b) Amend section 302, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "\$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "\$144,755,000", respectively.

Chapter 4—Supporting assistance

SEC. 106. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "1965" and "\$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "\$369,200,000", respectively.

Chapter 5—Contingency fund

SEC. 107. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "\$150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "\$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in southeast Asia such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided*, That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

PART II

Chapter 2—Military assistance

SEC. 201. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 503(b), which relates to general authority, by striking out the words "in foreign countries".

(b) Amend section 504, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "\$1,055,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1966" and "\$1,170,000,000", respectively.

(c) Amend section 505, which relates to utilization of assistance, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out the colon and add the following: ", or for the purpose of assisting foreign military forces in less developed friendly countries (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States in such countries) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic development of such friendly countries. It is the sense of the Congress that such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic development effort."

(2) Strike out subsection (b) and redesignate the proviso of subsection (a) as subsection (b).

(3) In redesignated subsection (b), strike out "Provided, That except" and substitute "Except"; strike out "or (2)" and substitute ", or (2) for civic action assistance, or (3)".

(d) Amend section 507, which relates to sales, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), insert the following new sentence between the second and third sentences: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 644(m)(2), nonexcess defense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization."

(2) In subsection (b), strike out the period at the end of the first proviso, substitute a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles or defense services ordered. Funds available under this part for financing sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the

defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries or international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 508. To the maximum extent possible, prices fixed under any such sales agreement shall be sufficient to reimburse the United States for the cost of the defense articles or defense services ordered. The President shall submit to the Congress promptly a detailed report concerning any fixed-price sales agreement under which the aggregate cost to the United States exceeds the aggregate amount required to be paid by the purchasing country or international organization."

(e) Amend section 508, which relates to reimbursement as follows:

(1) After "this part" the first time it appears, insert "have been or".

(2) After "United States Government," the first time it appears insert "receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected".

(3) Strike out "the current applicable appropriation" and substitute "a separate fund account".

(4) Strike out "furnishing further military assistance on cash or credit terms" and substitute "financing sales and guaranties, including the overhead costs thereof".

(f) Amend section 509(b), which relates to exchanges and guaranties, by inserting "(excluding contracts with any agency of the United States Government)" in the second sentence between the last word thereof and the period.

(g) Amend section 510, which relates to special authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "1965" each place it appears and substitute in each such place "1966".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "to the President".

(h) Amend section 512, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Africa, as follows:

(1) Strike out "programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter" and substitute "civic action requirements".

(2) Strike out "1965" and substitute "1966".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

MR. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which corrects a drafting error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: Page 12, line 25, immediately after the quotation marks and before the period, insert the following: "; and strike out 'available for military assistance'."

MR. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be appropriate for the chairman of the committee to explain in a few words the effect of that amendment.

MR. MORGAN. I would be glad to.

If the gentleman will turn to page 12 of the bill, this was a clerical drafting error. What we are doing is just reinserting the words that were left out.

MR. ADAIR. So the committee may understand that this is simply a drafting matter and not substantive.

MR. MORGAN. Not substantive; that is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as follows:

(1) In the section heading strike out "ITEMS" and substitute "CERTAIN ITEMS AND FUNDS".

(2) Add the following new subsections:

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of part I of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of part I of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

"(d) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(b) Amend section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(c) Amend section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, as follows:

(1) Amend the section heading to read as follows:

"PROHIBITIONS AGAINST FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—"

(2) In paragraph (2) of section 620(e), which relates to the application of the federal act of state doctrine, strike out "January 1, 1966" and substitute "January 1, 1967".

(3) In section 620(1), which relates to the prohibition against furnishing assistance to countries which fail to enter into agreements to institute the investment guaranty program and providing protection against certain risks, strike out "December 31, 1965" and substitute "December 31, 1966".

(4) At the end of such section 620, add the following new subsection:

"(n) Until the President determines that North Vietnam has ceased all efforts to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam, no funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965—

"(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to North Vietnam—

"(i) any items of economic assistance,

"(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and

"(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from North Vietnam."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 14, immediately after line 20, insert the following:

"(1) In paragraph (1) of section 620(a), amend the first sentence by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: 'Provided, That it is the sense of the Congress that so long as Cuba is exporting communism to any other country it is against the national interest of the United States to furnish assistance to the present government of Cuba or to any other country which furnishes assistance to the present government of Cuba'."

And renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the Clerk had read line 6 of page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Florida was on his feet and seeking recognition.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the amendment.

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

The Clerk rereported the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. The objective of it is quite simple but very essential. There should be no question in the mind of anyone sitting in this Legislative body that there is being exported from Cuba communism, particularly after the debacle we have seen and the problems we have seen, and the dying of American boys in the Dominican Republic to try to stave off, as the President himself said, the Communist takeover of that uprising that is Cuban inspired.

Mr. Chairman, there was named not 1, not 10, not 15, not 20, but 65 known Communists in the Dominican Republic uprising, most of whom were trained in Fidel Castro's Communist stronghold in Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, is there any question about the evidence that communism is being exported from Cuba today and that American boys are dying as a result of it?

Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do about it? What are we in the Congress of the United States going to do about cutting off the exportation of communism from the country that is the fountainhead and which will continue to be the fountainhead of communism in this hemisphere, unless we take affirmative, positive steps to do the job that needs to be done in order to get rid of Communists in Cuba itself?

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are familiar with the meeting that took place in November of last year, the most significant conclave of Communists from Latin American countries representing more countries than at any time in the history of the Western Hemisphere, the

meeting in Havana, Cuba, where they planned this thing—this Latin American Communist campaign.

Mr. Chairman, there are going to be more Dominican Republics. Do not kid yourself. There are going to be more of them because the Communists planned them in November of last year and they are going to hold another meeting in the near future. They announced what their blueprint is.

Mr. Chairman, their blueprint is that any time there is an uprising, any time there is a problem, in the first place, they are going to encourage it, and in the second place, if they do not encourage it, when it happens they are going to come in and try to take it over as a Communist movement. There is not any question about it. They are not kidding about this situation. They have a blueprint, they have a plan, and the Dominican Republic is just the symptom of the disease, the symptom—one symptom—of the disease. Mr. Chairman, what is the disease? Castro's Communist Cuba. Cuba is from where the Communist cancer is spreading.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what does this amendment propose to do? I am sure that many Members on this floor, when the issue was up before this House previously, in 1963, remember that the gentleman from Florida now in the well tried to make it mandatory that trade be cut off and that no aid go to any country that trades with Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment failed and trade has continued. There are all sorts of loopholes in the present trade policy. Everyone has read where locomotives are going to Cuba, heavy machinery is going to Cuba, and has read where other nations that get our aid are sending equipment and materiel and are trading with Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that there is a loophole is because of the language contained in the present law, which this proposed amendment is designed to amend and which states as follows:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the present Government of Cuba; nor shall any such assistance be furnished to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

What does my amendment do? It is very simple. It directs, it will help do the job, it will put the Congress on record as saying we want no more Dominican Republics emanating from Castro's Cuban Communist headquarters.

Today I read in the paper where the President has sent FBI agents to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of determining for the OAS and for the entire world to know that Communist activities exist down there; that they emanate from Cuba, thus proving, I hope, to this Congress and to the world that we intend to do something about it. Here is the tool to do it with.

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

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. CRAMER) he was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, here is the tool. It is very simple. So what do I say? What does the amendment propose? It amends the present law which reads:

No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the present Government of Cuba; nor shall any such assistance be furnished to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

What does my proviso do? That is all it says:

Provided: That it is the sense of the Congress that so long as Cuba is exporting communism to any other country it is against the national interest of the United States to furnish assistance to the present Government of Cuba or to any other country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba.

The Congress of the United States has an opportunity now to speak out in no uncertain terms that so far as this body is concerned, and I believe they would be speaking on behalf of the American people, we should not give assistance to any country because it is against the national interest, and we so determine as the sense of Congress that it is against the national interest to provide assistance to any country that assists Cuba and Castro so long as communism is being exported.

There are many more Dominican Republics coming if we don't act now. This is simply one symptom of the disease in the Dominican Republic and communism, Communist Castro-Cuba is the disease, the cancer. Cut it out, and here is your chance to do something about curing the disease.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he has any knowledge of U.S. assistance to Cuba. The bill does not provide assistance to Cuba. The gentleman's amendment deletes the provision of presidential determination in the act, does it not?

Mr. CRAMER. Only as it relates to the exportation of communism from Cuba. If Cuba is exporting it, yes, we will cut off all aid to all countries that assist Cuba, and that is the intention of it. We suggest no discretion in the matter. Cuba is exporting communism, as in the example of the Dominican Republic. That is the point. That is the objective of this. This is the way you get at the problem.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In the case, as we now have in the Caribbean, where Cuba has exported military assistance to certain countries the President's authority to meet such threats would be limited. For example, in the Dominican Republic, would the gentleman's amendments preclude the President from giving assistance to a recognized government in the Dominican Republic?

Mr. CRAMER. No. My amendment goes to countries that aid Cuba. That is what it says, any country that gives assistance to Cuba shall not get a cent

from the United States. That is all it does.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has made a very persuasive speech against aid to Cuba and one in which we all certainly concur. No one here wants to give aid or assistance of any kind to Cuba. In fact, there has been no aid or assistance going to Cuba for several years. However, the amendment offered by the gentleman is completely unnecessary.

Section 620 already prohibits aid to the Government of Cuba or to any country that is aiding Cuba. No aid recipients at the present time are aiding Cuba. The sense-of-Congress amendment that the gentleman is advocating is indeed far weaker than the present law and, therefore, I urge that it be defeated. What this amendment does in fact is to take an indirect slap at the United States by trying to say that the President will not have sufficient sense to know when the Communist government comes to an end in Cuba. I have confidence in our President and I think this amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I think it is worthwhile to point out that the gentleman is not answering the question. We have written into previous bills language prohibiting aid to Cuba and to countries that aid Cuba. The question is, Is the law being adequately administered and enforced? That is the question before us.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, the law is adequately administered. What this amendment attempts to do is to take a slap at Canada and some of our biggest customers and some of our best allies. In effect, what this sense of the Congress amendment really does is to say that the Congress will make up its mind when the President should make a determination. This House has written into section 620 our full unhappiness and our full displeasure with the Communist regime in Cuba. There is no aid going to Cuba. There is no aid intended and I think this amendment is superfluous.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. But there is aid going to countries that are assisting Cuba. Now it is bad enough if communism stays in Cuba. That is bad enough. But now they are exporting it openly and notoriously and the time has come to take away all assistance to all countries aiding Cuba under these circumstances and this is the sense of the Congress contained in my amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman from Florida has a unique way of saying things that have been going on for years as if they were something new and novel.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, but American boys have not been killed in the process of exportation of Cuban communism and they are being killed today in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That has nothing to do with this amendment and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. CRAMER. It certainly does.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If you want to make a speech along those lines, that is one thing—but we are talking about foreign aid.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

As I was saying, the foreign-aid bill already prohibits all that the gentleman refers to, and his amendment is completely unnecessary, and it is far weaker than the language of the present law.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is incorrect, and he knows he is incorrect. It is stronger.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unnecessary, since it is already written into the law of the land that no aid shall go to the Government of Cuba or to any country aiding Cuba.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an argument that has taken place on this floor for many years in considering this legislation, our foreign-aid legislation. The gentleman from Florida very cleverly camouflages his real intent and purpose in his amendment. There is no disagreement that all Members of Congress are opposed to communism. We do not want any part of the Government of this country to conduct any relations with or trade with Communist Cuba, and we condemn the exporting of communism from Cuba to any other Latin American country or to any other country. There is no question about this. The amendment is a direct attack upon the authority of the President of the United States to act under the Constitution of the United States in his direction of our foreign policy. It has no other purpose, and it can have no other purpose than to deny to the President his right to act. This is the issue involved here, and there is no other issue involved. Do you, as the Constitution provides, want to grant the right of the President of the United States to reasonably conduct our foreign policy, or do you want to transfer that authority here to the House of Representatives and to the Congress?

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Delaware whether we have all forgotten that originally the power was given to the people. We represent the people.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, to reply?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. McDOWELL. I do not believe that the gentleman, who I know accepts so well her full responsibility as a Member of this body, seriously would question the right of any Member of the Congress to exercise his full authority to represent the people of this country, but I remind the gentlewoman also

that the people of this country do elect the President and I believe the people of this country believe in constitutional government for the Congress and for the President.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentlewoman from Ohio would like to state to the gentleman from Delaware that we do recognize that fact, but we do not side-step our responsibility.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I should like to point out to my distinguished colleague that it was the gentlewoman who helped to write the language in section 620, which provides for the very things she has been discussing—our firm determination that no aid go to Cuba, our firm determination that any assistance be cut off. The gentlewoman, in conjunction with our distinguished chairman, helped to write the language in section 320.

Mrs. BOLTON. I should like to suggest to the gentleman and to the House that, among other things, we agreed there should be nothing exported by way of communism to South America. It has been constantly exported. It is growing in leaps and bounds in many of those countries. I believe we are side-stepping the responsibility which is ours, not only to the people of this country but also to the whole free world.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should like to confirm everything the gentlewoman from Ohio has said. I certainly wish to add that the purpose of the amendment is to say it is the consensus of this body to advise with the President in whatever powers he may have.

Finally, I should like to ask the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] to point out in what place in the Constitution, which I hold in my hand, there is delegated unto the President the determination of the foreign policy of the United States?

Mrs. BOLTON. I believe that is one of those things very much misunderstood about the Constitution. I believe the gentleman from Missouri [Dr. HALL], is quite correct in saying that the Constitution does not delegate everything to the President. We still have a responsibility not only to ourselves but also to the free world.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. McDOWELL. In reply to the suggestion that this country has not fully lived up to its obligations in preventing the export of communism from Cuba to other Latin American countries, and I suppose the suggestion that this is a responsibility of the President, does the gentlewoman not believe that the President has fully exercised his responsibility in regard to policy in respect to the Dominican Republic?

Mrs. BOLTON. I believe the President has been very ill advised. Certainly in

respect to Cuba we could have done much better.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentlewoman.

The fact of the matter is that the argument we are now having has nothing to do with the amendment. All of it is in the language of section 620, if anyone cares to read it. The language of the amendment, indeed, is weaker than the language already in the bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. All I wish to say is that I do not consider it weaker. I believe it is 100 percent stronger.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Without this amendment the present language in the legislation is directed toward Cuba remaining a Communist country. The amendment I have offered provides that it is the sense of the Congress that, now it has been proved communism is not only in Cuba but is being exported to other countries, we should do something about this too.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out a sufficient number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill. I have not been too happy with some of the things done recently in the name of foreign aid, although I have supported it in the past. But this argument during the last few minutes seems to me to have gotten so ridiculous that somebody ought to set the record straight.

The statement has been made here within the past 5 minutes that it is the fault of the Congress, somehow or other, or of the United States, because Cuba is exporting communism. Then someone asked the question and said, "Well, do you not think that the President exercised his responsibility in the Dominican crisis?" The answer was that, "I think he has been badly advised," which points out what I am trying to say; namely, there is pretty much, on the part of some people, of a dog-in-the-manger attitude. If anything goes wrong in Latin America, it is our fault, and if we try to do anything about it, then the President has been badly advised.

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

Mr. HAYS. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am very happy that the gentleman will yield to me. I have no intention of letting that ride. Because I have no such intentions, I think that we all had better look at our whole past, particularly in the last few years, with keener eyes and with a deeper understanding of the far-reaching implications of everything we do. I think we have not done so and, as a matter of fact, I was not speaking of this President but I was speaking particularly of the assassinated President, who was very sadly at fault there and knew it and said so.

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that the question was,

"Do you not think that the President has exercised his responsibility in the Dominican crisis?"

Mrs. BOLTON. I did not hear the words "Dominican crisis." There was too much noise.

Mr. HAYS. Then, it is a pretty good thing that I am setting the record straight for the benefit of my friend from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that is splendid, and I thank you.

Mr. HAYS. The record now is presumably that the President did exercise his responsibilities in the Dominican crisis.

It is fine to look at all of the things we have done with great care, but looking at all of the things we have done with great care is not going to prevent things from happening in the future. As far as I am concerned, I am for what the President did in the Dominican Republic. I hope that they do not force any compromise on anybody that is going to put any fellow in power in the Dominican Republic who has gone south with money from the Dominican bank, as the papers allege the man we are talking about now has done. I think we have to look at this whole picture from the overall view. I told the President not 3 months ago that it was fine he was getting the backing he was in the Vietnamese crisis. I said, "I am sure you will get that until about 90 days before the next election." I said that because I was here when we had the Korean crisis. Then the question will be asked about who is killing our boys and this will suddenly become Johnson's war.

While I am on this subject, let me say that I made a Memorial Day speech this past Sunday. This town celebrated it a week ahead of time, and I had no knowledge of what the distinguished Member of the other body who has been vocal in his support of the President was going to say out in Illinois. However, I told these people I was happy that the chief supporter of the President's policy was the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. While I was making that speech, I am told by one of my colleagues that this supporter was in Illinois making a speech saying, "I would like you people to remember that there was not a single American killed in Vietnam during the 8 years of General Eisenhower's administration." Well, that is not exactly true, either. Since I am in the process of straightening up the record, let me say that we got into the Vietnam thing not under the previous assassinated President or this President but under General Eisenhower, and we have been in it since. I am not blaming him. I think General Eisenhower did the right thing by going in there. I would point out to you that we have been in there over 10 years, and as of today our casualties—and I regret every one of them, because I know what heartache this brings to a family—are still fewer than they will be on this coming Memorial Day weekend on the highways.

The French, who were there 10 years trying to reimpose colonialism on the Vietnamese, had 140,000 casualties. So while this is a can of worms and we have not been the most brilliant in the han-

dling of it, at least our method of handling, from the casualties standpoint, has been superior to that of the French.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as long as we are in the process of allegedly straightening out the record, the gentleman implied that we had not participated or been involved in Vietnam prior to the time of President Eisenhower. I am sure the record will indicate that under Mr. Eisenhower's predecessor we inaugurated our MAAG—Military Advisory Assistance Group—in South Vietnam and contributed substantial economic assistance to South Vietnam under the Truman administration.

Mr. HAYS. That is right; assistance to the French in Vietnam. The point I am making is that when the French pulled out—and I say I thought our decision was the right decision—we decided to step in and carry the whole load. All I am asking is that when the blame is assessed in the next political campaign that everybody go back and read the complete record. I will say to the gentleman that I am not disputing at all what he says.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not think it would be fair to leave the remarks hanging as they are concerning our late assassinated President. Let us also include in the record that our late assassinated President, the great John Kennedy, inherited Cuba and Castro.

Mr. HAYS. Oh, yes. It was not under his administration that Castro made his pilgrimage through the United States and appeared before the Press Club with two wrist watches on his hand, one pointing this way and one pointing the other way. When he was asked why he said—and that is when I knew that he was nutty from that day on—he said he did not have to turn his wrist to look at it. Obviously, he would have to turn his wrist to look at either one of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the discussion back on the track of the proposed amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey what happened under this law that he has referred to so many times and which is supposed to have been so effective? How does it come that the Europeans have been supplying Castro and Communist Cuba with buses, with locomotives, with sugar-processing machinery and all that sort of thing? Why has not this been stopped under the law he cites if it is so effective?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yugoslavia and Canada sent the supplies, countries that do not get aid under the bill. Therefore I might say—

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, now; the gentleman knows—

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman wanted an answer and I wanted to give him an answer.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman gave me an answer and referred to the Communist countries. I am talking about the non-Communist countries that have been supplying Castro.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will let me finish, since when are France and Canada Communist?

Mr. GROSS. I said the non-Communist countries who have been supplying Castro.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Well, the United Kingdom does not get aid. Aid was cut off from them.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to answer the question, since the gentleman has yielded.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying that no non-Communist countries have been supplying Castro with anything of benefit to him?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I did not say that at all.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is the gentleman saying?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am saying that the countries that supplied Castro were Yugoslavia, to some extent, and Canada to some extent, France and the United Kingdom, who sent some buses. They do not get aid from the United States. Therefore, under 620 all countries that have been getting aid do not supply him and do not give any aid or assistance to Cuba under the provisions of 620, which expresses the sense of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman recall that not long ago we put up a substantial part of \$3 billion to prop up the pound sterling, to help the British save the pound sterling from collapse?

Mr. GALLAGHER. This does not have a thing to do with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It may have nothing to do with this particular law but what I am trying to point out to the gentleman is that this law is not effective. It has not been effective, and the gentleman knows it.

The amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from Florida would make it effective.

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

Mr. GROSS. No. The gentleman has had plenty of time. Let me say something else.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of the secret Communist meeting in Havana last November was brought up a little while ago in speaking of the administration's handling of foreign policy.

Do you know that testimony before our subcommittee revealed how the U.S. Government learned of this meeting in Havana, which was attended by Com-

munists from every Latin American country?

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Government discovered that this meeting had been held through an item in a Bolivian newspaper. With all of our vaunted intelligence, and with these emissaries of the Communists going from every Latin American country to Havana, this administration knew nothing about the meeting until it had been held.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not a fact that the law to which and about which the gentleman from New Jersey has spoken so highly allows the President to deny aid to nations which allow its shipping to be used in sending goods and materials to Cuba. Is it not true that Greece, a country which receives aid, has ships which have taken aid to Communist Cuba?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and Greece is not labeled as a Communist country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, I think there have been several others. Certainly the gentleman's point that this language has not been efficacious is well taken.

I would like to also make this point, if I may: I assume in writing this bill that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], and others, have tried to make the language which appears on page 15 with regard to trade with North Vietnam as strong as possible. At least, I do not know why they would not want the prohibition of aid to nations helping North Vietnam as strong as possible. If the point of the gentleman from New Jersey is correct, that the language now in the law dealing with Cuban imports is stronger than the language dealing with Vietnam, why do we not substitute the stronger language for that now appearing in the bill?

Are we going to be weak in prohibiting our aid recipients to aid North Vietnam?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Greece is now complying with the provisions of 620 and, therefore, it is effective.

Mr. GROSS. You hope it is, but the facts are that Communist Cuba is getting help from our so-called free world friends and everyone knows it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman wants to get the discussion back on the track, none of this discussion has had anything to do with this amendment. It was all very interesting, but the fact of the matter is that it did not have anything to do with the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CRAMER and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 2—Administrative provisions

Sec. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended, as follows:

(a) Amend section 622, which relates to coordination with foreign policy, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), immediately after "military assistance" insert "(including any civic action and sales program)".

(2) In subsection (c), immediately after "military assistance program" insert "(including any civic action and sales program)".

(b) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "Public Law 86-735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(c) Amend section 625(d), which relates to the employment of personnel, by striking out "twenty" in paragraph (2) and substituting "fifty".

(d) Amend section 626, which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(e) Amend section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, by inserting "benefits" after "travel expenses", in paragraphs (2) and (4).

(f) Amend section 635(g), which relates to general authorities, by inserting "and sales" after "loans" in the introductory clause.

(g) Amend section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, as follows:

(1) In subsection (e), strike out "section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62)" and substitute "section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 3105)".

(2) In subsection (f), strike out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substitute "Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(h) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1965" and "\$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "\$53,240,000", respectively.

(i) Amend section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, by striking out all beginning with "; or famine" and substituting a period.

(j) Add the following new section 639:

"Sec. 639. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMSON OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On page 17, immediately after line 2, insert the following:

"(3) At the end of subsection (d), add the following new paragraph:

"(8) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee of the United States performing end-use audit or end-use inspection activities outside the United

States in connection with programs with respect to which the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, has responsibilities under paragraph (2) of this subsection, shall be subject to the control and direction of the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, and shall report directly to him on their activities. Each agency of the United States Government shall cooperate with the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, including but not limited to the submission to the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, of written notification of every assignment of an officer or employee to perform activities referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph. This paragraph shall not apply to the General Accounting Office nor to any officer or employee thereof."

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes an extension but a very necessary addition to the authority of the Inspector General, who I think is doing an excellent job. The problem today is that the end-use investigators and the end-use inspectors who are trying to find out whether the money from the American AID program has been used in accordance with the law are working under the Ambassador or the mission chief in the country that is the recipient of the aid. About 3 years ago we had a glaring example which was brought out by the Porter-Hardy committee of an end-use investigator who had found out that American aid money was going into a Russian institution that was being constructed in Cambodia, and because he had the temerity to appear before the committee and testify to those facts, he lost his job. I think that the end-use investigator should be responsible not to the mission chief but to the Inspector General in Washington, D.C., and to the American taxpayer.

The record is replete with countries that received illegal money and improperly used money. One of the worst ones is Cambodia. Cambodia still owes us more than \$2 million because of improperly used money. Bolivia owes us \$1,400,000. The Dominican Republic owes us \$1,471,000 because of improperly used money. The Philippines owe us more than a million dollars. India owes us \$1,800,000. Pakistan owes us \$1,400,000. Spain owes us \$1,300,000.

I attribute much of this to the fact that the end-use investigators are too much obligated to the mission chief or to the ambassador who is trying to curry favor with the nationals of the country in which they are stationed. I think it would be to the great interest of the American taxpayer and to this program if we can tighten up the use of that money and insure that it is being properly used because I am convinced that much of the criticism of this program comes from the fact that money is being spent for lipstick and deodorants and sex stimulants and things of that kind which irritate the American taxpayer.

If my colleagues will read the debate on this bill last year, you will see the references to that and it may seem humorous to some but when it runs into millions of dollars, I think it is certainly unnecessary and reprehensible that it is permitted by this Government.

Just yesterday I pointed out in the report of the Comptroller General of

April 29 about AID money going for railroad equipment to build a railroad bed. The equipment cost \$543,000 and they sent the equipment over to Turkey after the roadbed had been constructed.

When it was pointed out that they did not need the equipment for construction, the AID Agency insisted that they leave the equipment there for maintenance. But the Comptroller General pointed out that, even so, the Agency files indicate that, for the most part, the equipment may not be needed for maintenance of the project.

This is an incredible situation pointed out by the Comptroller General, who says:

We found that the Agency's organizational unit responsible for the postaudit of Agency-financed purchases and initiation of any appropriate refund action was not made aware of the ineligibility of the construction equipment questioned in this report.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. First let me say that I agree with the gentleman as to the necessity for end-use determination. I do not believe there is any quarrel about that. I am trying to decide whether the amendment would, by placing the end-use investigator under the direct supervision of the Inspector General, as I understand it, take the investigator away from the chief of mission or from the Ambassador.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. It would make him responsible directly to the Inspector General. It would eliminate his dependence for his position and the assurance of his continuation of his efforts on the mission director or on the Ambassador. I am very hopeful that the chairman of the committee, who instituted the Inspector General, will accept this amendment as a proper extension of that authority.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to inform the author of the amendment that I rise in opposition.

It is true what the gentleman said; I am the author of the provision in existing law which created the Inspector General. When that office was created by amendment in the AID bill 4 years ago, I fully intended that the Office of the Inspector General be a compact supervisory but nonoperating organization.

Now, if I remember correctly, the Inspector General's office has about 50 employees. The amendment of the gentleman would add the end-use inspectors in each country. We have a program, let us say, in some 80 countries. If we assume there are 3 or 4 end-use inspectors in each country, this would channel into the Office of the Inspector General 250 more employees. I believe this would interfere with effectiveness of the work of the Inspector General.

We created this office to check up on the inspectors, not to do the inspecting. I cannot see how the amendment would improve making use of the end-use inspectors.

The gentleman knows and I know that since Mr. Bell took over as AID Adminis-

trator he has made a real effort to keep track of what is going on in the field and have the end-use inspectors work better. I believe they are doing a better job. I believe that the problems of which the gentleman from Wisconsin spoke are being cleared up.

Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. May I read from the testimony in the hearings, on page 956. Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, the author of the amendment, asked Mr. Bell about this particular problem in committee. Mr. Bell's reply was:

The Inspector General has all the staff that he thinks he needs and wants, and can hire more any time he wants. Whether or not he has end-use inspectors, I must insist that my mission directors have end-use—it is my responsibility and that of my mission directors to see that the goods go where they are supposed to go. I would feel it incumbent on me to have end-use inspectors.

Would the chairman agree that the basic issue is whether or not we assume the mission director and the Ambassador are trying to run a good, tight, honest program? That is the basic issue. If we so assume, the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GALLAGHER. With respect to the lipstick and other items of interest, to which the gentleman referred, those were found and discovered not by the gentleman by the AID administration itself. They have since made claims, and are in the process of collecting for those items.

Mr. MORGAN. They were found by the very end-use inspectors who are now under criticism by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Exactly.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I would like to point out to the Committee and our very distinguished Chairman that the report I read from was submitted to this House in 1963 and submitted again in 1964 and it was submitted again on April 29, 1965, because the AID administration failed to do anything for a period of 3 years. The Comptroller General says in that report he will continue to call it to the attention of the Congress. It is only \$543,000 of improperly used AID money, but I think that this House can do a lot more than they appear willing to do in order to tighten this program up in the interests both of this program and of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. MORGAN. I agree with the gentleman that we should tighten up the program, but I am opposed to our moving the end-use inspectors out from under the country missions and putting them under the Inspector General. That is not going to tighten up the program. I think the end-use inspectors are absolutely necessary in their present stations.

The mission director and the Ambassador, of course, must use end-use inspectors. You have heard the gentleman from New Jersey read the testimony in which the AID director said he must have end-use inspectors in the field under the mission director in order to discharge his responsibilities. The gentleman will create 250 new jobs under the AID agency if his recommendation is approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 18, line 5—

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN. The Clerk started to read on page 18, line 13, and the gentleman's amendment refers to an earlier part of the bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, when the Clerk finished reading he was on line 3, page 17. He was not yet at line 13 on page 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had read through line 12 on page 18 and commenced to read at the proper place.

The Clerk will read.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 18, line 5, strike out "\$53,240,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$51,500,000".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to state I am not going to insist on my point of order, but if the Members on the other side are going to offer any further amendments to this bill they should be prepared at the proper time to offer the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the gentleman from Illinois was not on his feet and offered his amendment at the time the Clerk started reading. The Clerk read through line 12 on page 18. The amendment is proposed to an earlier section, and therefore the Chair rules that the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 18, line 13:

Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 303. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 642(a)(2), which relates to statutes repealed, by striking out "143," and all beginning with "Provided," up to the semicolon.

(b) Amend section 644, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (g), insert "and not procured in anticipation of military assist-

ance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order," after "United States Government" and strike out "as grant assistance".

(2) In subsection (m)(2), strike out "Such price shall be the same standard price" and substitute "Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices)".

(3) Amend the paragraph following the numbered paragraph (3) in subsection (m) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence, insert "and sales" after "Military assistance".

(B) In the second proviso, strike out "by the military assistance program".

(c) Amend section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, by striking out "Public Law 86-735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 19, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"(d) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 649. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,934,195,000 for the fiscal year 1966 to carry out the provisions of part I and section 637(a) of this Act and, notwithstanding section 610 of this Act, shall be utilized as the President may determine to carry out such provisions. All other provisions of this Act authorizing the appropriation of funds to carry out the provisions of part I and section 637(a) of this Act are repealed."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would solve some of the difficulties encountered this afternoon by way of checking up on the use of funds in this foreign handout program. All this amendment would do is cut \$1 billion out of the bill. It is just that simple. With that reduction we could begin to get some order out of the confusion that is going on with respect to checking up on how the money is being spent and for what purpose.

The new authorization in this bill is more than \$2 billion; \$2,004 million plus a few odd thousands. Previously authorized \$1.5 billion, and the Alliance for Progress \$600 million, for a total of \$4,104 million.

I do nothing with the military assistance end of this bill which is \$1,170 million. Subtracting \$1,170 million leaves a total of \$2,934,195,000. The adoption of my amendment would take off \$1 billion, leaving \$1,934,195,000 in the bill, which, added to the estimated \$6.2 billion of unexpended funds in the pipeline is more than sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many faucets in this program of foreign aid that I would not know, and I doubt that anyone else would know, how to reach the separate faucets in order to cut down the flow of cash. So, by force of necessity, we must go to the main stem, to the main valve and twist that down a little bit if we are ever going to phase out this program. No one can tell actually how the money is being spent. Not even the General Accounting Office, as the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. THOMSON, has so well said, can ascertain how the money is being spent and for what purposes.

Finally, I think it is high time that in the interest of the taxpayers of this country and in the interest of Congress we break up the monopoly that the United States holds on foreign aid. If we phase this program out, get it down to size, and get out of this business, we can uproot the monopoly that we have had for so many years on dissipating the resources of the U.S. taxpayers all over the world.

Let some of the other countries take over and establish foreign aid monopolies. Let them take over the business of dishing out their cash to foreigners all over the world. I am sure the Democrat Members of the House, being the great antimonopolists they are reputed to be, will want to join me in this effort to bust the world's biggest monopoly of dispensing foreign aid that the United States has had for so long and which has cost the taxpayers so dearly.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Would the gentleman say that his amendment gives a certain flexibility to the administration in that it permits the administration to decide where it will cut the \$1 billion?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it gives the administration all the flexibility in the world. It can spend and give priority to any program within the limits of the \$1,900 million that is left.

Mr. Chairman, I would think that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in justice to the taxpayers of this country, in justice to all of us, would arise and accept this amendment without any argument.

That would be a fine way for him to close out this day.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I know that the gentleman from Iowa and others in the minority have some constructive criticism to make and some guidance for the President.

However, I cannot see just exactly why the gentleman from Iowa selected \$1 billion. Using the gentleman's own argument would it not be better probably in order to break this monopoly to probably cut it by \$2 billion?

Mr. GROSS. No. It would probably take a little time to end this monopoly. Even in the courts, they go through various stages. I am not a lawyer, but I know that charges have to be filed and the lawyers have to prepare their cases. So I am willing to give a reasonable amount of time and money.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. I would suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] that if he wants the constructive ideas of the minority, that he refer to the minority views in this year's report, in which we set forth what we thought were some worthwhile suggestions.

Mr. GROSS. On the subject of foreign aid, I forgot to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin and the members of the committee that there is another subsidy to the foreigners that was approved the other day in the matter of artificial and rigged coffee prices. Coffee has gone up some 20 cents a pound since the coffee agreement was entered into and the coffee cartel in London took over. You can just figure that up. Each 1-cent-per-pound increase in the price of coffee adds up to \$31 million in added cost to American consumers. So, on top of all the rest of this money that is being dished out to the various international lending agencies, and on top of this bill, American consumers of coffee are adding another \$500 or \$600 million subsidy to the Latin American countries.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I do not see any connection whatsoever between the statement that has been made by the gentleman from Iowa and his pending amendment.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to say is that they can easily live with this \$1 billion cut, in view of all of the other subsidies and handouts that are being made available to them.

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

Mr. GROSS. Sure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would like to reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR]. I have carefully read the minority views and I submit that I have found no constructive suggestions in that part of the report. Further, I am not a doctor but it seems to me that if a patient is sick—if the aid program is sick and is suffering from some ailment—we should try to cure him. However, it also appears to me that the suggestions of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is not to operate on the patient but to shoot him.

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee feels it would be rather unwise to take out \$1 billion at this time.

Therefore, we oppose the amendment and urge its rejection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa talked about the monopoly we have on foreign aid. Does not the gentleman know that several of our allies have foreign aid programs?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and a notable one is the State of Israel that entered into a foreign aid program while we were pouring dollars in there to keep them going, and they used our money.

Mr. JOELSON. Does the gentleman know anything about West Germany's foreign aid program at the present time? Does he know that many of our allies are contributing more as to per capita income to foreign aid than we are?

I do not think the gentleman is accurate when he talks about our having a monopoly.

Mr. GROSS. We subsidize them to carry on these foreign aid programs.

Mr. JOELSON. We are not subsidizing West Germany today. West Germany has a very large foreign aid program as well as several other of our allies which are not receiving a penny in foreign aid.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this \$1.3 billion cut offered by the gentleman from Iowa, of course, is going to cause a great deal of hardship to the economic part of the foreign assistance program. This cut would affect the Alliance for Progress, the Children's Fund, the International Organizations, and of course the old point IV operations which are still being carried on.

I think the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to direct the attention of the Members of the House to a development in a matter in which we should all be interested.

Mr. Chairman, along with many Members of this House, I intend once again to cast my vote for a foreign aid authorization, in hope that it will strengthen the President's hand in a troubled world.

My conscience tells me to support this legislation even though it may not be widely popular among the people I represent.

But it seems to me that we owe the taxpayers every assurance that their money is being closely accounted for.

Mr. Chairman, much has been made of purported extravagance in the use of foreign aid funds. We rightly insist on the sharpest scrutiny over these expenditures. Yet there is little opportunity for an individual Congressman to ferret out such abuses.

I would rather direct the attention of colleagues to an area in which we certainly can move to prevent abuse—right in our own offices.

On April 22, I introduced H.R. 7572, aimed at making certain that the clerk-hire funds available to congressional offices are paid only to employees on the job here in Washington, or in the Congressman's home community.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Did the gentleman from California obtain unanimous consent to speak out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I was not aware I was speaking out of order.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not make the point of order. I just present it as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I thank the gentleman for this concern.

During House Administration Subcommittee hearings on that bill, it was discovered that my proposal might not be needed. For in passing clerk-hire legislation in the 88th Congress, we had adopted a resolution, House Resolution 294, with the following paragraph:

SEC. 2. No person shall be paid from any clerk-hire allowance if such person does not perform the services for which he receives such compensation in the offices of such Member or Resident Commissioner in Washington, District of Columbia, or in the State or the district which such Member or Resident Commissioner represents.

The terms of that House Resolution 294, 88th Congress, were carried over into the 89th Congress by the passage of House Resolution 7, offered by the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and passed on the first day of this session.

Mr. Chairman, I understand from press reports that the distinguished chairman of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], has called upon the Clerk of the House to determine whether the regulations on clerk-hire, as prescribed by both the 88th and 89th Congresses, are being or have been violated by any Member.

I hope the Clerk will undertake such a study, and make known his findings to this body in the very near future.

Where improprieties exist, they should be eliminated. The millions of Americans who tend to regard politicians at all levels with cynicism should come to know that the word "Honorable," appearing in front of a Congressman's name, means exactly what it says.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I seldom like to take the floor twice in one day to make announcements about our space program, but I know it is of great interest and importance to all of you.

Mr. Chairman, NASA—Houston announced today that an astronaut may get out of the Gemini 4 spacecraft during the manned mission scheduled for June 3.

Pilot Edward H. White, if conditions are favorable, will open the right hand hatch of the Gemini 4 spacecraft and float some 25 feet out into space on the end of an umbilical line.

The extravehicular activity is tentatively scheduled for a total of 22 minutes, beginning the second orbit of the flight over Hawaii with nearly 10 minutes of the activity completely outside of the spacecraft.

NASA delayed the decision until today until final qualifications tests could be completed on the spacecraft, space suit, secondary life support patch and umbilical, although planning for such extravehicular activities has been going on since the beginning of the Gemini program.

The Gemini program has three primary objectives: Long duration flight, rendezvous and docking and extravehicular activities. NASA associate administrator, Robert C. Seamans, Jr., said:

We have spent a great deal of time planning for extravehicular activities and the decision to include the activity in this mission came after a long series of carefully planned tests of the equipment especially the life support test packs and training of the astronauts. It was only when we were satisfied that these tests were successfully completed that we made the final decision to go ahead.

The first manned mission in the Gemini program was a three-orbit flight March 23 with astronauts Virgil I. Grissom and John Young. The Gemini 4 mission with James McDivitt as the command pilot is scheduled for 62 revolutions over a 4-day period. The mission with the extravehicular experiment could establish two U.S. "firsts", the longest U.S. space flight and the first extravehicular activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 4—Amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

SEC. 401. Section 107 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"No sale under title I of this Act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States. No such sale shall be based on the requirements of the United Arab Republic for more than one fiscal year. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to sales made to the United Arab Republic under title I of this Act."

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct an inquiry to the chairman of our committee. In view of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we have very effectively completed a discussion of this bill without accepting any amendments, would the gentleman care to inform the House of the position the House will take if the other body should pass on a two-year authorization as opposed to our one-year authorization?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, if the gentleman took the time to read the majority report, on page 3 he would find some clear language outlining the position of the majority as far as the 2-year authorization is concerned. Today when I spoke on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana dealing with the development loan fund, I indicated that with the ending of the long-term authorizations which run out in fiscal 1966, I felt a new look should be taken

at these authorizations. I strongly believe it should be a one-year authorization as far as the bill as a whole is concerned. I can see some justification for long-range authorizations for the lending part of the bill, but I certainly will support legislation providing for annual authorizations.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the chairman for his comments.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to refer specifically to the last section which has been read. While I applaud the recognition of a point which many of my colleagues, as well as myself, have been making, that aid to the UAR under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act must be terminated in the face of increasingly anti-American statements and acts of Colonel Nasser. I am concerned about what might be taken as an ambiguity in the language before us. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a number of questions.

First, with reference to the determination as to what is essential in the national interest of the United States, there is, as I understand, no specific criterion laid down either in the report or anywhere else. I should specifically like to know whether it is the chairman's understanding that this finding will be made public, so that we all may know what is considered essential.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. The determination, of course, will be made by the President. There are certain documents of the President which are not made public. I assume, when and if the President makes any determination under this language, that when the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate are informed, some information might be classified. On the other hand, the fact that a determination has been made will be made public.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I take it from what the gentleman said that this will be a public document. Following that up, will the appropriate Senate committees and the Speaker of the House be consulted in advance of the proposed sale, or be advised of its completion after the fact?

Mr. MORGAN. It has always been the custom for the executive branch, when making a finding of this kind, and there have been a number of cases comparable to that which relates to the United Arab Republic, to brief the committee before a determination is made.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

With respect to the fiscal year that is described, does that mean the current fiscal year or the coming fiscal year?

Mr. MORGAN. That means the coming fiscal year, 1966.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman does not mind, I should like to refer back to section 101, on page 1, beginning at

line 11 and continuing to line 7 of page 2.

I certainly commend the committee for the proposed amendment to section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which I believe makes clear that Congress is deeply disturbed by the incidents of desecration and destruction of American property by mob violence. I should like to know whether the chairman would agree that much of this mob violence occurs because of acts and statements of some of the leaders of these countries. This reflex action goes beyond the borders of the country.

In essence what we are saying—I ask whether the gentleman would agree—is that while we deplore the acts themselves we also deplore anything which incites them in any manner.

Mr. MORGAN. I agree with the gentleman. I am sure that some of the statements made by leaders of these countries have been responsible for riots and destruction of property.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. I should like to bring to the attention of the gentleman the fact that at a hearing of the Subcommittee on the Near East, at which there was testimony by the Under Secretary of State for the Near East and the Assistant Secretary of the Agency for International Development, I inquired whether we would be informed prior to the determination of how much assistance we were to give to Egypt, rather than being told after the fact, as was suggested. We were told, if I remember correctly, that we would be advised before any aid was to be given, and that any determination they were to make they would inform us about prior to doing so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman. Would the gentleman agree that the import of this section, in essence, is that aid under the surplus food program has now come to an end except for some extraordinary reason in the interest of the United States?

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the exchange between the distinguished chairman of the committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. I believe that section 401 in the bill does deserve our special attention.

Section 401 amends section 107 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 by adding:

No sale under title I of this Act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States. No such sale shall be based on the requirements of the United Arab Republic for more than one fiscal year.

The section also includes a most important provision concerning aid to Nasser:

The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to sales made to the United Arab Republic under title I of this Act.

The Foreign Affairs Committee deserves commendation for including this important section. I also want to commend our colleague, Mr. FARBSTAIN of New York, for his part in drafting this language. Ever since I have been in Congress I have been deeply concerned with the fact that the United States aids a country which clearly plans aggression against one of our great democratic friends—Israel. On the floor of the House and in communications to the Secretary of State and the President I have pointed out that our aid to Nasser is inconsistent with our commitment to peace and democracy. This commitment led the Congress to write into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 a clause which "is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against any country receiving assistance under this Act or any other act."

It is clear from the debate that the intent of the Congress was to deny aid to Nasser. Again in 1964 the Congress amended Public Law 480 to provide that no sales shall be made to any country if the President finds such country is "an aggressor in a military sense against any country having diplomatic relations with the United States." Again the clear intent of the Congress was to deny aid to the United Arab Republic.

Nasser is in violation of both the Foreign Assistance Act and Public Law 480. He has continued to foment strife in the Middle East. His self-admitted determination to destroy Israel has not abated. On the contrary, he has accelerated his arms buildup and still receives substantial quantities of highly sophisticated weapons from the Soviet bloc. Nasser has also employed German scientists to work on missile development to aid in his plans for the destruction of Israel. Nasser has incited other Arab states to join in the establishment of the United Arab Command for the purpose of military encirclement of Israel. He has also worked with other Arab countries toward the diversion of the headwaters of the Jordan River.

In addition to his anti-Israel crusade, Nasser is clearly anti-American. His speeches reflect this sentiment. He has accused the U.S. Ambassador of using economic pressure and has told his people that anyone disagreeing with his anti-U.S. attitude "can drink from the sea."

Mr. Chairman, the existing prohibitions against aid to Nasser have never been implemented. I have time and time again asked the State Department for an explanation of the flouting of congressional intent. All I have received is avoidance of the question. It is time for Congress to unequivocally assert itself on

this important issue. Appeasement of Nasser must end.

I hope that section 401 will in fact terminate aid to Nasser and that the President will, in keeping with this section, keep the Congress informed on this issue. The record is plain. It is time for plain action.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have supported this legislation for 16 years. I have had some doubts about it from time to time and I have some serious doubts about part of it at the moment, but in voting for or against this legislation you have a kind of tough choice to make. If you vote against it, you vote against all of the money for prosecuting the war in Vietnam. On the other hand, if you vote for it—and this choice occurs in nearly every bill—you vote for some things that you probably think are not right and that you do not like. I had thought I would vote against the bill, and I would probably do so, undoubtedly, if it were not for the money in it for Vietnam, which I think is important and necessary. However, if Congress adjourns at a reasonable time this year for the first time in a long time, I do propose as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on State Department personnel, which includes the AID personnel, to hold some rather searching inquiries about the adequacy of some of this personnel. I think some of the decisions they have made in some of the areas of the world about spending this money have been, to put it mildly, unfortunate. I have gotten the definite conclusion that some of these people in the AID program are more interested in maintaining the bureaucracy at its present high level of employment than they are in doing a job. We would gather from some of the hearings we have been having that some of the Government employee organizations are interested in seeing that everybody in AID stays on the job whether they are competent or whether they are not competent. This organization has been in existence for a long time. In the beginning, under the Marshall plan, when we were operating in areas where we were putting people with high industrial competence back to work, I do not think anybody can deny that if it had not been for this program some of the nations of Western Europe at least, who are not behind the Iron Curtain today, would have been behind the Iron Curtain. When we moved into the underdeveloped areas of the world, it seems to me that imagination was lacking and there was too much of the idea down there, "Well, the program is to pour in money and build more dams and create more work, as we did in Europe, so let us do it everywhere."

I said before and I will say again that in the underdeveloped areas of the world it seems to me that the Peace Corps is doing a better job in a great many respects than the AID program because they are attacking the problem that we are supposed to be attacking, in the basic

areas of villages and schools and health and things of that kind.

Mr. Chairman, I hope, if we do have some time this fall, if Congress is not in session, that I can get a reasonable number of the members of my committee together so that we may take a look, a long and sweeping look at this program in some of the underdeveloped countries, not necessarily to go there, but to examine the people who are making the decisions here in Washington and to find out why they made some of the decisions that they have made.

Although I have defended this program and fought for it for 16 years I am not one of those who says that everything they have done is perfect. I do think there is a great area that could be improved upon in our AID program outside the military area.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the first trip abroad that I made was with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]. That was quite a number of years ago and I shall never forget it. I was proud of being a member of a group headed by the gentleman from Ohio. It was a hard working delegation. I know that when the gentleman undertakes the investigation to which he has referred following the adjournment of Congress he will do a mighty good job.

Mr. Chairman, that however is not why I asked for this time. Today is the second anniversary of the signing of the Charter of African Unity. I am chairman, as many of you know, of the Subcommittee on Africa. I have a pride, a very deep pride, as has the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and I am sure all members of our subcommittee, in the progress that has been made in Africa. Each year has been a year of going forward.

I know that on occasion we read in the newspapers bad news from Africa, but by far most of the news is good. It all adds up to a story of real hemispheric progress.

I am happy to note that the second anniversary of the signing of the historic charter in Addis Ababa falls on the day when we are passing in this Chamber the foreign aid bill with fewer storms than it has ever experienced since I have been here.

In my remarks on May 29, 1963, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 8, pages 9851-9853. I said that the charter of African unity was to be compared to the Articles of Confederation that loosely bound our States together during the Revolutionary War and the critical period which led to the adoption of the Constitution that perfected our Union.

I stated further that I regarded the all-African charter of unity of such importance as a statement of the common objectives of the African nations and the methods agreed upon for the advancement of the interest of an entire continent that I was including in my remarks the full text of the document.

Those interested, then, may refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

In the 2 years of its existence the Organization of African Unity has served well the causes of the independent nations of Africa. One of the challenges that first came to it was the settlement of a border dispute between Algeria and Morocco, and what might have developed into a war between these neighboring countries was averted.

It sought to bring peace and understanding between warring forces in the Congo, and while in this the full objective was not attained it at least was heartening and reassuring to know that the Africans themselves working within the charter of their own organization were undertaking the solution of African problems.

Mr. Chairman, for myself, for the Subcommittee on Africa, and I think I am safe in saying for the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and for the House of Representatives itself, I extend to all the nations of Africa warm congratulations on the second anniversary of their union and sincere good wishes for the future.

It is the policy of the United States, as I understand it, to abide by the decisions of the African states on the sound reasoning that equitable and lasting solutions of African problems can come only from the Africans themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues who have little personal knowledge of Africa, as well as those better informed, will find interest in the African economic assistance program for fiscal 1966, as projected in the bill we are about to pass, and a brief sketch of past accomplishments and future plans.

The total program request for economic assistance to Africa amounts to \$218 million—\$100 million in development lending, \$92 million in technical cooperation and \$26 million in supporting assistance. An additional \$5 million is included in the appropriation for "contribution to international organizations" to continue the presence of essential U.N. personnel in the Congo. The program represents less than a 10-percent increase over fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and substantially less than the \$315 million in fiscal year 1962 and \$261 million in fiscal year 1963. In comparison with the Latin American region—the United States increased its economic assistance to Latin America from \$254 million 5 years ago to an estimated \$610 million for fiscal year 1966. U.S. economic assistance to Africa was \$264 million in 1961, \$46 million more than what is projected for 1966.

While assistance to 32 countries is planned in 1966, two less than in 1965, about 60 percent of the authorized funds are expected to be spent in five countries—Nigeria, Liberia, Ethiopia, Tunisia, and the Congo. Each of these countries is a firm supporter of the Western world, each is important to U.S. interests and for the most part each is characterized by considerable stability.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Of the \$92 million proposed for technical assistance in 1966, by far the larg-

est amount will be spent in the agriculture and education sectors; \$85 million is required to cover the minimal requirements for carrying forward existing projects leaving just \$7 million either for additional costs of continuing projects or for new ones. As of December 31, 1964, there were in effect \$85.2 million worth of contracts in 30 countries. Eighty percent of these funds were for university and foundation contracts in the education and agriculture fields. For the five countries receiving most of the aid university contracts in these two fields totaled as follows:

	(Dollar amounts in millions)	Number of contracts
Nigeria.....	\$17.5	11
Ethiopia.....	10.7	2
Liberia.....	5.0	4
Tunisia.....	.8	1
Congo.....	.4	1

DEVELOPMENT LOANS

The \$100 million for development loans proposed in fiscal year 1966 are intended mostly for capital projects, especially in Nigeria and Tunisia. In all at least 30 proposed loans in some 14 countries are to be considered in fiscal year 1966 covering a wide range of activities—local development banks lending to local private investors, navigational aids and other equipment for civil aviation facilities, expansion of roads, railways and communication and construction of college facilities; as of December 31, 1964, interest collected on loans amounted to \$28.2 million in dollars and dollar equivalents and principal repayments of \$5.1 million.

SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

About \$26 million of the total aid request is proposed for supporting assistance in 1966, a continued reduction from previous levels. The bulk is programed for the Congo where the funds will be used to try to maintain security until that country can reestablish the conditions for longrun development.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In the political field major recipients of U.S. aid have weathered serious political storms and have built genuine stability.

First, Nigeria—the world's 10th largest country in population—has built a federation of some 55 million diverse peoples, has converted its form of government to that of a republic and has added a fourth region to its original three regions. Last December, Nigeria weathered its first general election since independence in 1960 and came through the experience stronger than ever, despite an acute period of dissension.

Nigeria has resolved its political conflict by adherence to the rule of law and constitutional processes and has reached the point where Prime Minister Balewa recently was able to say: "The President—Azikiwe—and I have once again shown that the things that bind Nigerians together are stronger than those which separate them."

Second, Ethiopia is another country that has strengthened its government since an abortive revolution in 1961 and

has moved ahead to play a leading role in African affairs. This oldest of independent African countries has been governed by Emperor Haile Selassie since 1930, and his leadership has survived both foreign invasion and domestic crisis during the 35 years of his reign. In the last few years, the Emperor has become a leading figure in pan-African matters. His role in the formation of the Organization of African Unity was especially impressive.

Third, Tunisia also has developed a high degree of order and stability which has led to a remarkable level of economic growth in that country. Working quietly and steadily on the improvement of its agricultural economy, Tunisia has put to good use the assistance it has received—principally from France and the United States—and the standard of living of its people is rising—hearings on FAA of 1965, page 101.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRAMS

In the economic field a number of African countries appear to be making solid economic and social progress.

First. In recent years, Liberia, Ethiopia, and Nigeria have been able to increase their gross national product by 4 to 5 percent annually.

Second. Agricultural production for the entire continent has risen 25 percent in the past 10 years.

Third. African exports have increased 45 percent in the same period of time.

Fourth. Oil production in Libya and Nigeria has increased sharply in the last 4 years.

Fifth. The U.N. Economic Commission for Africa is one of the most active and most effective of the U.N. regional bodies. Its activities in planning for African development augur well for the future. For example: (a) The ECA fathered the African Development Bank established last year; (b) the ECA is cooperating with African nations in planning regionally integrated programs in such fields as transportation, telecommunications, and industrialization.

Sixth. In education, Africa is making remarkable progress. South of the Sahara in the past 4 years, the number of universities has risen from 24 to 35. Secondary school enrollment has increased from about 800,000 to 1.8 million. (a) Thirty U.S. colleges and universities hold 39 contracts to assist education in 15 African countries. (b) Nearly 3,500 Peace Corps volunteers are now in 19 African countries, and most of them are working in educational activities—from FAA of 1965 hearings, page 102-103.

BLOC AID

Combined Soviet and Communist Chinese offers of aid to Africa—exclusive of the United Arab Republic—totaled about \$413 million for fiscal year 1964. The cumulative total of Communist offers to African nations amounts to more than \$1 billion although less than one-fifth has been drawn upon by African governments. More than one-half of all Communist aid to less developed countries is currently earmarked for Africa. Free world aid to Africa dropped from \$1.77 billion in 1962 to \$1.41 billion in 1964. At the same time Communist assistance doubled. At the

present time the Soviets have diplomatic relations with 24 African countries—6 new in 1964—and Communist China with 17—7 new in 1964. So far, however, there is no Communist satellite in Africa.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT

U.S. investment in Africa—excluding the United Arab Republic—has increased over fivefold in 10 years. It went from \$267 million in 1950 to \$1,423 million in 1963. AID points out one program in the field of private enterprise they consider promising. Mr. Hutchinson, in his testimony on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, page 111, describes it as follows:

That is, by working with the Small Business Administration we have been able to find a number of small businessmen in the States who have been quite successful in their own businesses here, who have some desire to expand their businesses overseas and are also really pretty highly motivated in terms of wanting to make a demonstration of the American way of life overseas.

We find that there is a very considerable kind and degree of motivation on their part. We have sent two groups of six to eight people each to Tunisia with a view to seeing if they could develop joint enterprises with Tunisian businesses. These would be quite small. The experience has been quite surprising. Out of the first group one man has already come back and obtained his investment survey guarantee and gone into a detailed examination of a little project for millwork with Tunisian partners.

Three of the second group have themselves already organized a Tunisian development corporation. This is an American corporation to which they have contributed capital themselves with a view to investing in Tunisian industry with Tunisian partners.

There are two small industries that they have decided to go into and have selected their partners. There are a number of other specific projects and proposals which we expect they will be going forward with. I won't take the time of the committee to go into them in detail.

Let me say that out of these groups we have already developed a number of projects where we expect only quite small American investment, but these represent joint undertakings with Tunisians to develop a private endeavor. This is a country which hasn't been too sure it was very much interested in the private sector. The response by the Tunisian Government has been very good. In fact, a quasi-governmental agency was willing to pay the travel expenses of this second group over there to make the investigation.

After we get a few of these successfully going in Tunisia, we expect to send another group over and we hope to expand this effort into other countries. It is a type of approach that is new and hasn't been tried. But I think our success in actually getting some proposals and some prospects going has been better with this approach than anything we have tried in the private sector to date.

We wanted to call it specifically to your attention because the idea of the small man going in, particularly in the African situation, where business must by its nature be very, very small, is a dimension that hasn't been in our program before and we think that this may be very significant.

Mr. Chairman, this is the story of success, the story of marvelous and continuing programs of the nations of Africa. The aid we give to Africa will be returned to us a thousandfold in rich new markets opened for our products and our wares and in deep and abiding friendships in a world of freedom. Again our congratu-

lations and good wishes in this happy second anniversary of the Charter of African Unity.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: On page 20, line 1, strike out "national interest" and insert in lieu thereof "national security".

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, last March this Congress was presented with a difficult decision. The United Arab Republic sought an extension of aid. Although I was opposed to this extension, because of an emergency I voted to give the President the flexibility to extend or not to extend aid, at his discretion, if it best served the interest and security of the United States. My vote was predicated on the belief that as a U.S. Congressman and citizen, the safety and security of our country must remain of paramount importance in all my decisions.

This vote did not then, nor does it now, alter my firm belief that the United Arab Republic has by its actions demonstrated that it is worthy of continued American aid.

I am convinced that Nasser is an ingrate who asks our aid on the one hand and encourages mobs to stone our Embassy on the other. Not long ago he told the United States to "go drink in the sea." I do not believe the American people favor such highhanded treatment from Nasser or any other Communist-dominated dictator of this ilk.

H.R. 7750 has been offered to further amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I wish to take issue with a section of this bill—namely, chapter 4, amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Under section 401, the following language is found:

No sale under title I of this act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States.

I take exception to the word "interest." It is my belief that the word "security" should be substituted.

It is my belief that Nasser should be denied our help under all circumstances. But I think the criteria to be applied by the President in determining who receives our aid should be our national security, not merely our national interest.

Interest is a broad, general term implying concernment. Security is a sharper, more precise term which means freedom from danger and risk. This is the core of the matter.

I want it made incumbent upon the President not to extend aid to Nasser unless the security—the freedom from danger and risk—of our Nation is directly enhanced by such aid.

Generally, decisions on whether to extend aid to a foreign nation should be a matter determined simply by our national interest. But in cases where the supplicating hands of tyrants are extended toward us, the hands of those

who have vilified us, ridiculed us, spat upon our flag, then our national security must be the only meaningful criteria.

I call upon the House of Representatives to support my plea to withhold aid to Nasser and others of his breed except in those cases where our own American national security is directly enhanced by such aid.

It is high time for us to be as pragmatic in the use of our power as our adversaries have been cynical in the use of theirs.

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

Mr. Chairman, opposing this amendment, I should in the beginning like to say that I certainly hold no brief for Mr. Nasser. I find his actions just as reprehensible as does the gentleman who just occupied the well. For this reason, I offered in the committee an amendment to the bill that constitutes the language which appears on page 19 which says:

No sale under Title I of this Act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in addition to this, there was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBER] and others, a provision accepted by the committee, that no such sale shall be based on the requirements of the United Arab Republic for more than one fiscal year.

In addition to this, this section contains a requirement that the President keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to the sales, a requirement of publicity.

It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the language that we have used "essential to the national interest" is strong language. Perhaps "security" would be stronger. Perhaps it would be somewhat different but to me, the distinction is one without significance.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that I voted twice in 1963 to permit the continuance of the sales to the United Arab Republic. But I now feel that we should have in this bill a specific provision to put Nasser and others of his ilk on notice as to what the intention of the House of Representatives and the Congress, and the people of the United States is in this connection.

I might say also that this language "essential to the national interest" is the same language that appears in the bill at the present time with reference to the prohibition of aid to Cuba and the section relating to Indonesia, so that it is language that has already been accepted by the House and has been used under comparable circumstances.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I agree with the gentleman's definition of the use of the words "national interest" in the bill. May I ask the gentleman, not only is this prohibition in the bill, but is it not his understanding that the only commit-

ments now with respect to aid are to terminating the existing program? There are no funds for future programs.

Mr. MONAGAN. The program has been terminated, insofar as I am informed, and there is no current program in existence at the present time. So that in that sense this provision is academic. The Executive has already acted with reference to this program, but nevertheless I feel this should be here with reference to any future program.

Mr. FASCELL. The administration has made the statement that it would not consider a new program until there are changes of policy in that country?

Mr. MONAGAN. I think that has been obvious, and that certainly was made clear to the committee in the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated I urge rejection of this amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the interest of the United States is peace in the Middle East. How to achieve peace is difficult. It involves more than the military safety of the United States. It involves the security and welfare of Israel and others. This is a political, economic, as well as military problem. The committee amendment recognizes this and directs the President to do what is necessary to achieve this goal. The amendment unduly restricts the President to achieve what we all want to achieve.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important provisions contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 is the provision amending section 224 to provide funds for investment guarantees to stimulate construction in Latin America of privately owned housing for low-income families.

As has been said many times here, tens of millions of families in Latin America still suffer privations forced by very low national family incomes; in particular, millions have only the most primitive housing.

Each year, their frustration manifests itself in rebellion and revolution, with such frequency that we have become almost insensitive to their governmental troubles. But Batista and Castro, Trujillo, and Cannano and Imbert, remind us all too painfully, that the aspirations of the sugar cutters of the islands, of the campesino in the highlands of the Andes, or the anger of the slum dweller in Caracas, can be equally fateful for our sons' futures, as what happens in our own land.

We of the United States, from our plenty, have therefore in these past years pledged continuing help to the people of Latin America. We have provided technical assistance for many years. Starting with the act of Bogotá in 1960, and the Charter of Punta del Este in 1961, we have begun a major joint effort, with the Latin Americans, to establish condi-

tions of self-sustaining economic growth. The change in the flow of our assistance has been dramatic. Up to 1960, only one-fiftieth of our aid funds went to Latin America. Now, nearly one-fourth of our assistance is going to Latin America—much more assistance per person in Latin America than in any other part of the world. The Alliance for Progress authorizations support this vital work.

Latin America is hungry for change. Sometimes the peoples and the governments know what they want, but do not know how to achieve it. Sometimes, they know how to achieve change, but lack the capital to carry it out. The Alliance for Progress is struggling to provide both the added margin of capital and of know-how.

The provision of funds for investment guarantees to stimulate construction of privately owned housing, as stipulated in section 224, certainly fits this pattern.

The investment guarantees are meant to attract the margin of capital needed for this vital task.

In fact, it would be most unrealistic for us to attempt to provide the entire capital needed. Were we to try to buy every family a house, or buy every farmer an ox, or buy all the pipe needed for water service in every village of Latin America, or make loans to each small businessman among the more than 200 million people in the hemisphere—to do all this—we would need to allocate well over \$100 billion of capital investment during the 10-year period of the Alliance. Instead, we anticipate that well over four-fifths of the total capital required for the factories, the houses, the schools, the water systems and the roads essential for development can be generated by Latin Americans themselves. Substantial parts of the remainder are coming from Europe, from private investors and from the international lending institutions. In the past few years the U.S. assistance to the Alliance has averaged something over \$1 billion a year—a sizable sum, but only a small fraction—less than a fifth—of the total net capital formation occurring in Latin America. We should encourage this trend.

One of the key provisions of the Charter of Punta del Este laid down the need for national development planning and programming. Resources are scarce in Latin America. Its gross national product is roughly one-tenth of our own; its population is slightly larger. National planning is designed to determine the resources available for development in each country, to assign priorities for investment and to work out the changes in national policy—taxation, education, manpower training, roadbuilding, incentives to industry—which will assure that the nation grows as quickly as the resources permit.

Recently, the Alliance partners have formed a multilateral group—the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—to pass on the performance, the self-help effort, and the reform programs of each of the countries of the Alliance. The reports of this Committee now show a better focused picture of the Latin American economies, and provide a statistical framework within

which we can work out our U.S. lending priorities and strategies.

The facts indicate that, in many places, the Alliance is doing well. In others, we already see the promise of future improvements.

A substantial number of Latin countries have undertaken exactly the kind of self-help measures that are needed. For example, tax reform programs are underway in no less than 11 Latin American countries, and in several of them tax yields have already increased very sharply, so that the people of the Latin American countries are providing more of their resources for their own betterment. Incidentally, the U.S. aid program has provided specialists from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service to help improve tax administration in those 11 Latin American countries.

No less than 10 countries have enacted at least the beginning of land reform legislation, and the activity in this field is greater than at any time in Latin American history since 1900.

The budgets of Latin American countries for public education have risen over 25 percent in the last 3 years.

The major disappointment in the Alliance to date has been in the area of private investment from abroad, including private investment from the United States. The way to increase the inflow of private capital has already been shown by countries like Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela which have actively encouraged foreign investment and achieved a degree of fiscal and economic stability which the foreign investor requires.

There are also distinct contributions the United States can make to increase the flow of private capital. Now available and being used are AID investment guarantees which insure the private American investor against a variety of risks for ventures in developing countries. Through the investment survey program, AID now underwrites part of the cost of investigating the feasibility of a business venture in Latin America, paying half the cost if the investor decides to go ahead.

President Johnson has recently committed the United States to a redoubled effort in support of Latin America's development aspirations. And the record of Latin American performance well justifies this renewal of our commitment.

Over half the nations of Latin America have completed their past development plans.

Over half have met or surpassed the target of a 2½-percent yearly increase in per capita income.

The institutions which can carry forward progress and change, through Latin America's own efforts, are becoming more numerous and effective.

By mid-1965, U.S. assistance to Latin America, both directly and through the institutions which Latin America now has, will have helped build 326,000 homes; construct 36,400 classrooms; print 11 million textbooks; extend 290,000 agricultural credit loans; build 735 health centers, hospitals, or mobile health units; drill or install over 2,000 wells and water

systems; and provide food, under Public Law 480, for 22 million people.

This is an achievement—still, perhaps, small in relation to the total needs—but growing daily. It is growing as the sense of pride and responsibility in Latin America itself grows, as Latin Americans themselves see the effects of their own efforts, and renew their dedication to the task ahead.

In Latin America as elsewhere, we must continue the battle for world order, in which our society and our way of life can thrive best, and in which each nation can work out a better life for its citizens.

I am confident that the Alliance for Progress will continue to prosper and will make the Americas one great community, where every man, woman, and child will be free, healthy, and prosperous. As President Johnson said:

The Alliance for Progress is of the same faith that enabled us to nourish a new civilization in these spacious continents * * * faith in the power of freedom to achieve the betterment of man.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to advise the Committee that there is at the desk a motion to recommit which will contain two provisions. First, it would reduce the bill by the amount which we mentioned in the debate earlier in the afternoon. That is, by \$130,958,000.

The second part of the motion to recommit would add on pages 5 and 6, after the word "free" in each instance, the words "non-Communist dominated".

That is the motion which was proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

I might add that the proposed dollar reduction, as we pointed out earlier, does not reach military funds. It is economic, relating to the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has spent well over \$200 billion on foreign aid rather than the \$130 billion so often referred to in debate. It is true that since World War II, we have spent on direct foreign aid in the neighborhood of \$130 billion but when considering the total amount of foreign aid, we must include the billions appropriated for lend-lease during the war and even before World War II. Even the lowest figure mentioned is a fantastic amount, almost beyond human comprehension.

I oppose foreign aid because it is unconstitutional and because if continued, it will wreck the economy of the United States, leaving us at the mercy of our Communist enemies. When we base our foreign relations and human understanding, brotherhood, cooperation, and love on money alone, it is doomed to failure.

We cannot buy security. We cannot buy understanding. We cannot buy the respect of individuals or of nations. We have created with our foreign aid program the dollar image around the entire

world. Largely because of our foreign aid program, when peoples in foreign lands think of America they think of dollars. When they see Americans walk down the streets, they think of dollars. Unfortunately, when they see the American flag, they think of our gold and they think of the American dollar. This is the tragic consequence of a foreign policy founded on the American dollar. When our foreign allies and so-called friends around the world see the Stars and Stripes, they do not think of our Bill of Rights, our Declaration of Independence, or of our free enterprise system with high standards of living but they are reminded of our money.

Mr. Chairman, they do not think of our hospitals, schools, libraries, churches, and the opportunities we have created for the underprivileged, but they think of how much they are going to get. Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is largely due to our foreign aid program. I have always believed in food and fiber and medical attention to those in need throughout the world. The people of the United States have always acted with alacrity and with generosity to the cry of the hungry and the distressed. I believe, however, that aid should be administered on a people-to-people basis—through the Salvation Army, International Relief Organization, the Red Cross, and development programs such as those of Firestone in Liberia and U.S. oil companies in Saudi Arabia. I sincerely believe that if a great portion of the billions we have spent on foreign aid had been expended for exploration of space, we would be on the moon today and would be so far ahead of Russia in space that there would be no contest and the world would be looking to this Nation as the nation of the future and not as a nation making a pitiful attempt to catch up with Russia in space. We would be in space for peace and our bases there would be used for peace rather than for slavery and conquest as envisioned by the Soviets.

Mr. Chairman, with only a portion of this money, we could have a Polaris submarine fleet that could control the seas of the world for 100 years. The United States could have intercontinental missiles which could hit any target in the world and which could explode on targets on the moon smaller than the size of New York City. We could have anti-missile missiles. We could have supersonic bombers, flying at the speed of 3,000 miles an hour. We could have the largest and most mobile hard core combat troops in the world to be rushed in a matter of hours to any danger spot. We could guarantee the free nations of the world security and freedom from fear. Our country could have over a hundred thousand miles of interstate highways. We could have eliminated pollution in our rivers and have pure air, better hospitals, and schools. Poverty would not be a way of life in the United States. Our unemployment rate would be nearer to that of Germany and Japan where there is no unemployment.

Foreign aid did not make friends of the Soviet Union, one of the greatest recipients of our foreign aid. We are receiving

no cooperation from Sukarno, only enmity and hatred. Nasser and Ben Bella lean toward the Communists and treat us with disdain and outright hostility. India condemns our bombing of North Vietnam. China is behind the Iron Curtain and Cuba is in Communist hands—all recipients of our taxpayers' money and all lost to the cause of freedom during our incredible foreign aid program. Even France flirts with Russia and ridicules our efforts for freedom in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. Pennypinching efforts are needed to preserve our gold stocks while it is being permitted to go overseas by the billions.

Mr. Chairman, our foreign aid should be gradually tapered off. As an alternative we need to bolster our defense effort and win the race for space. We need to and we can and must contribute more through our established and respected relief organizations. Our philosophy is founded and based on Christian concepts. We can and must send more missionaries to roll back the tide of atheism and let our friends know of our respect for the worth and dignity of the individual.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Greek-Turkey loan and would do so today in areas where such a program would stop the spread of communism. Our whole foreign aid program is negative. Its entire objective is negative. It is against something and it is against communism. We need to go from the negative to the positive. We need to sell Americanism and our basic philosophy on a people-to-people basis with the same zeal, with the same initiative and the same know-how that we sell our material products. Should we do this, the cold war would be no contest. We would win hands down. We must be for something. We must and we can turn the wheels of progress forward. We must not turn the clock back to dictators and statism. We must move forward with the modern dynamic philosophy of the United States—a philosophy which carved out of the most underdeveloped continent in the world the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of freedom. We were not enslaved, encumbered, or pampered with foreign aid. We moved forward with initiative and imagination to create out of the wilderness the highest standard of living in all history.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to hear the language in the motion to recommit proposed by the gentleman from Indiana. Both of the points he includes have been voted on this afternoon and were defeated by a substantial vote.

I wonder if by putting the two together the gentleman hoped to sweeten his proposition.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman that both parts of the motion to recommit were included because it was felt they were worthy and meritorious and ought to be presented to this body for a vote. Neither part is a sweetener

for the other. They are regarded as substantive matters of great importance and I think the Members of this body ought to have an opportunity to vote on them.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDOWELL. If the gentleman's double-barreled recommittal motion is adopted, is the gentleman then going to support the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman does not expect to vote for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand to express my wholehearted support of H.R. 7750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965.

This bill authorizes the expenditure of \$3.3 billion for foreign aid—this is the lowest authorization request the House has been asked to approve in the 17-year history of the aid program, and it is some \$12 million below the amount requested by the President. I believe that the Foreign Affairs Committee has done a remarkable job in studying and adjusting the President's request, and in reporting to the House a bill which will enable the United States to carry on its great work in this humanitarian venture, with the least burden on the American taxpayer, with minimal effect on our balance-of-payments deficit, and with full accord given to the principle of withholding assistance from nations which have flouted it in the past.

Mr. Chairman, it is axiomatic that the developing nations simply cannot maintain stability without continued economic growth, and that such growth requires external assistance for its nourishment. Without this help, the economies of these struggling nations would certainly falter, and chaos and communism would very probably ensue. It is not to "buy friends" that we predicate this aid. Rather, it is in recognition of the fact that we have been peculiarly blessed with a bounteous economy, and regard for our less fortunate brothers compels us to share with them our good fortune. In addition, it is clearly in the interest of the free world that we give these nations an alternative to communism—an opportunity to be self-reliant.

I know that most Americans realize these facts, and fully endorse our foreign assistance programs. Some, however, have legitimate misgivings, but I believe that a careful study of the bill before us will go a long way toward alleviating their doubts.

If my own mail is representative of American sentiment—and I believe it is—then those apparent aspects of our foreign aid program which most give people pause, are the feelings that we are involved in a giveaway program, and an indiscriminate one at that, where we are just as anxious to help those who insult us and thwart our goals, as we are to help our friends.

Fortunately, much improvement has been recorded in the administration of

aid programs. Much of this is attributable to the able leadership of David Bell, the Administrator of AID; much may also be attributed to the watchful eye of the Congress. As a result of all our efforts, the criticism of the past is simply not applicable to the programs of today. Under the Marshall plan, more than 90 percent of the aid was in the form of outright grants. Today, over 65 percent of our foreign aid takes the form of loans. Most of these loans are long-term loans, which provide a 10-year grace period during which the borrowing country need make no payments. This grace period is crucial, for it gives the developing nation an opportunity to concentrate on basic reforms—such as roadbuilding and housing—which are necessary for long-term progress, but which do not provide the country with immediate profits. As these nations develop their economies, the need for such "soft" loans will diminish, and they will be able to seek future credit from international institutions, or from the Export-Import Bank, on standard, "harder" terms. At that point, our aid will cease, but in the meantime I think it is heartening to know that this aid does take the form of loans. This lightens the burden on the American taxpayer, and enables the recipients to turn to the United States for help with full assurance that our assistance can be solicited and accepted without impairing their own dignity and self-respect.

In some areas, of course, our programs still rely upon grants. These, however, are minimal and worthy beyond doubt. For example, the bill before us now would authorize \$210 million for technical co-operation and development grants for fiscal year 1966. These funds would enable developing countries to improve the educational, technical, and professional skills of their people, and to identify and develop the human and material resources basic to sound economic growth. In addition, these funds will be available to assist American hospitals and schools abroad. I do not believe that the wisdom of these grants is open to question. I think they represent a very reasonable investment in a healthier and better world.

Another important fact is that approximately 85 percent of foreign assistance funds is spent right here in the United States. This creates jobs for our people, and advances our productivity. When loans are used to purchase American equipment, the U.S. businessman gains a market and a customer—a customer who will return for spare parts and for new machinery years later. And because this money is spent here at home, the long-term effect on our balance-of-payments deficit is very minor, indeed. I think it is most unfortunate that so few of our people realize how much of these funds is devoted to the purchase of American goods and services.

The bill we are now considering authorizes \$1.17 billion for military assistance. As Secretary McNamara so cogently pointed out, we can either let the Communists overthrow friendly governments with impunity, build up our own

forces to a point where we can provide U.S. troops for every emergency, or assist friendly nations in developing their own military power so that they will be able to carry their share of the collective defense burden. Like the vast majority of my colleagues, I favor the latter course.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my attention to the criticism that the United States lacks principle in implementing its aid program, and that once we begin giving assistance we are afraid to cut it off, even if the recipient works to undermine and subvert our own foreign policy. I would like to see even stronger language than that contained in this bill. For example, I agree with the comments made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] that the language in the agriculture assistance section should be strengthened and I support his amendment. But this bill is a vast improvement over previous years. Three separate provisions in this bill go far to blunt the criticism we have expressed through the years. First, it expresses the sense of the Congress that aid to nations which do not take all necessary action to stop mob destruction of U.S. property, should be summarily terminated. Second, aid is prohibited to countries permitting ships under their registries to carry cargo to North Vietnam. Third, the bill amends the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to forbid sales of surplus agricultural products to the United Arab Republic. The President is given authority to waive this only if he determines that such a sale is "essential to the national interest of the United States." I firmly believe that this particular provision is long overdue.

The United Arab Republic is actively engaged in subverting legitimately constituted governments in the Congo and in Yemen. It has continued to employ its resources for the purpose of arms-building. It practices secondary economic boycotts against U.S. business firms dealing with Israel and, just last December, Mr. Nasser sneered at the \$1.5 billion in U.S. aid that he has received, and invited us to "go and drink up the sea." While we neither expect nor desire subservience from the recipients of our aid, it is equally true that we neither expect—nor will we tolerate—their insults.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 is an excellent bill. It demonstrates the fairness, the generosity, and the good will of the American people. I believe that it will continue to encourage our allies to take increased initiative in this area; that the world will be better and safer as a result of our efforts; and that the cause of peace and brotherhood will prosper.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague, the able and brilliant gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to compliment him on his remarks. I associate myself with him in those remarks and

I encourage him to continue the efforts he has made to achieve justice in this field in this troubled area.

I am in support of the pending legislation, but I am concerned that our assistance continues to go to a nation which has continued its foreign adventures against its neighbors, including our staunchest ally in the Middle East—Israel.

In 1963 the Congress made it clear that it would not condone continued assistance to nations which engage in or prepare for "aggressive military efforts" against the United States, or against other nations receiving U.S. assistance.

This principle is as sound now as it was then and I think that its retention in the bill before us reaffirms our determination not to support this type of aggression.

Perhaps in the future, we should also look at the increasing importance of indirect forms of aggression by nations such as the United Arab Republic against its neighbors. Modern warfare involves military weapons and political ideology; it may also involve economic repression, and the diversion of natural resources from neighboring countries contrary to reasonable international agreements on the sharing of those resources.

It is no secret that nations in the Middle East, such as the United Arab Republic would like nothing better than to turn the scarce water resources of that region away from neighboring nations which have great need for their fruits and benefits. Such action is contrary to the recognized principle of mutuality of international river systems.

Colonel Nasser's actions in regard to the Jordan waters when coupled with his military efforts on behalf of factions in civil disturbances in the Congo, in the Yemen, and in Cyprus, demands that we keep a careful watch on any U.S. programs of assistance to the United Arab Republic. So long as that nation has a leader more interested in stirring up disorder among his neighbors than in permitting their peaceful development and concentrating on the internal growth of his own country, we can never attain the goal of peace and stability in the Middle East.

I hope that the President in evaluating the quantity and quality of aggressive acts committed by the government of President Nasser, in accordance with section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act, will take into account not only outright military actions, but acts of indirect aggression as well.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Could the gentleman from New York inform me as to the future of the other distinguished gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALPERN. I believe his future is quite apparent.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the debate draws to a close, I want to speak of today's challenge for tomorrow's world. The less

developed world promises to be a continuing challenge to our creative powers as well as a major source of instability in the years ahead. The United States, the leading power and the richest nation in the world, has an immense stake in a process of change in these countries. In the world today the issue is no longer change versus status quo. Change in less developed countries is inevitable.

The only question is: What kind of change? Change cannot be smooth and painless, but we must do what we can to see that it leads toward stable, open societies. That alone is sufficient to focus our attention and effort.

Beyond this interest is our humanitarian concern in improving the standards of life in the poorer two-thirds of the world. It is proper to argue a course of policy on grounds of self-interest, but it would be both unwise and untrue to American tradition to deny its humane foundations. Since material progress is a necessary condition for the kind of change we seek in the less developed countries, economic questions are basic to our relations with them.

President Kennedy recognized this 4 years ago, when he said in his inaugural address:

Man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life.

President Johnson has shown awareness of the combination of responsibility and self-interest we have toward the less developed world. He stated recently:

The pages of history can be searched in vain for another power whose pursuit of its self-interest was so infused with grandeur of spirit and morality of purpose.

It is perhaps only through economic programs and by dealing with economic questions that we can influence for the better the kind of change which is to occur in the less developed countries. Overcoming poverty should be the objective of any viable government in the underdeveloped world. Widespread failure to move toward this goal could confront the United States with large-scale political instability with its ensuing threat to a peaceful world.

On the other hand, governments preoccupied with internal development and economic growth—and assisted by us in this task—are less likely to engage in unsettling external adventures and more likely to evolve political institutions and social processes compatible with our own rather than with coercive systems on the Communist model. U.S. assistance for the purpose of economic development is an essential element of any U.S. effort to influence sound political evolution of the emerging nations. In the words of the framers of our own Constitution, therefore, we are seeking "to secure the blessings of liberty" for ourselves and for a dynamic and peaceful world community of open societies.

Mr. Chairman, it is with these considerations in mind that I support the role and purpose of American foreign assistance. Basically, what we are trying to do with foreign aid is to bring about constructive, peaceful change in free so-

cieties. Obviously, this cannot be accomplished without the consent and self-help of the countries themselves.

There are real limits on what foreign aid can do. Successful development rests primarily on the determination and the ability of the government and people of the developing nation. Foreign assistance provides an important margin of resources and skills, but it cannot produce development at reasonable cost unless the country is itself making the major efforts.

This simple fact is today fundamental to the development assistance strategy of the U.S. Agency for International Development, as it has adjusted to changed world relationships. It is concentrating assistance in countries where the performance will enable American aid to produce results.

The most hopeful sign for the future is the growing determination of the less developed countries to help themselves and their increasing competence in this task. Today, for every dollar of U.S. bilateral assistance, the 20 major recipients of U.S. aid in Asia, Africa, and Latin America allocate an average of \$6 for development from their own limited resources.

In virtually every case, AID is intensifying its efforts to identify needed improvement in the economic policies and programs of recipient countries. It seeks to secure adoption of these improvements through incentive programming, and it seeks specific country commitments to these improvements in return for increased economic aid to raise the country's rate of economic growth.

Another way of putting it is that AID is seeking to help the developing nations to make better use of their own and external resources. To the extent they put their own houses in order, the United States is prepared to bear its share of the total burden and thereby hasten the day when they will no longer need our aid.

Mr. Chairman, part of the problem for the less developed world is that its leaders and informed people are determined to achieve in 10 or 25 years what took us 150 years to achieve. This is not an unreasonable determination in a world brought together by rapid communications. But it is a tremendous undertaking.

I do not suggest that the economic gap can be closed within the next decade or two. But experience in countries such as Israel, Greece, and Mexico has shown that an adequate pattern of income distribution begins to make it possible for people to live decently and for growth to continue with decreasing reliance on external assistance.

The foreign aid program in the future must increase the capacity of the less developed countries to utilize foreign assistance effectively in order to increase their rates of economic growth. Progress has been made in this direction. The governments of many countries are beginning to recognize the importance of development planning and of policies that go with it. But so far the transformation of institutions essential to modernization has taken hold in only some of the countries.

AID has, in the past 3 years, increasingly concentrated its efforts on such institution building and is attempting to utilize the vast private resources of American education, industry, and the professions to reach the operating levels in these nations.

Let us look briefly at some statistics relating to underdevelopment. Per capita GNP in the United States is close to \$3,300 a year. By contrast, some 80 less developed countries all have per capita gross national product under \$500; all but 11 have per capita gross national product under \$300; 33 of them are under \$100; and 10 are under \$50. Their average is roughly \$150 per capita, or one twenty-second the U.S. level.

Most of the less developed countries are rural in nature. Approximately 80 to 90 percent of the people live in rural areas. More than 50 percent of the working male adults in less developed countries are engaged in farming and related pursuits. Most are unskilled and untrained and, therefore, do not make the best use of their land. These same countries, because they are rural and agrarian in nature, merely export raw materials and fail to gain the economic benefits of the higher prices of finished products.

The rate of literacy is low; 35 percent for the less developed nations compared with almost 100 percent for the developed countries.

Mr. Chairman, little by little, foreign aid from the United States, from other bilateral donors and from the multilateral agencies, is helping to raise the low standards and increase the rate of growth and per capita incomes of these countries. Under current assumptions, the aid donors are seeking to increase the rate of growth of per capita income in the less developed countries by the very modest rate of 2 percent a year.

It is clear that economic development will be a central task of foreign policy in the decades ahead. It must stimulate the greatest energy and deepest imagination in our society. This call to a priority task should not go unheeded. It is one that can itself generate commitment in the business community, universities, and voluntary organizations. As I see it, this challenge is an opportunity.

It is a logical consequence of our recognition of our responsibilities in today's world. If we set our sights high, we will raise the sights of the less developed countries in this whole process of economic development as we build tomorrow's world.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been disturbed by the report of the Comptroller's Office, which appeared in the RECORD yesterday during the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

In his speech the gentleman quoted from reports of the Comptroller. He quoted the statement by the Comptroller's Office that the AID program had spent dollars in Brazil when they could have spent cruzeiros.

The Comptroller also reported concerning the spending of money for

equipment for a project which had been completed.

There were other references which Members can read, if they did not hear the debate yesterday, as shown on pages 11246 and 11247.

This morning, at an executive meeting of our Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Bell appeared before our committee, and I asked him about these statements and the actions reported by the Comptroller's Office about the AID program. He said that he had been advised that these statements had been made. He was, of course, familiar with the Comptroller's reports.

I told Mr. Bell that I felt some answer should have been given, either yesterday or during the debate today, to refute the Comptroller's report, because he indicated there were some inaccuracies in it.

I have been here all day, waiting for somebody to answer this and to tell why the Comptroller would make such statements in criticism. He made them not only in March and April of 1965, but he had made statements in 1964 as well as 1965.

A part of the report which disturbs me says:

The Agency for International Development has made and is currently making improper payments for ocean shipments of surplus agricultural commodities donated by the United States. * * *

And so on.

When an agency such as AID flouts any criticism like that, and does not care about answering it, I cannot have the confidence I should have in the operation of that agency.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] a minute ago said he had some reservations about this bill. I, too, have supported the foreign aid program for a number of years on the theory that we had to maintain some type of foreign aid program. In the past I have offered amendments which I felt would improve the program, but I have become resigned to the fact, early in the debate, that no amendments were going to be accepted. I had hoped the committee or some member could give me some assurance that there had been corrections made in the administration of the AID program criticized by the Comptroller but there has been no answer to the charges.

The only way I have of showing my feelings about the administration of this program and the fact that we are wasting money which could be saved is to vote against the bill. This is the only way, as I see it, of registering my protest.

I am going to vote against this authorization not because I feel we should not have some kind of an aid program but when these things continually keep coming up every year of improper uses of money and particularly spending American dollars when we could be spending foreign funds which would not be a drain on our dollar reserve, the only way I can express my feeling and also my criticism of the way in which this program is being operated is by voting against this bill. That is the reason why I expect to vote against this authorization bill here today.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes. I yield to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Missouri talked to me earlier in the day about these reports. I told him that most of these reports, although recently issued, were based on investigations 1 or 2 years old. If you read through the reports, you will find that the GAO acknowledges that some corrective action has been started on most of them. If you will examine the GAO reports on the Department of Defense, you will find that they find deficiencies in the operation of the Army and the Navy. I would not use criticism by the General Accounting Office as a criterion for voting against the foreign aid bill, because you could apply the same kind of argument to voting against legislation for the Department of Defense. The GAO writes many reports about the waste of money in our Military Establishment and in our defense budget. So the criteria you are using here in opposing this bill I think are not entirely consistent.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Johnson doctrine of defending American citizens around the world has resulted in a new faith in our country here at home and much needed respect for us abroad.

The President has demonstrated time and again, in southeast Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America that the full might of our Nation will come to the aid of our own citizens in danger, and the freedoms of others threatened by communism.

Floridians take special note of this new approach in American policy. No other State has been as close to Cuba—as close to a Communist takeover, nor seen the wave of refugees escaping oppression. Florida knows also the threat of military action, as we witnessed the offensive and defensive buildup in our State at the time of the missile crisis when thousands of troops and weapons were assembled for any eventuality.

The people of Florida saw the United States stand by while Castro was taking over Cuba. The people of Florida vigorously applaud the actions of President Johnson in preventing a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic. Had similar action been taken with regard to Cuba during the Castro takeover, Cuba would not be a Communist country today.

Being close to the troubled waters of the Caribbean we understand and appreciate the need for action rather than prolonged discussion. There is time enough to consult, advise, and receive the views of friends. The Organization of American States was notified of the developments in the Dominican Republic, and when the situation worsened the President acted for the U.S. interests. Now that the peacekeeping machinery of the OAS is in operation and a joint military command has been established, we are hopeful a peaceful solution can be found to return the Dominican Republic to democratic government. But

we can be sure that if the United States had not acted a new Communist government would be establishing itself on another island in the Caribbean.

Some critics have voiced the opinion we should have awaited joint action rather than our unilateral move. During the naval quarantine of Cuba, the United States acted on her own in the best interest of this hemisphere. And, of course, at that time we were taking action against an established government, Castro, while our landings in the Dominican Republic were at the request of the existing government which indicated it could no longer guarantee the safety of American citizens.

The Johnson doctrine, of course, applies equally to Cuba today. There are some who would try to lead one to believe that this administration has forgotten Cuba. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The President has indicated that we have no intention of living with communism in this hemisphere. Soon after assuming office the President was faced with a crisis over the water supply to our naval base, and he acted quickly to increase our defensive capability and to replace the water supply, while preparing the base for military action and evacuating dependents. This swift action met the situation of the moment, and gave clear proof to Castro that his test of the new President's resolve had been met without hesitation.

The United States and the other members of the Organization of American States do consider the present regime in Cuba a danger to Latin America because of its continuing dedication to the subversion and overthrow of Latin American governments. The United States and other members of the OAS are determined that this danger will be checked and thrown back. That determination is one of the key factors in the actions taken by the United States and the OAS in the Dominican Republic.

In keeping with the continuing goal, or U.S. policy toward Cuba—a truly free Cuba, free of communism—and the kind of threat which the Cuban regime presents to the hemisphere, the United States has followed, and will continue to follow, courses of action designed, first, to reduce the will and ability of the present regime to advance the Communist cause in Latin America through support of subversion; and second, to assist and cooperate with the Latin American nations in strengthening their ability, in both the short and the long term, to resist subversion.

The first part of this U.S. and OAS strategy—the reduction of the will and ability of the Cuban regime to advance the Communist cause—has taken the form of efforts to isolate the regime politically, psychologically, and economically. The core of this program has been the exertion of economic pressure upon the regime in order to maintain and increase its internal difficulties and to limit its potential for external activities.

The administration has, through determined, day-to-day efforts, been main-

taining strong pressures on the Cuban economy. All of our allies are cooperating to some extent in the maintenance of these pressures and the cooperation of certain governments is quite good. None permits the exportation of strategic goods to Cuba, and some governments discourage the shipment of industrial items and raw materials that are non-strategic but which are critical to the Cuban economy. Further, so far as is known, none has granted credit to Cuba, nor, for approximately the last year, guaranteed private credits for Cuban purchases.

Although much of the administration's effort has been aimed at eliciting the cooperation of foreign governments and firms, it has also taken a number of unilateral measures to reduce Cuba's economic ties with the free world. For example, U.S. law prohibits, in the absence of a Presidential waiver, the granting of U.S. assistance to any nation which furnishes strategic goods or economic assistance to Cuba or whose vessels and aircraft carry any equipment or merchandise to or from Cuba. In addition, U.S. Government-financed cargoes cannot be carried from U.S. ports aboard vessels employed in the Cuban trade, and a variety of measures prohibit or restrict the bunkering of vessels in the Cuban trade, especially in U.S. ports or with products of U.S. origin.

In addition, the Cuban assets control regulations prohibit transactions involving U.S. dollars between any party and Cuba. These regulations also prohibit any person or entity subject to the jurisdiction of the United States from engaging in financial or commercial transactions with Cuba.

Total Cuban trade with the free world dropped nearly 80 percent between 1958 and 1963. The temporary increase in free world trade with Cuba in 1964—the result of exceptionally high world sugar prices in 1963 and early 1964—is overshadowed by the expected drop in this trade in 1965 to approximately the 1962-63 levels. Sugar is, of course, Cuba's main earner of foreign exchange, and sugar prices have fallen precipitously, from about 12 cents a pound in January 1964 to about 2.5 cents at the present time.

Cuba's trade with Latin America—the principal target of the Castro regime's subversive efforts—has declined even more dramatically. Total Cuban trade with the nations of the Organization of American States—excluding the United States—was approximately \$115 million in 1958 and in the range of \$15 million in 1964. All of the OAS countries, with but one exception, adhere to last July's OAS resolution which suspended shipping and trade with Cuba and severed diplomatic and consular relations.

The number of calls by free world vessels at Cuban ports in 1964 was approximately 60 percent lower than in 1962. Moreover, figures for the first 4 months of 1965 indicate more than a 30-percent decline over the same period in 1964.

The free labor unions of the hemisphere are giving important assistance to the OAS governments in this matter. These unions have recently begun a se-

lective boycott at hemispheric ports of vessels of those nations whose ships are in the Cuban trade or whose trade with Cuba has increased.

Cubana, the Cuban state airline, flies to only two free world countries, Mexico and Spain, on a regular basis. Only one free world airline, Iberia, provides scheduled passenger service—one flight per week—to and from Cuba. In October 1962 4 non-Communist airlines operated about 20 scheduled flights per week to Cuba.

External pressures and the Castro regime's own ineptitude and mismanagement have together kept the Cuban economy from serving as a showcase for communism.

Industry remains essentially stagnant and its products shoddy. The industrial plant and the transportation system—primarily of Western origin—have substantially deteriorated for want of spare parts.

Many basic foods and household necessities are rationed. Rationing allotments are often not met and inferior items substituted.

Cuban labor's enthusiasm for work has diminished. Absenteeism and low productivity continue to plague the regime and reflect labor's resistance to the coercion growing out of enforced production norms, the standardization of wage scales and a military draft rigged to provide cheap labor for the regime.

To keep the Cuban economy operating at minimum levels the Soviet Union, and to a lesser extent the other Communist countries, have been forced to grant Cuba large-scale economic assistance. Communist economic aid in the period 1961-64 is estimated to have amounted to well over \$1 billion. This has constituted a sharp drain on Communist, especially Soviet resources, and the end is not in sight. Taking into account Soviet credits to finance Cuba's projected trade deficit with the U.S.S.R. in 1965 and the subsidy Cuba receives on its sugar sales to the Soviets, the U.S.S.R. will probably give Cuba upward of \$300 million in economic assistance this year.

The serious economic difficulties which the present regime faces and, according to the best estimates, will continue to face have a definite effect on the political situation of the regime. Frictions and strains are evident within the power structure of the regime as it continues to be incapable of performing on its promises of a better economic life. As popular support of the regime declines, it resorts more and more to repression. The recent wave of arbitrary arrests, the purges among university students—heretofore a specially favored group—all testify to the need of the regime to exert greater control over the population.

The dependence of the present regime on the Soviet Union has created frictions, not only between the regime and Moscow which is trying to exert stronger controls over the uses to which its huge subsidies are put, but also within Cuba between contending pro-Moscow and anti-Moscow factions. These internal political developments, which have been influenced by external economic pressures, suggest that there are cracks in the

structure which appears outwardly solid and that these cracks may be widened by frictions and pressures which exist within the system.

In addition to carrying out programs for weakening the Cuban base for subversion, the United States has been assisting and cooperating with the Latin American nations in strengthening their ability to resist that subversion. In the short term, the second part of our strategy has been executed bilaterally and multilaterally through the OAS and through cooperative arrangements with the countries of the Central American isthmus. Although much remains to be done, measurable progress has been made in the field of controls on the travel of subversives to and from Cuba, the transfer of material, funds, and propaganda, internal security, and surveillance of borders and coastline.

The decision of the OAS Foreign Ministers in July of last year, referred to earlier in an economic context, marked a significant step in the political and psychological isolation of the Cuban regime from the rest of the hemisphere. The fact that these actions were taken by an overwhelming vote of the Foreign Ministers testified to the growing awareness of the subversive threat on the part of Latin America. It also clearly demonstrated the decline of the appeal of Castro communism in the hemisphere. Moreover, both of these factors are reflected in the action of Latin American maritime unions against vessels of countries trading with Cuba.

The Cuban regime and the Communist parties in Latin America are currently making a determined effort—in line with decisions taken at the November 1964 meeting in Havana of the Latin American Communist parties—to capitalize on the Dominican situation to recover ground which they have lost over the past 2 years. With good sense and firm determination and with the continuation of present policies toward Cuba, refined and reinforced by lessons learned and actions taken in the Dominican crisis, the United States, and the other members of the OAS will move forward toward the unchanged and unchanging goal of a truly free Cuba.

It may be difficult to warn nations of the dangers of communism when looking at distant Russia or China, but we have only to point to nearby Cuba.

Castro's communism is incompatible with the needs and desires of the people of the Western Hemisphere in their legitimate attempt and desire to better themselves. Within the framework of Latin America, Cuba before Castro was high among economically developed nations. Health standards, education, housing, agriculture and industry ranked at or near the top of the list of Latin American nations. The fall to its present position today can be but further proof of the folly of Castroism.

The actions of this Congress in supporting the President in all these efforts is an indication of the support of the American people and an indication to the rest of the world of our firm resolve that no new front be opened to the Communists in the Western Hemisphere or

elsewhere, and that we intend to speed the removal of Castro and his like from the island of Cuba as well.

Those who say we have forgotten Cuba must have their eyes closed, as some of them did when Castro came to power in the first place. It is assuring for the American people to see, through the Johnson doctrine, that their President has his eyes open. We know him by his actions. We remember them by their inaction.

As a further indication of the support being given the President in south Florida, I include four editorials on the Dominican situation to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, May 4, 1965]

LONG OVERDUE U.S. POLICY MAKES CLEAR TO THE WORLD WE WILL PROTECT OURSELVES

There would appear to be little question today but that under President Johnson's personal supervision the United States has embarked upon a new foreign policy approach which, thought fraught with considerable danger and unpleasant consequences, is one which almost all clear-thinking citizens can welcome as a sorely needed restatement of basic American principles.

Where this new policy will eventually lead us is almost anybody's guess. Our involvement in the Dominican situation on the scale the President has ordered is certain to bring screams of protest, not only from the Communist world, but from certain of our so-called friends and allies who have already labeled our intervention as a return to the era of "gunboat diplomacy."

Yet, as we stated in this space last week, and which evidence produced by our military, diplomatic, and intelligence agencies has confirmed, it was only the quick dispatch of American forces to the Dominican Republic which prevented a Communist takeover in that nation and a much greater loss of life and property than has yet occurred.

As of now, there seems to be little prospect that our military intervention in the Dominican Republic will be of the quickly in and quickly out style. To the contrary, all evidence clearly points to the maintenance of strong American forces in that country until such time as we are assured that law and order have been restored, that a stable and acceptable government is in control of things, and that the withdrawal of our forces will not be a signal for the same Communist elements which tried to seize power before to make another and perhaps more successful attempt.

To those Americans who have had to disgustedly stand by and watch the sequence of events which culminated in the establishment of a Communist base of operations in Cuba, President Johnson's unequivocal statement this past Sunday night that we would not permit the Dominican Republic to go the way of Cuba, came as a refreshing breeze.

But saying this is far easier than doing it, and thus, as in the Cuban missile crisis, Americans will have to wait on future developments before making any final assessment of President Johnson's determination to keep this hemisphere free of any further Communist encroachments.

In the meantime, Mr. Johnson is making every effort to persuade the member nations of the Organization of American States to establish a task force which can go into the Dominican Republic and take over the responsibilities now being carried out by American troops.

These responsibilities are hardly of a minor nature. They involve such grim tasks as burying the dead and caring for the wounded; of bringing in food and medical supplies so

that people won't starve or die of neglect: of restoring communications and other essential public services in order to bring back a semblance of normal life to the battle-ravaged city of Santo Domingo; of finding some effective way to reclaim the great number of weapons put into civilian hands by rebel forces at the start of the revolution, and, finally, of reestablishing law and order to the point where the people of the Dominican Republic can freely choose new leaders to guide their own destinies.

This is a large order and it cannot be accomplished overnight. Thus, it seems inevitable that American forces, now that they are in the country, must stay there until we are certain that what these troops were sent in to accomplish isn't frittered away by a premature withdrawal or by bowing to the shrill demands of those who are presently accusing us of armed aggression and unwarranted intervention into the internal affairs of another nation.

This Dominican affair, coming as it did on the heels of our greatly stepped-up participation in the war in Vietnam, provides the Communists and the neutrals with a lot of grist for their propaganda mills, and we would be naive not to expect them to exploit this opportunity to the utmost.

But we have been slandered and vilified before so this will be nothing new or different. The main point Americans should remember is that at long last we appear to have reached the point where protection of our own interests, our own security and that of other free nations are all being considered of greater import than whatever opinion other countries might have of our conduct or our policies.

We sincerely hope that President Johnson meant exactly what he said when he stated Sunday night we "cannot, must not and will not permit establishment of another Communist government in this hemisphere." That is a statement that has been long overdue, and regardless of the consequences its enforcement might bring, we think it is time we meet this threat head on and make it crystal clear to all the world we are not afraid to back up our principles with whatever force is needed to carry them out.

JACK W. GORE.

[From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post,
May 4, 1965]

DOMINICAN DOCTRINE

President Johnson's report to the Nation on the Dominican situation was a heartening one, and no criticism in the U.N. Security Council or indecision on the part of the Organization of American States should be allowed to weaken the firm stand taken.

His statement that the goal of the United States "is to help prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere" should serve as a warning to all concerned that the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine is not dead.

Even though we allowed it to lapse in the Communist takeover of Cuba, the Reds have now been put on notice that the Western Hemisphere is not open to further incursions. With a little further stiffening of the U.S. backbone, perhaps even the Cuban cancer can be eliminated.

When U.S. Marines were dispatched to the Dominican Republic last week, the message was plain: This country is fed up with having its citizens threatened, its Embassies attacked, its interests violated, either by lawless mobs or hostile foreign governments.

Now with the strengthening of U.S. Armed Forces on that embattled island another plain message has been delivered: This nation also is fed up with Red infiltration and aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

Primary purpose of U.S. Marine and Army units in the Santo Domingo area still is protection of the lives of Americans and other foreign nationals. That became necessary

when Dominican ability to preserve order and protect lives broke down under Communist-directed mob action.

But now these military forces have a second mission: To thwart apparent efforts of Castro Cuba Communists to turn the Dominican revolt to their own purposes and possibly establish a Red regime in Santo Domingo similar to—if not directly tied to—the one in Havana.

The obvious interest and involvement of the Kremlin and its Cuban puppet was emphasized in their calls for U.N. action to condemn U.S. landings in the Dominican Republic.

Moscow called it another attempt to keep in power a reactionary, an antipopular dictatorship regime which suits the United States, and to suppress the strivings of the people for freedom and independence.

Havana called it a new and insolent aggression against the sovereignty and independence of a foreign country.

Those whose toes are stepped on naturally yell the loudest. And, of course, there are altogether too many who will listen sympathetically.

It seems to be impossible for the United States to undertake a humanitarian action without having the pink-hued neutrals, and even some of our allies, believe Communist charges of sinister political purposes.

Unfortunately, in the past, this presumed reflection of world opinion has been allowed to alter the shape of our foreign policy to the point where we have none worthy of the name. And the inevitable result has been a slow retreat in the face of encroaching communism.

It is time to call a halt to that—with the blessing of the United Nations and the active support of the OAS, if possible; in defiance of both, if necessary.

Pinkish pickets in New York, protesting the Dominican action, carried signs reading: "One Vietnam is too many." One Cuba is too many, too.

[From the Sun-Sentinel, May 3, 1965]

JOHNSON BOLDNESS BARRED RED GRAB

The United States and the free world are about to be forced to sit through act II, scene II, of that tired old Communist road show farce: "Uncle Is a Teenage Imperialist."

In act I, friendly and dashing juvenile lead, Juan Bosch, came on stage as the student prince. There was dancing and singing and gaiety at the palace because the wicked dictator was dead and Juan had come home from school abroad to rule.

All of the subjects frolicked and did as they pleased and the professional troubadors sang Juan's praises outside the realm. But some of his old school chums became a little too exuberant and began fleching the silver and annoying the maidens as their companions plotted to move in with Juan and rule the kingdom.

So the mean old captains of the guard marched in and threw the culprits out, telling Juan to begone because the subjects must return to their tasks, or the palace would fall into the hands of the enemy.

Act I ended with Juan sulking in a sympathetic neighbor state and plotting his return.

The second act opened with some of Juan's comrades, who had been mingling with the people, rising up suddenly and attempting to capture the unromantic captains to throw them in the dungeons so Juan could come home.

But to everybody's surprise, Uncle Sam, who was busted battling scoundrels in the distant Orient, sent in forces to aid the beleaguered captains. They set down the revolt and the rebels demanded forgiveness, insisting they wanted merely to have Juan in his rightful place in the palace and to set the people free.

That sets the stage for the second scene of the second act. In this, Juan's followers will become emboldened and will demand concessions for putting down their arms. Meanwhile, back in the old university, their colleagues will call for a meeting of the prime ministers of the many nations and they will point an accusing finger at Uncle Sam, claiming that he really didn't want to protect the freedom of Juan's subjects, but actually seized the opportunity to serve his imperialist ambitions.

Some of the prime ministers will agree and will insist that the rebels are the real heroes and should not be punished. Other ministers will fall to arguing among themselves and there will be much confusion and the scene will end with word being received trouble has flared elsewhere. All exit with much confusion.

If this plot seems familiar, it is, because it has become such a part of our real life. It doesn't take much effort to set the scene in Cuba, or West Berlin, or the Congo, or Vietnam—or the Dominican Republic. Only the actors and the costumes change. The play remains the same and there never is a third and final act.

What will happen now is the rebels in the Dominican Republic will insist upon asylum and protection, and will have the audacity to demand concessions for a rebellion that did not succeed.

Already, Russia has called for an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council. They want to heap blame upon the United States and President Johnson for supposed aggression by intervening in the Dominican revolt and preventing what surely was intended to have been another Communist takeover under the disguise of an act of liberation.

The truth of the matter, of course, will show that Communists trained the insurgents and instigated the entire affair. But it will be the United States who will be roundly castigated on the world's propaganda network.

The time has come to end this theatrical fantasy and to face the realities of life. All of the shouting in the world is not going to erase the brutal fact that conspirators callously upset the orderly life of a sovereign nation, bringing death to hundreds of people and misery to thousands of others.

For this the rebels should not be permitted to go unpunished and left in a position for a repeat performance at a time and place of their own choosing. Nor should the worldwide Communist conspiracy be left unreprimed for its role in this heinous affair.

We, the United States, do business with the Soviet conspirators, supplying them with food and materials, while they, in turn, export weapons and death and slavery to the distant points of the earth.

This arrangement should come under the severest review as a result of the Dominican Republic affair that would have been another Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere, had it not been for decisive action on the part of President Johnson and the muscle of the U.S. Marines.

Indeed, the Communist road company has put on its show just once too often. The long overdue time has come to tell the players to disband and to ring down the final curtain on their hackneyed farce.

WILLIAM A. MULLEN.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald,
Apr. 29, 1965]

THE MARINES HAVE LANDED

Yesterday this newspaper pleaded: "Let us have no second Cuba in the Dominican Republic."

Today it makes no difference whether we said this or whether someone else did. The pertinent fact is that President Johnson has

acted swiftly to prevent just such a catastrophe. He has sent a powerful marine unit ashore for the ostensible purpose of protecting American nationals in the hotted-up civil war. One faction in that conflict would return Juan Bosch to power with the help of undisguised cadres of Communists.

It is all very well to argue that we have no real business in Santo Domingo. The same argument was made—much to our woe—in that vacillating venture known as the Bay of Pigs which has cost the United States worldwide prestige and a Red foothold one jump from the U.S. mainland.

We think that Mr. Johnson moved wisely last night.

He was careful to consult the friendly council of the Organization of American States.

He conferred with and responded to the Dominican government in power (though beleaguered) which requested our help.

He brought in the congressional leadership.

It is clear, however, that the Marines are there to stay a bit, for their "assistance will be available to the nationals of other countries."

Well, let them stabilize the situation, not in the selfish name of any entrenched and selfish colonialism but to protect the national interests of two proud peoples in political freedom in the Caribbean.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, May 5, 1965]

THE JOHNSON DOCTRINE

For more than a century the Monroe Doctrine was a keystone of American policy. It proclaimed that the United States would consider any attempt by the European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety" and implied that we would act accordingly to prevent it. There were some who said the Monroe Doctrine was dead when Soviet Russia was suffered to extend its system to Castro's Cuba.

But now in connection with the Dominican Republic trouble a Johnson doctrine has been proclaimed. In his speech explaining the dispatch of U.S. troops there, President Johnson stated the doctrine in these words: "The American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

The Johnson doctrine is pointed squarely at the problems confronting this Nation and this hemisphere in 1965 and is admirably suited to dealing with them, just as the doctrine proclaimed by President James Monroe in 1823 was shaped for the problems of that day. Then Russia was seeking to stake out exclusive rights for fishing, commerce and industry along the whole northwest coast of North America; and European nations were conniving under the doctrine of "the divine right of kings" to restore their monarchic rule over newly independent Latin American States that had overthrown Spanish rule. Today, of course, the threat comes from Communist subversion and aggression.

One difference between the doctrines of Monroe and Johnson is that the former was unilateral on the part of the United States alone while Johnson phrases his as a doctrine for "the American nations" and not just this country. But this is more a difference in form than in substance. Throughout the years after 1823 the United States frequently invited the other American republics to adopt the Monroe Doctrine. President Wilson sought to give it a worldwide application. He told the Senate in 1917: "I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world; that no nation should seek to extend its polity over any other nation or people,

but that every people should be left free to determine its own polity, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful." The other nations did not adopt the doctrine; it would have been a vastly better world if they had.

"The American nations," through the Organization of American States, may or may not adopt the Johnson doctrine. But whether they do or not, the United States must in any event be its chief supporter and bear the responsibility for the upholding of it. The Monroe Doctrine was never a part of international law. Yet it rested, as Elihu Root stated, "Upon the right of self-protection and that right is recognized by international law." So will it be with the Johnson doctrine.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, the foreign aid program is one of the most successful assets the American economy has going for it.

There are both immediate and long-term benefits from the crop which we are so carefully planting with our foreign aid program today.

To begin, we all agree that the aim of the foreign aid program is to help the weak to become strong; to help the underdeveloped countries of the world to preserve their independence, stand on their own feet and take their place and assume their responsibilities alongside of the other countries in the world which are in their turn, helping others.

Many of those whom we have helped, have gained in economic stability to the point where they have foreign aid programs of their own and are doing their part to assist the less fortunate countries. Japan is an example of this and an outstanding example too.

To illustrate my point, sizable economic aid from the United States to Japan was ended over 10 years ago. More recently, Japan has agreed to repay \$490 million of our economic aid grants, and its own foreign aid and reparations program a year ago totalled nearly \$300 million. For nearly a decade, Japan has been second only to Canada as the best market for U.S. exports.

You can see the double-barreled effect of this. Not only are they in the process of the actual repayment of the grants which were made to them but they are using our products; assisting our labor, industry, management, agriculture—our economy by importing our merchandise. Since 1950, United States exports to Japan have tripled. They have doubled to Western Europe during this same period of time.

Japan and Western Europe are not the exceptions. There are other equally striking examples, which I could mention, to show that our work has been effective.

You have all heard, many times, that 85 percent of the foreign aid dollar is spent in the United States. In the foreign aid program we are not sending money overseas but we are sending American goods and American services and in doing this, this means business, export orders for factories, farms, railroads, trucking lines—in fact, the American economy.

There are now 129 colleges and universities—including our own University of Tennessee—involved with the foreign aid program through more than 300 technical assistance contracts.

Private American engineering and construction firms are now at work in over 50 countries supervising the design and construction of more than \$4 billion in AID-assisted capital projects; irrigation systems, power dams, fertilizer factories, and the like.

Since 1961, AID has enforced a "buy American" policy and has tied the AID dollar to the American economy. This "buy American" policy is tied to anything AID finances for development: machinery, commodities, the services of engineering and construction firms, the services of technical experts of any kind, and so on.

In 1964, American business and industry exported nearly a billion dollars worth of goods to Asia, Africa, and Latin America under the AID program. American shipping lines were paid another \$80 million to carry these goods to their destinations.

My congressional district, Memphis and Shelby County, stands at the hub of three States, at the center of a booming economy. And in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee in the past 3 years, AID-financed commodity procurement contracts have totaled \$31,481,614.46.

Before my colleagues in the Mid-South oppose this measure, I hope they have looked at this matter from a strict dollars-and-cents viewpoint. These millions are spent right in our own States, providing jobs for our people.

In Memphis alone, during the past 3 years, AID-financed commodity procurement has totaled \$1,381,733.38. Here are the AID contracts authorized in Shelby County, Tenn., since January 1962:

AID-financed commodity procurement, Memphis, Tenn., January 1962 to May 24, 1965

Producer	Commodity	Country designation	Amount
Acetylene Cylinder Corp.	Acetylene cylinders	Turkey	\$35,020.00
Ely & Walker	Yarns	Republic of Congo	2,999.72
Firestone International Co.	Tires and tubes	Turkey, Pakistan, and Republic of Congo	287,900.31
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	do	Pakistan	43,249.75
Fruehauf Trailer (division of Fruehauf)	Components, power station	India	9,782.00
General Cable Corp.	Not given	Yugoslavia	25,000.00
W. R. Grace & Co.	Urea	Vietnam	782,703.69
International Harvester Export Co.	Trailers	Pakistan	18,375.00
Layne & Bowler, Inc.	Pumps, steel drums	Vietnam	79,277.40
Memphis Hide Co., Inc.	Hides	Yugoslavia	36,600.00
Oliver Corp.	Spare parts for combines	Turkey	221.29
Veisicol Chemical Corp.	Heptaclor	Turkey and Korea	60,604.22
Grand total from Memphis, Tenn., January 1962 through May 24, 1965.			1,381,733.38

In the most immediate sense, the AID program means production orders for American business. Profits, not in the future, but now, today. There are more than 400,000 jobs created by the current AID program. AID-financed orders are handled through regular commercial channels. The business is there to bid on now—and it is reserved for American enterprise. It is the gateway to some great potential future markets.

Because it is tied to U.S. procurement, the AID program is a kind of "welcome wagon" for American products, introducing them into areas that have traditionally traded with somebody else. At the same time, by helping other countries develop and expand their economies, the AID program helps to create more paying customers for American exports. After all, people without money or jobs are not much of a market, whether they are in this country or overseas.

We have already experienced many benefits from our AID program, and, in time, we will reap even greater dividends. In time the countries which we are assisting will be able to take their part in a stable world, economically fit and able. Then we will reap the greatest economic benefits as the new markets which we have helped to develop begin to spend more and more in the United States.

I urge complete and wholehearted support of the President's request for the full authorization for our foreign aid program.

DOLLAR SAVINGS ATTRIBUTED TO ROGERS AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in an effort to follow compliance with a provision in the foreign-aid program which calls for progressive reduction and eventual termination of bilateral economic grant assistance, I again asked for a separate report on savings which can be attributed to this provision this year.

This provision, which I sponsored, and which was adopted by the Congress, marked the first expression of congressional intent that such assistance be terminated.

I am pleased to state that the total savings which may be attributed to this provision amounts to \$763 million, and that the number of countries receiving this type of assistance has been reduced by 38.

I ask that the report which I received concerning this provision be included in the RECORD at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1965.

The Honorable PAUL G. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: I am pleased to respond to your inquiry regarding compliance with the Rogers amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (sec. 634(e)).

This section, as you know, directs the executive branch, wherever practicable, progressively to reduce and eventually terminate bilateral grant economic assistance. This directive has been in effect with reference to supporting type assistance since fiscal year 1959, and with reference to technical cooperation type assistance since fiscal year 1962.

Attached are two charts showing the progress that has been made in complying with the Rogers amendment in these two appropriation categories.

With reference to supporting type assistance, the total request made by the executive branch has declined from \$1,047 million in fiscal year to \$369 million in fiscal year 1966—a reduction of \$678 million. The reduction in the number of countries for which such assistance is programed has been from 41 in fiscal year 1959 to only 13 in fiscal year 1966—an overall reduction of 28 countries.

With reference to technical cooperation type assistance, the total reduction in the appropriation request from fiscal year 1962 to 1966 is \$85 million. The reduction in the number of countries has been 10—from 77 in fiscal year 1962 to 67 in fiscal year 1966.

These figures show that there has been substantial compliance with the congressional directive contained in the Rogers amendment regarding the reduction in bilateral grant economic assistance.

I hope this information will be helpful to you, and if there is any way we can be further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. GAUD,
Deputy Administrator.

Supporting type assistance appropriation requests since application of the Rogers amendment (sec. 634(e))

Fiscal year	Appropriation request (millions)	Number of countries for which assistance programed
1959	\$1,047	41
1960	1,106	42
1961	992	34
1962	610	42
1963	481	22
1964	435	19
1965	1,405	14
1966	369	13
Total reduction in request, fiscal years 1959-66	678	
Reduction in number of countries, fiscal years 1959-66		28

¹ Includes \$70,000,000 special additional request for South Vietnam.

Technical cooperation type assistance appropriation requests since application of the Rogers amendment (sec. 634(e))

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Appropriation request	Amount for Alliance for Progress	Number of countries for which assistance programed
1962	\$380		77
1963	435	(100)	80
1964	357	(100)	79
1965	310	(85)	69
1966	295	(85)	67
Total reduction in request: Fiscal years 1962-66	85		
Reduction in number of countries, fiscal years 1962-66			10

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the following is my testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on my bill, H.R. 6464, to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949. I call for protection of American business against the Arab economic boycott of Israel. The text of my statement follows:

The question before us essentially is this: Must American businessmen submit to loss

of trade, to bring used as a "weapon of war" and impeded in international commerce, and to being dictated to by a foreign government as to where and how to invest. I speak of course of the Arab economic boycott against the State of Israel.

Such boycott has forced the American businessman to choose between the Arab Government and Israel. This is an unwarranted interference with private American interests. As third parties, the American businessman or firm is forced into a political squeeze. In the instance of the Arab boycott, we do not have the situation of one antagonistic country confronting another in recognized economic warfare. Here we have the situation of American business interests being adversely affected, not because they are nationals of either country but only because as third parties, private parties, they seek legitimate commercial objectives in international trade and investment. We have ample documentation to show that not only are those firms involved who directly seek trade and investment outlets in the Middle East, but that firms who deal with such firms are also adversely affected and boycotted. Thus, the boycott stretches not only to one private firm but to second, third, fourth, and even fifth firms who are commercially bound up with the first.

I know you are aware of the humiliating questionnaires to which American firms trading with Arab countries are subjected and the degrading affidavits which they are compelled to sign. There are those who say this is a very simple problem. They say that there is no need for legislation, that the American firm need not submit, but this is easier said than done. American trade, American jobs, American productivity are all involved.

What the American business firms need is the unequivocal backing of U.S. law. We must give the American interests the vehicle whereby they can state they cannot defy the provisions of the Federal statute. We must remember, too, that the Arab nations have shown no constancy in applying this boycott. Wherever they wished, they looked aside. With this act on our books, I have no doubt that the whole Arab boycott would collapse. Blackmail no longer being possible, the Arab nations would accept American trade opportunities and investments lest their economic plight, already manifest, become truly desperate.

The passage of H.R. 6464, I repeat, would give American business the assurance it needs that it has governmental backing in rejecting the sordid and sorry Arab boycott. Thus, we also encourage the expansion of international trade into the entire Middle East and help to lessen the tensions therein and make a valuable contribution to world peace. We declare thereby that Israel is here to stay and that the United States recognizes its international rights to trade freely.

Some have wished to back away from supporting this bill, saying that we would establish a precedent and thus tie the United States hands in dealing with countries antagonistic to her. This is not so. We must recognize the major difference. Such restrictions as we have, for example, against China and Cuba are limited to U.S. citizens, U.S. companies, and products of U.S. origin. Here is a matter of government versus government. We do not impose restrictions on private citizens of foreign countries.

It is true that we do penalize foreign firms that misrepresent and violate restrictions on our own exports. We also penalize ships that trade with Cuba by denying them U.S. Government-financed cargoes. But that is as far as we go.

Let me make it clear we are not asking for Congress to legislate for Israel. We are asking Congress to legislate for the protection of American business and American commerce.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before us.

H.R. 7750 authorizes the funds necessary to carry on the foreign aid program for another year and makes a number of amendments to the basic act to improve the operation of the program.

For almost two decades the United States has provided economic and military assistance to foreign countries. Foreign aid has become a major factor in the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy. Through our aid programs we have sought to contain the march of world communism and to assist the underdeveloped countries to economic viability.

As President Johnson so aptly has said, foreign assistance offers "strength to those who would be free; hope for those who would otherwise despair; progress for those who would help themselves."

The duration of the program, the kinds of assistance we provide, and the amount we spend will depend on the progress made in coping with the Communist menace and bringing economic and sociopolitical stability in the less developed countries.

Under past and present administrations, a long succession of studies of the foreign aid program and its impact on our foreign policy, have judged the aid program to be in our national interest.

Neither these surveys nor the executive branch has recommended a dramatic departure from the program as it is currently structured.

We must remember, however, that the House Foreign Affairs Committee conducts a continuous review and analysis of this program. And each year, through suggestions conveyed to the executive branch, and through legislation, our committee attempts to strengthen the program, to improve its operations, and to make sure that its size and direction correspond to our foreign policy requirements at this particular time.

There is one conclusion which our committee has reached over the years, and which is as valid today as it was 2 or 5 years ago; namely, that the military and the economic portions of this program are interdependent, and that both of them must be related at all times to specific objectives of our foreign policy.

With this I fully agree. I believe that separating the economic and the military components of this program simply does not make sense. In my opinion, the program cannot be so divided without the prospect of harm being done to it and to our foreign policy.

I also believe that, for some years to come, the foreign assistance program will continue as a permanent feature of our foreign policy.

This conclusion is dictated by our national self-interest. We cannot, we must not, let our guard down simply because Communist tactics change, and Communist-sponsored revolutions and subversion may at a particular time appear to be abating. While the Communists continue to adhere to their goal of world domination, we must do what we can to prevent them from attaining that goal.

But there is a further reason for this program: The progress of science, of transportation and communications, is bringing the peoples of the world closer together. In a world made small by the concurrent revolutions of the 20th century, we must be able and be willing to continue our programs of mutual assistance for mutual benefit and security.

There is one thing I would like to add: I regret that the oversight and coordination of many programs which bear directly on the implementation of our foreign policy, are scattered among various committees. This state of affairs makes difficult an overall evaluation and direction of these activities.

In particular, I regret that the operation of the Public Law 480 program does not come under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The policy embodied in this program, its scope and the various activities it finances, have a major impact on our foreign policy. Also, the shortcomings of this program reflect on the work of our committee—yet we have no effective responsibility or control over it.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate my strong belief that the foreign aid program is vital to our national security.

The authorization in the bill before us—\$3.4 billion—is essential to enable the United States to deal effectively with the present world situation and to promote our national interests abroad.

This, by the way, is the smallest authorization requested by the executive branch, and approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, in many years.

I hope that in the future, the world outlook will be brighter so that we may be able to make even further reductions in these programs. Until this happens, however, I urge that we approve the full amount recommended in the bill.

I would also like to say that I for one—and I am certain that the chairman and other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee would likewise—welcome any suggestions for the strengthening of this program.

Constructive criticism is welcome and healthy—and it will serve our national interest.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself briefly to some of the improvements in the foreign assistance program which I have sponsored and which are reflected in the bill before the House.

First, with respect to private pilot housing projects in Latin America.

H.R. 7750 contains my amendment which increases from \$250 million to \$450 million the amount of guarantees that may be issued under this program. I believe this change is required for two reasons:

First, virtually all of the \$250 million currently available for this very successful and effective program is used up. Unless additional money is provided, the progress that is being made toward the solution of Latin America's critical housing problem, will be jeopardized.

Second, in the bill before the House today, we are proposing to expand the pilot housing project program to include

the building of institutions necessary to the success of the Alliance for Progress—institutions such as cooperatives, savings and loan associations, and other community and regional enterprises. These private self-help associations, such as Father McClellan's Savings and Loan League in Peru, can serve as a bootstrap for economic progress in all of Latin America.

My second amendment relates to the extended-risk guarantee program.

There is \$300 million available for this program. Very little of this money has been used to date. Also, the executive branch, through administrative action, has set aside \$50 million under this program for worldwide housing guarantees.

My amendment increases that set-aside to \$150 million. Housing is one of the critical needs not only in Latin America but also in other developing continents. And decent housing is one of the foundations of social and economic progress. We should, therefore, make every effort to encourage home-building as a part of an integrated approach to the conquest of disease, poverty and illiteracy in the free world. This is what my amendment proposes to do.

My third amendment relates to military sales—an activity in which I have been interested for many years, and which has been affected positively by the amendments which I have offered, and which the Congress had adopted, over the years.

One of the apprehensions voiced recently in the press is that the military sales program may be getting too big and may antagonize some of our allies in Western Europe. I do not believe that this program is producing such results. Nevertheless, in order to keep military sales activities under appropriate safeguards and restraints, I have offered an amendment which appears in section 201(d)(2) of the bill and which provides that in making sales abroad, the military authorities must endeavor, to the extent possible, to sell equipment for what it costs the U.S. Government. This is intended to forestall any overly competitive bidding and underbidding in such sales. My amendment further provides that with respect to any sale in which the proceeds are not sufficient to cover the cost of the equipment to the U.S. Government, detailed reports must be made promptly to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendments I have just described strengthen and improve the foreign aid program. I have offered them in the spirit of constructive support for this program, and I hope that they will be adopted by the House.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, the foreign aid program is working now to insure the future of all of us and of the generations to come. It is a program of foresight, initiative, imagination, trust and courage and a sincere belief that the result of it will be a more stable world of the future.

One of the main goals of our aid program is to make the less fortunate recipient countries self-supporting and independent; able to take their proper place among the nations of the world

and to assume their fair share of world responsibility. Well, as proof of the success of our program, we have been able to end economic aid to 26 countries since the program began after World War II. Of that 26, 13 have made so remarkable an adjustment to self-support that they have become our partners in the world foreign aid program and are carrying on foreign aid programs of their own. This is, I think, a highly impressive figure and it will increase as the years go by.

Another positive accomplishment has been the shift in emphasis of our program. Ten years ago, two-thirds of our aid was military—today, two-thirds is economic and most of that is directed toward long-term development, improving the ability of more countries to support their own continued growth.

Foreign aid has made great contributions in the field of health. Reported cholera cases in the less-developed countries dropped from 211,943 in 1950 to 32,827 in 1960 and cholera deaths from 130,481 to 12,806 in the same period.

By 1963, 700 million of the 1.4 billion people who live in the less-developed world's malarious areas were protected by malaria education programs and for more than 300 million of these, the threat of malaria has been completely eliminated. Our aid has financed much of the DDT and equipment for this humane program. In India, for example, malaria which formerly incapacitated 100 million people each year has almost been completely eradicated. Wells for potable water have increased at a rate of 85,000 a year.

We are making strides in the field of health and we are conquering the enemy of disease. This too is a long-range battle but well worth the effort in our continual striving to bring about a better world and a better life in the future.

We are battling on other fronts also, and I mean in such areas as ignorance, hunger, and poverty. Slowly, we are winning in the battle against disease. We are also making progress in the battle against ignorance. Since 1958, the less-developed countries have increased their investment in education an average of 15 percent annually. As an example of this, 2,000 classrooms were built in Brazil in 1964 with 4,500 more slated for completion in 1965 and 1966. In Chile, 72 grade and high schools accommodating 50,000 students were built in 1964 alone. AID-financed contract teams from 11 American colleges and universities are working with the Nigerians to expand facilities and to reshape the Nigerian educational system so that it can turn out skilled technicians at every level from typists to engineers.

In agriculture, tremendous reclamation projects such as the Indus Basin development program in Pakistan will help to greatly increase the yield of wheat in what has been characterized as one of the least productive agricultural areas in the world. With U.S. assistance, Tunisia has become an exporter rather than an importer of fruits and vegetables. Among other things, our assistance helped to establish 24 nurseries which now distribute 2.5 million

fruit trees and 50 million vegetable plant stocks annually.

We are working with the governments of less fortunate countries in their agricultural programs to step up production, raising both quantity and quality. Agricultural processes and laws are under revision in many areas. In countries such as India and Pakistan we are co-operating in the establishment of agricultural colleges which are organized not only to train specialists but to transmit new techniques and methods to the field in order that the many can benefit.

One result of this effort has been a demonstrable rise in agricultural output. In Thailand, for instance, rising agricultural output has stayed well ahead of population growth, and important new crops like corn have been successfully introduced.

As agricultural techniques and output improves, the battle against hunger is made easier. Hand in hand with this there is a general rise in the stability of the economies of the underdeveloped nations.

I have already mentioned that 13 of the 26 nations to which we have ended economic aid are now carrying on foreign aid programs of their own. In some cases such as France, Japan, and Western Germany, these are programs of considerable magnitude. And in the same vein, there has been a heartening growth in the economies of many of the nations which are still receiving aid from us under our foreign aid program.

One of the most dramatic examples of this is Taiwan where we will close our economic aid mission on the 30th of June. Since 1954, Taiwan's industrial output has tripled and its total output of goods and services has jumped 45 percent. Exports have risen rapidly. Education and health facilities have expanded. Taiwan is one of our brighter accomplishments, yet 10 years ago it was said that Taiwan would be indefinitely dependent upon the United States. Our assistance has not ended poverty in Taiwan. The average income there is still only about \$150 per person contrasted with about \$3,000 per person in the United States but what we have done is to put the people of Taiwan in a position where they can solve their own problems. They are now able, as they were not before, to do the things that will lead to a steadily increasing income for themselves and their children.

We can be proud of our efforts in Taiwan. This growth is but one example of the progress which we are making in other countries. In the years since 1950, the less-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have:

Increased total production at an average of over 4 percent a year.

Increased industrial output at an average of 8 percent annually—except for Latin America which averaged 6 percent—and

Increased the value of their exports from \$19 to \$29 billion between 1950 and 1962 despite falling world prices for primary products.

We are all familiar with the part which our governmental agencies have played in this development but AID has brought many private resources into the picture.

I mentioned the field of education—American colleges and universities are a definite and positive part of our program. As of September 30, 1964, over 100 American universities held more than \$230 million in AID contracts for research, surveys, training, and technical assistance. Over \$170 million of this amount was for technical assistance by 67 universities in 41 countries.

Since the enactment in 1961 of the Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, AID has strongly emphasized assistance for the development of farm credit and marketing cooperatives, credit unions, savings and loan institutions and housing and electrical power cooperatives to help organize capital and individual effort at the grassroots level.

For technical assistance in these fields, the Agency has relied heavily on contracts with private American institutions including the Credit Union National Association, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the National Farmers Union, the Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and the International Cooperative Training Center.

Private American engineering and construction firms are now at work in over 50 countries supervising the design and construction of more than \$4 billion in AID-assisted capital projects; irrigation systems; power dams, fertilizer factories and so forth.

AID contracts with the American Institute for Free Labor Development, spearheaded by the AFL-CIO, have permitted effective labor participation in assistance to Latin America.

Since 1964, through its Partners of the Alliance program, AID has been acting as the catalyst in establishing and sustaining wider private involvement in the Alliance for Progress. Twenty-five active partnerships have developed and more are to follow wherein teams from U.S. communities travel to Latin America to develop, with local counterpart groups, a program of mutual interest based on identified needs and available resources.

The International Executive Service Corps has been formed by industry to assist in providing skilled executives to assist in the development of the less fortunate countries. There are a large number of voluntary agencies which are contributing time, effort, money, and personnel to help to do their part in insuring the success of this program designed for future world progress.

I think we can be proud of our efforts in the field of foreign aid so far. I feel that we can take great pride in the success shown by Western Europe, Japan, and Taiwan and in many other countries where progress has been dramatic.

Our foreign aid program is our way of doing our part to make the future one that we and the generations to come can enjoy and of which we can all be proud.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, while I applaud the committee's recommendation that no sale under title I of this act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United

States, I believe our sanctions would be much more effective if we declared a complete ban on further sales to Nasser until he demonstrates a civilized attitude toward our own country and renounces his attacks on Israel. I am aware that the U.S. Constitution gives the responsibility of determining foreign policy to the President. But, Mr. Chairman, by giving to the Congress the power of the purse strings, our Founding Fathers said in effect that they want the Congress to look over the President's shoulder.

I cannot conceive of a situation affecting our national interest which would permit continued sales to Egypt in the light of Nasser's arrogant statement that we can jump in the ocean with our foreign aid. More important, Mr. Chairman, the fact that Nasser is accepting aid from the Soviet Union with which to continue his aggression against Israel and the United States, makes it impossible to justify any further aid to Nasser at this time.

I have the highest confidence in President Johnson but I believe the language in the bill puts the President on the spot. I believe we in the Congress should set the policy of no further aid to Nasser until he stops muddying the waters by cutting off the authorization for funds at this time. He will squeal and protest but at least he will know that we here in Congress are determined to deal effectively with those who would wage aggression against us or our allies. Israel deserves this kind of positive help from us at this time. I know of no violence that would be done to our foreign policy by declaring a 1-year moratorium on further aid to Nasser. It would give him a year to consider the folly of his policy toward those who sincerely want to reach a just and peaceful solution in the Middle East. We shall review this entire legislation in another 12 months. If Nasser shows signs of civilized conduct, we can again consider renewing our assistance program to Egypt. But as far as I am concerned, he should have no more of our assistance, at least until he shows he deserves this kind of aid from the American people.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, the arguments pro and con on the question of U.S. foreign military and economic assistance have undergone some change since the inception of the Marshall plan. Yesterday and today the debate on H.R. 7750 has reflected the change in attitude on both sides. As for myself, I have always felt our foreign aid programs were not only sincere expressions of America's historic humanitarian concern for other people whose fates have not been as favorable as ours, but they have been measurably successful in stemming the onslaught of Communist ideology as well as the assumption of power by men who are Communists.

The humanitarian and anti-Communist impulses, however, are themselves not the only reasons for inaugurating and continuing foreign assistance. We have been, and we continue to be, concerned for the economic foundations of new and developing nations. It is in our own best self-interest to assist these countries in fulfilling their legitimate as-

pirations for sustained economic growth in order to satisfy the material needs of their peoples and to protect their political independence. These nations, once they are on the road to a balanced and developing economy, will then be able to help smooth out the wrinkles in international trade and add significantly to the economic abundance of everyone. Our own economic well-being, therefore, is contingent upon the economic conditions of these countries.

Should we suddenly end or even phase out our foreign aid programs over a period of 2 or 3 years, the consequences at home would be drastic. We would do well to remember that over 85 percent of all foreign aid money appropriated by Congress is providing the foundation for several hundred thousand jobs in the United States. If these funds were suddenly withdrawn, the unemployment level would soar. For the State of Ohio the impact of foreign aid funds is even more important. Under AID orders in the 6 months from July to December 1964, Ohio's industry was awarded contracts totaling \$11,552,335.09, and in the 12 months of the same year the total was \$27.3 million. Ohio was second among all the States in the production of goods which were exported under funds administered by AID last year. These funds employ thousands of workers who, we can say with certainty, would otherwise be out of work altogether or only partially employed. These same funds yield rewards for industry in terms of profits and capital investments.

In view of these facts for the State, when we turn to the influence of foreign aid on Cincinnati's economy, we find that in the last 6 months of 1964 industries there received orders totaling \$131,003.09, and probably more—the exact figures are not available and therefore the data were developed from partial computations. For the entire year of 1964, Cincinnati industries were recipients of contracts in excess of \$270,000.

Taking all of these factors into account, Mr. Speaker, I believe we can fairly conclude that foreign aid is not only desirable but necessary in maintaining freedom abroad and a high level of prosperity at home.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this foreign assistance legislation. Basically I oppose this program because it seems plain to me that foreign aid has not been accomplishing the objections originally intended. Secondly I do not feel that the \$3.4 billion which are expected to be appropriated this year, in view of our regular annual deficits, can be afforded without jeopardizing our economy. I think Congress should reduce the authorization to not to exceed \$1 billion. If this was done and the program was terminated or completely overhauled in the next 2 years, I would vote for the bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, in view of the drain of our foreign aid on U.S. gold stocks, I think the time has come to restrict this program.

The unexpended balances in the program after June 30 this year will total more than \$9 billion.

I do not see how our country with its heavy load of debt and tremendous load of domestic obligations can fight wars and at the same time assist some 70 other countries under foreign aid.

So, as I have said, I intend to vote against the bill on final passage.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support H.R. 7750—a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

No man can deny the fact that foreign assistance has made and is an essential part of our foreign policy. Without the foreign aid program there is serious doubt in my mind that we would be meeting here today. Without this essential program, we would have long since been fighting for survival against foreign invaders in the streets of our cities, towns, and villages.

Under the able leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has thoroughly reviewed our foreign assistance program and with a fine-toothed comb has reduced the authorization request to the minimum necessary for our own international survival.

No Member of the House has devoted more time to this essential program—no Member has the experience and the responsibility as that possessed by Chairman MORGAN. I have complete faith and confidence in his judgment and therefore I respectfully urge the Members of the House to pass H.R. 7750 as recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. It is urgent for the future of America that we join together to support the proven and experienced leadership of Chairman MORGAN.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, although I disagree with a number of parts of the foreign aid bill, I will vote for the measure because, on balance, I feel that its advantages to our Nation outweigh its disadvantages, and also because in these critical days of confrontation between the forces of freedom and the forces of communism in widely scattered parts of the world foreign aid, carefully awarded and well administered, is a basic weapon in the arsenal of freedom.

I have thus put aside some significant reservations I have about this foreign aid bill and deferred to the broader concerns of national security which this legislation is designed to promote.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, during my 3 years of service in the House, I have supported the foreign aid program, each time with a heightened sense that we are getting over our depth and that control has been lost by the administrators of the program and, even more alarming, by the Congress itself. I shall vote for the program again this year, although I shall also vote as in the past for a moderate reduction. Our country has undertaken grave responsibilities and I feel compelled to support our commitments to carry them out.

It should be pointed out that this bill—H.R. 7750—does not represent the total of foreign aid spending by the United

States by far, in spite of its inclusive name—the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965. This bill would authorize \$2,197,670,000 for economic assistance and \$1,170 million for military assistance. In addition to this, through other legislation, we are budgeting for this fiscal year:

The Peace Corps, \$115 million; the food-for-peace program—Public Law 480—\$1,658 million; the Inter-American Development Bank, \$706 million; the International Development Association, \$104 million.

When these sums are added to the funds authorized by H.R. 7750, the foreign aid spending for the fiscal year 1966 totals around \$6 billion.

On top of this, after June 30 of this year, there will remain some \$9 billion in money previously authorized that has not been spent in the foreign aid program.

We in Congress cannot run this program ourselves, nor should we try, but we are entitled to an accounting of it that we are not getting. We should insist on it but we are not. We are the ultimate guardians of the Nation's resources and we are ultimately responsible to the American people for our stewardship of them.

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY SHOULD BE SEPARATE

Personally, I do not see why the military and economic portions of foreign aid should be lumped together in a single bill. The military budget concerns the vital defense of our country and the free world. It should probably be in the defense budget. The economic portion concerns the political and humanitarian aspects of our world leadership. It does not make sense to me to put them together in such a way that it is almost impossible for us to revise one without jeopardizing the other.

Budgetary problems and the subject of fiscal responsibility are difficult and complex. Every one of us knows how difficult it is to hold audience attention through a labyrinthine discussion of economics, even though the subject matter strikes to the foundations of our society. Yet we must talk about them and weigh the effects of every program we enact upon welfare of the people—on their jobs, their incomes, the value of the money in which they are paid, and on their general security.

GOLD FLOW PROBLEM

There is dispute among experts on the effect of the foreign aid program upon our national credit, the loss of gold, which is the bedrock of our national credit, and on our financial stability. But there is no disagreement that the program has an effect and that the effect is, to a greater or lesser degree, harmful.

We must keep in mind that, while the purpose of foreign aid is to strengthen the free world in its battle against international communism, and to help underdeveloped and backward countries to achieve self-sufficiency, our ability to reach these goals will collapse utterly if our economy collapses. Without a strong America, the battle would be hopeless.

VOTE TO REDUCE EXPLAINED

So my concern for the program and my vote to reduce it, is not an attack on the principles behind it but a protest over the manner in which it is being administered. It is an expression of concern that Congress is not carrying out its responsibility in this area, that it is leaving too much to the discretion of the anonymous functionaries in the dark departmental caverns downtown.

Foreign aid, it was truly said, can never be a substitute for foreign policy. It is but one tool in a varied arsenal. Our commitments abroad, particularly the war in Vietnam and our involvement in the Dominican Republic, are almost certain to require heavy additional, unforeseen expenditures. Our military resources are gravely extended at present and it is likely that Congress will be called on to authorize substantial new spending for defense. Let us not lose sight of the fact that we are running huge budget deficits, and proposing further tax cuts. The American people will make any sacrifice they are asked to make if the reasons are clear and sensible. But they will not tolerate waste and the aimless frittering away of their substance nor should they be expected to.

Let us then exercise prudence and care, with the total picture in mind, as we enact foreign aid and indeed all other programs.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign assistance authorization bill, H.R. 7750, now before this House for its consideration.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been privileged to participate actively in the hearings and discussions of this year's foreign aid program. From this participation I have had the opportunity to examine the overall assistance effort, as well as the individual country programs and the major categories of economic and military aid.

Although it would be expecting too much to hope for complete agreement among the Members of this House on each and every aspect of the President's program, I believe President Johnson deserves full credit for adhering to his expressed determination to "impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948." In carrying out this objective, the President has sent us a foreign aid request for fiscal year 1966 that is both highly selective and at the same time represents the result of careful review and critical analysis.

Therefore, as we debate the pros and cons of the various military and economic assistance programs, it is important that we in Congress also take a cold, hard, and thoroughly businesslike look at each of them. Our final decision should rest on whether or not, or to what extent they contribute to and advance our national interest, and the interest of the other freedom-loving countries of the world.

Certainly, none of us wants any part of a giveaway program that does not advance the cause of our national se-

curity. We do not have, never have had, and never will have sufficient resources to be able to afford any wasteful or extravagant programs that do not stand on their own merit by helping to make the world a more secure and a better place in which to live.

On the other hand, who among us can doubt that the military and economic assistance we gave to the war-ravaged nations of Europe, and later to Greece and Turkey, was not a major cause of their stout and successful defense against the threat of Communist takeover during those perilous days after World War II?

Many nations, who once had received large amounts of assistance from us, are today able to stand on their own, and in fact, have now become donors of assistance to less fortunate nations.

Other countries are in what we might classify as a middle position: They continue to receive some assistance from us, but they are steadily moving in the direction of economic independence, and in the not too distant future should be entirely on their own.

There is also a third category, made up largely of the underdeveloped countries of Africa, southeast Asia, and Latin America, which will need substantial amounts of financial, technical, and related assistance for some time to come.

One essential requirement for this third category of nations is that they bend every effort to help themselves, that they be willing and able to make the necessary changes and reforms to enable outside assistance to be effective.

The Alliance for Progress is the name we use to describe this joint economic assistance and self-help effort in the Latin American area. Though not living entirely up to our most ambitious hopes, the Alliance has made solid gains, and gives promise of greater accomplishments in the future life of our good neighbors to the south.

But, as President Johnson has said:

A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle.

With these thoughts in mind, I would urge my colleagues to consider carefully all the aspects of the legislation before us, and weigh the cost of the program against the pressing needs around us.

Then, I am confident that a majority of the Members will cast their ballots in support of the President and in support of meeting our national obligation to do our part in the defense of freedom wherever it is challenged around the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

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 the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended,

and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 395, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 7750) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments: Page 2, after line 8, insert the following:

"TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

"Sec. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development loans, is amended as follows:

“(a) Amend section 202(a) by striking out “and \$1,500,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years, which sums shall remain available until expended: Provided, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year: Provided further” and substitute the following: “\$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, and \$649,292,000 for the fiscal year 1966, which sums shall remain available until expended: Provided”.

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Page 5, line 15, immediately after “free” insert “non-Communist-dominated”.

Page 6, line 16, immediately after “free” insert “non-Communist-dominated”.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 219, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—178

Abbutt, Andrews, Battin, Abernethy, N. Dak., Belcher, Adair, Arends, Bell, Anderson, Ill., Ashmore, Bennett, Andrews, Baring, Betts, Glenn, Bates, Bolton

Bow, Hall, Poff, Meeds, Poage, Smith, Iowa, Bray, Halleck, Miller, Price, Staggers, Brock, Hamilton, Minish, Pucinski, Stalbaum, Broyhill, N.C., Race, Mink, Purcell, Steed, Broyhill, Va., Hardy, Monagan, Redlin, Stratton, Buchanan, Harris, Morgan, Reid, N.Y., Sullivan, Bureson, Harsha, Morris, Reuss, Sweeney, Burton, Utah, Harvey, Mich., Reinecke, Rhodes, Pa., Teague, Tex., Byrnes, Wis., Henderson, Rhoads, Alaska, Tenzer, Cabell, Herlong, Rivers, S.C., Roberts, Thomas, Callaway, Hosmer, Robson, Rodino, Thompson, N.J., Casey, Hull, Rogers, Tex., Rogers, Colo., Thompson, Tex., Cederberg, Roush, Murphy, Ill., Rogers, Fla., Todd, Chamberlain, Ichord, Murphy, N.Y., Ronan, Trimble, Clancy, Jarman, Nedzi, Rooney, N.Y., Tunney, Clausen, Jennings, Satterfield, Rooney, Pa., Tupper, Don H., Johnson, Pa., Saylor, Tuten, Cleveland, Jonas, Schneebell, O'Hara, Ill., Udall, Collier, Jones, Mo., Schweiker, O'Hara, Mich., Ullman, Colmer, Keith, Olson, Mont., Roybal, Van Deerlin, Conable, King, N.Y., O'Neil, Mass., Ryan, Vanik, Corbett, Kornegay, Selden, Ottinger, St Germain, Vigorito, Cramer, Kunkel, Senner, St. Onge, Schauer, Vivian, Cunningham, Laird, Shipley, Patten, Schuler, Wilson, Curtin, Langen, Shriner, Pepper, Schisler, Charles H., Curtis, Latta, Sikes, Perkins, Schmidhauser, Wolff, Dague, Lipscomb, Smith, Calif., Yates, Davis, Ga., Long, La., Smith, N.Y., Zang, Davis, Wis., McClory, Smith, Va., Lockk, Derwinski, McCulloch, Stafford, Young, Devine, McDade, Stanton, Pickle, Dole, McEwen, Stephens, Andrews, Dorn, McMillan, Talcott, George W., Hagen, Calif., Resnick, Dowdy, MacGregor, Taylor, Bandstra, Hanna, Roncallo, Downing, Marsh, Teague, Calif., Harvey, Ind., Skubitz, Duncan, Tenn., Martin, Ala., Thompson, La., Stubblefield, Edwards, Ala., Martin, Mass., Thomson, Wis., Toll, Ellsworth, Matthews, May, Utz, Watts, Erlenborn, Findley, Mills, Walker, Miss., Walker, N. Mex., Weltner, White, Idaho, Fisher, Ford, Gerald R., Minshall, Watkins, Willis, Fountaine, Mize, White, Tex., Wright, Fulton, Pa., Moore, Whitener, Pool, Fuqua, Morton, Whitten, Powell, Gathings, Moshier, Widnall, White, Gattys, Murray, Williams, Bob, Giddell, Griffin, Nelsen, O'Neal, Ga., Wyatt, Gross, Grover, Gubser, Wylder, Gurney, Felly, Younger, Haley, Pirnie

NAYS—219

Adams, Dingell, Hathaway, Addabbo, Donohue, Hawkins, Albert, Dow, Hays, Anderson, Dulski, Hechler, Tenn., Duncan, Ore., Helstoski, Annunzio, Dwyer, Hicks, Ashley, Dyal, Hollifield, Aspinall, Edmondson, Holland, Ayres, Edwards, Calif., Horton, Baldwin, Evans, Colo., Howard, Barrett, Everett, Huot, Beckworth, Evins, Tenn., Irwin, Bingham, Fallon, Jacobs, Biatnik, Farbsteyn, Joelson, Farnsley, Johnson, Calif., Boggs, Farnum, Johnson, Okla., Boland, Fassel, Jones, Ala., Bolling, Feighan, Karsten, Brademas, Flood, Karsten, Brooks, Fogarty, Kastenmeter, Broomfield, Brown, Calif., Kee, Burke, Ford, Kelly, Byrnes, Pa., William D., Keogh, Cahill, Fraser, King, Calif., Callan, Frelinghuysen, King, Utah, Cameron, Friedel, Kirwan, Carey, Fulton, Tenn., Kirwan, Celler, Gallagher, Kluczynski, Clark, Garmatz, Krebs, Clevenger, Gialmo, Landrum, Cohelan, Gibbons, Leggett, Conte, Gilbert, Long, Md., Conyers, Gilligan, Love, Cooley, Gonzalez, McCarthy, Corman, Grabowski, McDowell, Craley, Gray, McFall, Culver, Green, Pa., McGrath, Daddario, Greigg, McVicker, Daniels, Gridler, Machen, Dawson, Griffiths, Mackay, de la Garza, Hagan, Ga., Mackie, Delaney, Halpern, Madden, Dent, Hanley, Mahon, Denton, Hansen, Iowa, Malliard, Diggs, Hansen, Wash., Matsunaga

Meeds, Poage, Smith, Iowa, Miller, Price, Staggers, Minish, Pucinski, Stalbaum, Mink, Purcell, Steed, Monagan, Redlin, Stratton, Morgan, Reid, N.Y., Sullivan, Morris, Reuss, Sweeney, Morrison, Rhodes, Pa., Teague, Tex., Morse, Rhoads, Alaska, Tenzer, Moss, Roberts, Thomas, Multer, Rodino, Thompson, N.J., Murphy, Ill., Rogers, Colo., Thompson, Tex., Murphy, N.Y., Ronan, Trimble, Natcher, Rooney, N.Y., Tunney, Nedzi, Rooney, Pa., Tupper, O'Brien, Rooney, Pa., Tuten, O'Hara, Ill., Roosevelt, Udall, O'Hara, Mich., Rosenthal, Ullman, Olsen, Mont., Rostenkowski, Olson, Minn., Roybal, Van Deerlin, O'Neil, Mass., Ryan, Vanik, Ottinger, St Germain, Vigorito, Patman, St. Onge, Schuler, Vivian, Pepper, Schisler, Charles H., Perkins, Schmidhauser, Wolff, Philbin, Sikes, Yates, Pickle, Sisk, Young, Pike, Slack, Zanglockk

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews, Green, Ore., Resnick, George W., Hagen, Calif., Roncallo, Ashbrook, Hanna, Skubitz, Bandstra, Harvey, Ind., Springer, Berry, Hébert, Stubblefield, Bonner, Hungate, Toll, Brown, Ohio, Lennon, Watts, Burton, Calif., Macdonald, Weltner, Carter, Mathias, White, Idaho, Chelf, Moorhead, Willis, Clawson, Del, Nix, Wright, Dickinson, Pool, Flynt, Powell

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Macdonald against.

Mr. Skubitz for, with Mr. Burton of California against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Pool for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Bandstra against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Hagen of California against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Roncallo against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Watts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Willis with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. HAMILTON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 148, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—249

Adams, Anderson, Arends, Addabbo, Tenn., Ashley, Albert, Annunzio

Ayres	Gray	Nelsen
Baldwin	Green, Pa.	Nix
Barrett	Grelgg	O'Brien
Bates	Grider	O'Hara, Ill.
Beckworth	Griffin	O'Hara, Mich.
Bell	Griffiths	Olsen, Mont.
Bingham	Halleck	Olson, Minn.
Blatnik	Halpern	O'Neill, Mass.
Boggs	Hamilton	Ottinger
Boland	Hanley	Patman
Bolling	Hansen, Iowa	Patten
Bolton	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Brademas	Hardy	Perkins
Brooks	Harris	Philbin
Broomfield	Hathaway	Pickle
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Pike
Burke	Hays	Pirnie
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler	Price
Byrnes, Wis.	Helstoski	Pucinski
Cahill	Herlong	Purecell
Callan	Hicks	Quile
Cameron	Hollifield	Redlin
Carey	Holland	Reid, N.Y.
Celler	Horton	Reuss
Clark	Hosmer	Rhodes, Pa.
Cleveland	Howard	Rivers, Alaska
Clevenger	Huot	Robison
Cohelan	Irwin	Rodino
Conable	Jacobs	Rogers, Colo.
Conte	Joelson	Ronan
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.
Corbett	Karsten	Roosevelt
Corman	Karth	Rosenthal
Craley	Kastenmeter	Rostenkowski
Culver	Kee	Roybal
Daddario	Keith	Ryan
Daniels	Kelly	St Germain
Dawson	Keogh	St. Onge
Delaney	King, Calif.	Scheuer
Dent	King, Utah	Schisler
Denton	Kirwan	Schmidhauser
Diggs	Kluczynski	Schweiker
Dingell	Krebs	Senner
Donohue	Kunkel	Sickles
Dow	Landrum	Sisk
Downing	Leggett	Slack
Dulski	Lindsay	Smith, Iowa
Duncan, Oreg.	Long, Md.	Smith, N.Y.
Dwyer	Love	Stafford
Dyal	McCarthy	Stagers
Edmondson	McDade	Stalbaum
Edwards, Calif.	McDowell	Steed
Evans, Colo.	McFall	Stratton
Everett	McGrath	Sullivan
Evins, Tenn.	McVicker	Sweeney
Fallon	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Farbstein	Machen	Tenzer
Farnsley	Mackay	Thomas
Farnum	Mackie	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Madden	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	Mahon	Todd
Flood	Mailliard	Trimble
Fogarty	Martin, Mass.	Tunney
Foley	Matsunaga	Tupper
Ford, Gerald R.	Matthews	Udall
Ford,	Meeds	Ullman
William D.	Mills	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Minish	Vanik
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Vigorito
Friedel	Monagan	Vivian
Fulton, Pa.	Morgan	Whalley
Fulton, Tenn.	Morrison	Widnall
Gallagher	Morse	Wilson,
Garmatz	Morton	Charles H.
Gialmo	Moss	Wolf
Gibbons	Multer	Wyder
Gilbert	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
Gilligan	Murphy, N.Y.	Young
Gonzalez	Natcher	Zablocki
Grabowski	Nedzi	

NAYS—148

Abbutt	Burton, Utah	Dole
Abernethy	Cabell	Dorn
Adair	Callaway	Dowdy
Anderson, Ill.	Casey	Duncan, Tenn.
Andrews,	Cederberg	Edwards, Ala.
Glenn	Chamberlain	Ellsworth
Andrews,	Clancy	Erlenborn
N. Dak.	Clausen,	Findley
Ashmore	Don H.	Fino
Baring	Collier	Fisher
Battin	Colmer	Fountain
Belcher	Cramer	Fuqua
Bennett	Cunningham	Gathings
Betts	Curtin	Gettys
Bow	Curtis	Goodell
Bray	Dague	Gross
Brook	Davis, Ga.	Grover
Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Wis.	Gubser
Broyhill, Va.	de la Garza	Gurney
Buchanan	Derwinski	Hagan, Ga.
Burleson	Devine	Haley

Hall	Minshall	Scott
Hansen, Idaho	Mize	Secret
Harsha	Moeller	Shipley
Harvey, Mich.	Moore	Shriver
Henderson	Morris	Sikes
Hull	Moshier	Smith, Calif.
Hutchinson	Murray	Smith, Va.
Ichord	O'Konski	Stanton
Jarman	O'Neal, Ga.	Stevens
Jennings	Passman	Talcott
Johnson, Okla.	Pelly	Taylor
Johnson, Pa.	Poage	Teague, Tex.
Jonas	Poff	Thompson, La.
Jones, Mo.	Quillen	Thomson, Wis.
King, N.Y.	Race	Tuck
Kornegay	Randall	Tuten
Laird	Reid, Ill.	Utt
Langen	Reifel	Waggonner
Latta	Reinecke	Walker, Miss.
Lipscomb	Rhodes, Ariz.	Walker, N. Mex.
Long, La.	Rivers, S.C.	Watkins
McClary	Roberts	White, Tex.
McCulloch	Rogers, Fla.	Whitener
McEwen	Rogers, Tex.	Whitten
McMillan	Roudebush	Williams
Marsh	Roush	Wilson, Bob
Martin, Ala.	Rumsfeld	Wyatt
Martin, Nebr.	Satterfield	Younger
May	Saylor	
Michel	Schneebell	

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews,	Green, Oreg.	Resnick
George W.	Hagen, Calif.	Roncallo
Ashbrook	Hanna	Skubitz
Bandstra	Harvey, Ind.	Springer
Berry	Hébert	Stubblefield
Bonner	Hungate	Toll
Brown, Ohio	Lennon	Watts
Burton, Calif.	Macdonald	Weltner
Carter	Mathias	White, Idaho
Chelf	Miller	Willis
Clawson, Del	Moorhead	Wright
Dickinson	Pool	
Flynt	Powell	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Skubitz against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Pool against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Bandstra for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Carter against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Hagen of California for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Springer for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roncallo with Mr. Weltner.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Wright.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, ETC., FOR ARMED FORCES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 800) 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.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday night, May 29, to file a report on H.R. 7105, the Export Control Act, including minority and supplemental views.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's taking this time for this purpose because I do want to announce some additions to the program. In the first place, we go on as previously announced with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill tomorrow.

Following that we shall take up S. 800. There will be a rule on this bill waiving points of order on the conference report on that bill, which is the Armed Services Procurement Act. We hope, if we finish the appropriation bill and the conference report that we may take up H.R. 5883, which is the bonding bill scheduled for Thursday. If we can complete those we will expedite the handling of the business for the week.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, and while I have the time, in order that Members of the House may be advised, it is our hope that we will finish the legislative program on Thursday, that we will meet without legislative business on Friday for the purpose of adjourning over until Tuesday, as Monday is a legal holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

U.S. POLICY ON THE SIDE OF DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as a severe critic of earlier U.S. positions in the Dominican Republic, I want to commend President Johnson for the current policy which places U.S. power and authority on the side of democratic constitutional processes. In the long run we have no other choice because of our belief in the right of people to govern themselves. Yet too often in the short run we yield to other considerations and fail to act decisively when free government is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States had made its intention to support restoration of constitutional processes in the Dominican Republic explicit at the outset, much of the criticism directed toward our Government would have been avoided. It is, nevertheless, a tribute to the wisdom and understanding of our President that U.S. policy is clearly emerging on the side of the people of the Dominican Republic and their right to govern themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make this support of self-government a long-term commitment. Such a commitment will require a reexamination of some of the current ideas about intervention held within the OAS and elsewhere.

Yet such a commitment is essential if we are to preserve democratic governments in the Western Hemisphere and ultimately throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert a report published in today's issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

WASHINGTON SHIFTS DOMINICAN POLICY

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—One of the historic turning points in the foreign policy of the United States may well have been passed in the past few days. The United States now is acting to check communism through the forces of popular, democratic government instead of through military reaction.

Although the change of course has come in the Dominican Republic, it is likely to have a profound effect on the much more important case of Vietnam, where a similar problem exists.

Up until some time last week, President Johnson and his advisers were backing the military junta in Santo Domingo, while claiming to be impartial.

The best friends of the United States in Latin America—those statesmen who represent the forces of constitutional democracy as against fascism of the right or communism of the left—were urgently and even passionately advising him behind the scenes that this was a profound mistake.

POSITION CHANGED

The President then changed his position. His advisers then began the formation of the prospective Guzmán government from men who represent the constitutional tradition and were agreed to by former President Bosch.

In so doing, it seems likely that President Johnson has emerged from his own "Bay of Pigs." If his present decision holds, if his advisers are able to carry through with the Guzmán government they have nearly completed, a period of talking democracy and acting through a foreign military dictatorship to crush it will have ended.

It is considered not too late to recover the rapidly fading respect of the progressive forces in Latin America and elsewhere in the free world. Indeed the dramatic turn of events is likely actually to enhance the American position.

CREDIBILITY RESCUED

From Washington, it also appears that something much more important now is possible. For the credibility of the United States and of President Johnson, when he promised to withdraw from Vietnam as soon as free government was secure, had been severely damaged.

It seemed for a while that American policy in Vietnam might find its graveyard or its vindication in the Dominican Republic, where the issue was more sharply defined for the whole world to see. The direction now has become one of vindication.

There has never been any question here of relaxing the guard against Communist infiltration, either in the Caribbean or in southeast Asia. That remains the first aim of the U.S. policy.

The question was whether a predominantly military action, such as stiffening American military action in Vietnam and using the guns of the Dominican Army to restore order, was enough in itself to check communism without also building a strong middle-ground government and encouraging it to make the reforms which would ease the revolutionary pressures that feed communism.

RISKS COMPARED

In Vietnam the makings of such a government exist, but it has not been a prime object of U.S. policy. President Johnson has looked chiefly to military measures to achieve his purpose. In the Caribbean the ingredients of such a non-Communist government were actually being liquidated by the forces of the military junta.

To the more military minded advisers in Washington the risks of this course seemed less than the risks of working with popular reform governments which seemed vulnerable to the maneuvers of Communists and of radicals who are willing to work with Communists.

There are highly placed political advisers to the President, however, who took the opposite line.

KEY EVENTS

Though in the minority, they have argued that communism feeds on economic unrest, plus the unpopularity of so-called strong-arm regimes—or on weak though well-meaning governments (like that of Saigon) which are unable to bring about economic and political reform.

These advisers have insisted that communism can best be thwarted by the maximum emphasis on the kind of people's government that the United States believes in.

Events now appear to have brought the President around to this view.

The events included the mounting criticism of the friends of the United States in the free world, the action of the Dominican military junta in discrediting itself, and a swinging of the pendulum in argument within the highest echelons of the Government here.

It now remains to be seen whether the President can stay on the new course and what its influence on the restraint of communism and the support of the free world will be.

THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM

Mr. RACE. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the senior Senator, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, recently traveled to Reed College in Portland, Oreg., where he debated with the very able senior Senator from that State, WAYNE MORSE. The topic which they debated was one which merits the concern of all Americans—the policy of the United States in Vietnam. Because of the timeliness of this topic, I extend my remarks at this point in the Record in order to bring this debate to the attention of my colleagues:

DEBATE BETWEEN THE HONORABLE WILLIAM PROXMIRE AND THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE, AT THE CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM, SPONSORED BY THE REED COLLEGE PUBLIC AFFAIRS BOARD

Senator MORSE. To understand my position on foreign policy during my 20 years of service in the U.S. Senate, one must recognize that I am a disciple of Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan. Senator Vandenberg was, at one time, the leading isolationist in the Senate. He became, in my opinion, the leading internationalist and the greatest expert on foreign policy in the Senate. He left with us a tenet, "There is no hope for permanent peace until all nations, not just some, not just those we like, but until all the nations of the world are willing to set up a system of international justice through law." Every issue that threatens the peace of the world would be submitted to such a system for a final and binding decision, to be enforced by some international organization such as the United Nations.

This is referred to as the call for a substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military force. The major premise of my position on Vietnam is that we should have insisted upon a substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of unilateral American action in southeast Asia, for we are acting outside the framework of international law. We have walked out on one of the greatest opportunities available to try to lead mankind to a lawful settlement of this threat of peace * * *. Those [lawful] procedures could have been used through a series of agencies. I urged that we try to do it through SEATO. I urged that we try to do it through a reconvening of a 14-Nations Conference, going back to the Geneva Accord Conference of 1954.

When it became obvious that we had passed by any chance of using those agencies for the substitution of the rule of law for unilateral American military action in southeast Asia, I pleaded to take the matter to the United Nations. I have asked for nothing more than Franklin Roosevelt asked for 20 years ago at Teheran and Cairo, when he proposed the establishment of an international trusteeship for all of Indochina. Roosevelt pointed out that there could not be any peace in Asia if the powers were going to resort to a balance of power theory and were going to use military power for the maintenance of peace. He recognized that no longer will war produce peace; all a war will do is produce more war, with an interim period between wars that some people mistakenly call peace. Great Britain

blocked Roosevelt at Teheran and Cairo. Great Britain thought it could still hold its colonial possessions in Asia. France, too, thought it might hold its colonies. But Roosevelt answered Great Britain by pointing out that France had milked Indochina for years and Great Britain had no hope of maintaining colonies in that part of the world much longer. Even then, colonialism in Asia was dead, and a new colonialism in Asia, in my judgment, has no possible hope of success, even a form of American colonialism in southeast Asia.

We got into Vietnam in large part because John Foster Dulles, then Secretary of State, thought France should stay in Indochina, and we poured \$1¼ billion into France, hoping to keep France in Indochina. But then Dienbienphu occurred. Dulles went to London, and he tried to persuade Churchill and Anthony Eden to commit British troops to help France in Indochina, in return for which he would commit American troops. Then they were to go across the channel and make the offer to France, hoping that this would keep France in the war in Indochina. Churchill turned him down.

Following that, we had the Geneva accord of 1954. France made it clear she was pulling out of Indochina. The Geneva accord of 1954 was consummated, but the United States did not sign it, and the United States succeeded, and I speak advisedly, in getting its first puppet government in South Vietnam, the Diem government, not to sign the accord. We have never signed the Geneva accord of 1954, yet we keep saying through our spokesmen, that one of the reasons we are carrying on military action in South Vietnam is because North Vietnam has been violating the Geneva accord. She has—and so has Red China, and so have the Pathet Lao and Laos. I think there is some evidence that on occasion Cambodia has, too, but that has been no justification for American violation of the Geneva accord.

Articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva accord prohibit, by specific language, the United States or any other country from sending into South Vietnam a single soldier, a single tank, a single jetplane, a single bit of military aid. The International Control Commission, consisting of the Indian representative as chairman, a Canadian representative, and a Polish representative, has found the United States and South Vietnam, as well as North Vietnam, in violation of the Geneva accord time and time again.

If we were going to keep faith with our belief in substituting a rule of law for the jungle law of military might, we should have laid this matter immediately before either a reconvened Geneva Conference (and, interestingly, the Geneva accord makes provision for such a reconvening) or before the United Nations. I would have preferred the latter, for I think others should have asked for a reconvening of the Geneva accord * * * the signatories should have asked for it, and not a nonsignatory. The Geneva accord established Laos and Cambodia; then it drew a line in Vietnam at the 17th parallel to develop what we refer to as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. But, the Geneva accord did not set up separate governments to the north and to the south of the parallel. That is a false assumption that is contained in much of the discussion on the Vietnam crisis.

In the northern part of the country, Ho Chi Minh, a Communist leader during World War II, was an ally of the United States as commander of the guerrilla forces in the war against Japan. The first leader of the government in the south was the French puppet, Bao Dai. It soon became clear that he no longer was going to be acceptable to the Vietnamese who had gone south and to the Vietnamese who were already in the south * * * Ngo Dinh Diem, a Vietnamese who had lived and who had been trained in

the United States, became the first leader endorsed by the United States to be placed in charge of not a free government, but a police-state government in South Vietnam.

The governments in South Vietnam have been police-state governments just as the government in North Vietnam has been an enslaved government of communism. These have been military dictatorships; there is much talk about supporting freedom in South Vietnam * * * there has never been any political freedom in South Vietnam as we know it. It has been a totalitarian government of a military policy type from the very beginning.

The Geneva accord has a provision that deals with the matter of the type of government that was to be established by the people of North and South Vietnam, since it was not contemplated when the Geneva accord was signed that there should be a permanent partition of Vietnam into North and South. That was to be left to the people to decide in the election to be held in 1956.

The election was not held. Why? Because the United States of America blocked the election. The United States of America goes down in history as the Nation responsible for the fact that this section of the Geneva accord was never carried out * * * President Eisenhower, in his book, points out our position in regard to that election and said that our intelligence reports showed that if the election was held, Ho Chi Minh would receive 80 percent of the vote in South Vietnam, as well as an overwhelming majority in North Vietnam. Many authorities on South Vietnam would tell you that if an election was held tomorrow in South Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh would receive a large majority of the vote. He is still the most popular figure in all of Vietnam. * * *

Let me give you a statistic or two about the problem that confronts us in South Vietnam. The population is about 15 million, in round numbers, with 500,000 to 750,000 military personnel. How much money has been poured into that military establishment, including the one and one-quarter to France? Six and one-half billion dollars, not including the cost of our own military personnel. What is the top figure given to us by the administration as to the Vietcong military establishment? Between 25,000 to 35,000, the hard-core probably 20,000. Who now controls better than 75 percent of the land area of South Vietnam? The Vietcong—not the forces of the government.

I have a little difficulty understanding why it is necessary to have 28,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam to put down 25,000 to 35,000 Vietcong, with a military establishment of the South Vietnamese Government of at least 500,000. * * *

This brings me to the white paper. There is not anything in the white paper * * * except mention of one ship in which they found about 100 tons of weapons, that has not been known to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the administration for 3 years. The white paper bears out what the administration witnesses testified to before our committee within 3 years before its issuance. The record of that committee is replete with testimony that bears out these conclusions: about 80 to 90 percent of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese and not North Vietnamese; about 80 to 90 percent of the weapons are captured American weapons and not North Vietnamese, Russian, or Chinese weapons. The white paper is so full of holes in regard to its allegations that student after student has torn it apart. (When I refer to students, I refer to authorities on Asia.) In fact, all one need do is read the account of our recognized authorities on Asia, such as Hans Morgenthau, at the University of Chicago, such as Commager, of Amherst, such as these great academic leaders who, as I have said on the floor of the Senate, have forgotten more about Asia than Rusk and McNamara

and Taylor and the Bundys and Alexis Johnson will ever know. I would that my President would obtain at least the counter-advice of these recognized authorities on Asia.

Let me point out that Cambodia, the Vietcong, North Vietnam, Burma, Indonesia do not happen to be pro-Chinese. And, in my judgment, they are Communist governments—most of them. What we are doing is driving these Communists of a different stripe right into the arms of Red China. For example, Ho Chi Minh was kept in prison for a year in China. Ho Chi Minh is Russian-oriented, and Russian trained; Ho Chi Minh is a Russian Communist. The great danger is that we are, by our course of action, going to move these countries into the orbit of Red China.

We are violating article after article of the United Nations Charter. So are other countries. There are the commitments required under articles 33, 34, 35, and 51, and other articles of the charter, that place upon us the solemn responsibility of taking threats to the peace of the world to the United Nations for U.N. determination. Why have we not done it? Of course, I am greatly disappointed that others have not done it, too. My plea is that if we continue this unilateral military course of action, we run the great risk of taking mankind to the brink of a third holocaust. That is why you find me pleading in the Senate for us to try to get other countries to come on in with us, to try to carry out the objective of Roosevelt 20 years ago at Cairo and Teheran. I have been pleading for the United Nations to try to set up a trusteeship in South Vietnam for as many years as it may take to make it possible for them to develop a free society. * * *

When I put the question to the Secretary of State in the Foreign Relations Committee, "Why don't you go to the United Nations?" he said, "I do not think it will work." "But will you know until you try?" He replied, "Senator Morse, don't you think Russia would probably beat it and put it in the Security Council?" And my answer was, "Yes, I think so. I cannot be sure, but I think so. But I want to put Russia on the spot. I want to show who it is who is unwilling to use the peaceful procedures by way of the rule of law provided for in the United Nations Charter. But, Mr. Secretary, don't stop with the sections on the Security Council. If Russia follows that course of action, and she might not, then you still can take it to the General Assembly. * * *

I believe if brought before the General Assembly, a minimum of 85 nations would backup the sending in of a peacekeeping force. You say, "Mr. Senator, do you have any precedent at all?" I want to mention three: does anyone really think that there would not have been a major war years ago in the Middle East if the United Nations' peacekeeping force had not occupied the Gaza strip? Do you really think there would not have been a major war in Africa if the United Nations had not taken the action in the Congo? My last precedent is in Cyprus. Of course the United States and Great Britain got kicked in to the United Nations over Cyprus * * * 10 days before France and Russia showed their hands on the Cyprus issue, I made a major speech in the U.S. Senate calling for a change of American policy and urging that the United States support the United Nation's jurisdiction over Cyprus. At that time the United States and Great Britain were trying to have the Cyprus issue brought under NATO and of course NATO did not have a scintilla of basis for being placed in charge of Cyprus. But the United Nations did. We did not know at the time that Russia and France were busily at work. The State Department apparently did not know it either, but that is nothing new for the State Department; they have that kind of intelligence. They did not

know, as we subsequently discovered, that France and Russia were at work around the world and they presented us with an accomplished fact that a huge number of nations were joining them in asking for United Nations jurisdiction. Then, to the everlasting credit of our Government, we changed our course and the U.N. went into Cyprus. I do not know whether it is going to be able to prevent a war or not, but it has so far.

That is the way you build up a system of international law, as every lawyer knows, precedent by precedent, instance by instance.

I think that bilateral negotiations between the United States and North Vietnam are now impossible. We have gone past that time, and now must have multilateral negotiations. A third force, consisting of non-participants, must be brought into the picture, a third force based upon a resolution of the United Nations taking jurisdiction that says to the United States and South Vietnam on the one hand, and to the Communist groups on the other hand, "We beg you to now come to an international conference table, in which the other nations not at war will help find a settlement in honor and consistent with security to the participants in this dispute." That is the kind of settlement I want. If the leaders of mankind do not face up to that great moral obligation as well as legal duty, the danger is that we shall move into a massive war in Asia. No one can dispute the ugly fact that I now give you: It is hoped by our Government that Red China will not move, but it is recognized by our Government that if Red China moves we cannot beat her with bombing, conventional or nuclear. We can do great damage. We can destroy her cities and her industrial complex, we can kill millions of her people, but she still will move on the ground and we could not beat her with American troops. The talk is 300,000 to 350,000 American troops to begin with, but that will be just a drop in the manpower bucket. We will have to send 3 million to begin with; half of them will come home in coffins in the first 18 months, and this country will be bogged down in Asia for 25 years. For generations of the future, Asia is going to be controlled by Asia and not by Western powers. I would plead that my Government really put into practice that great moral teaching that the President so often uses, "Come now and let us reason together, sayeth the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow. Though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. * * *

Unless the nations are willing to sit down at an international conference table to reason together, the great danger is that the United States will become the greatest threat to the peace of the world. A continuation of our conduct in North Vietnam, in my judgment, is certain to lead to war. What we are doing now is shooting fish in a barrel in North Vietnam, against a country with no naval or air force, a country that has not yet moved on the ground. I cannot square it with the principle that I think ought to be morality, that should characterize the foreign policy of my Government.

Senator PROXMIER. I am here because, on this issue, I feel very strongly; because on this issue, even the Senator from Oregon is wrong. He is wrong in Vietnam. He is wrong about the course that President Johnson and this administration is pursuing. We have used power, let's face it. We have used direct, overt military power. We bomb, we strafe, we burn. That is true. We have attacked in North Vietnam and defended in South Vietnam. War is a dirty business. It is a terrible business and it is a cruel business.

From the first, we have responded to proven aggression. We must recognize, in all fairness, that we have been in Vietnam

not just 2 or 3 months. We have been in South Vietnam for 10 years, and for years our presence in South Vietnam has been carefully, painfully designed to avoid military action by American soldiers. Even following the Tonkin Gulf and the Pleiku incidents, the attacks on Americans, we confined our military targets. We limited our retaliations. Most important of all, we have designed our military strategy not to secure unconditional surrender by Hanoi, not to engage China or Russia, but simply and clearly to secure a cessation of aggression by North Vietnam. Yet this restrained, limited policy has been attacked. Senator Morse has been attacking our policy in South Vietnam for many, many months—at least for 2 or 3 years. Lately he has been joined by other leading American citizens. Walter Lippmann, perhaps the most brilliant and profound commentator we have on the scene today, agrees that we are losing in South Vietnam and that we should get out. The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, has said that our policies in South Vietnam involve us in a great danger that the American public does not appreciate and that they should be accompanied, as he feels they are not, by definite negotiations. University professors from coast to coast have been criticizing our positions. At Columbia University they had an all night teach-in on Vietnam, beginning at 11:30 p.m. and going to 8 a.m., with professors speaking in relays against our being in Vietnam. Nobody spoke for the administration. At the University of Michigan the hat was passed and money was raised on behalf of the Vietcong. Our record has been attacked throughout the world. As a matter of fact, Kosygin, the Soviet leader, in talking about the white paper, said "How in the world can the Americans ever categorize their acts in South Vietnam in a white paper? The dirty acts of Americans should be in a black book."

What are these dirty acts? What is this dirty American policy they are talking about? Not only have we restrained our military action, but our efforts in South Vietnam have been very largely constructive and economic. They have been exactly the kind of economic program designed to build the seedbed of democracy, that the Oregon senior Senator was talking about. Our economic assistance in South Vietnam has been well over a billion dollars. Just in the last 2 years, \$230 million has been allocated for food for peace for South Vietnam. There is no military threat to North Vietnam in this. It was food to help build the peaceful life. Our agricultural assistance to South Vietnam has not been confined to sending food. We have recognized that the kind of technical assistance used in the Alliance for Progress can be used in South Vietnam, too. We have trained thousands of Vietnamese farmers in the marvels of modern agriculture. We have trained them in irrigation, concentrates, animal husbandry, and insecticides. We have introduced fertilizer, we have introduced corn and potatoes. This constitutes no military threat, but it does build the peaceful life. The economic program can eventually become the seedbed of political freedom. We have helped to equip or build 10 big vocational schools; 7,000 students are actually enrolled. We have built four teacher-training schools; right now we are training 2,000 Vietnamese teachers. The fact is that in the years since 1955, the number of South Vietnamese children going to elementary school has increased from 350,000 to 1,400,000. It is almost a miraculous increase and it would not have been possible without American assistance. This causes no military threat to North Vietnam, but it does build the prospect for peace, and it does provide the seedbed of political freedom. We have established and stocked first aid centers in 12,550 villages and hamlets in South Vietnam. In 5 years, we have cut malaria from

an incidence of 7 percent of the population down to less than 1 percent.

These are the kinds of things you do not read about in the newspapers, because they are not spectacular. They do not involve violence, conflict, bombing, or troops. This is what most of America's efforts in South Vietnam have been. We have helped build 1,400 wells to provide clean, fresh water for 750,000 rural inhabitants. We have made fresh water available to one-half million urban dwellers and 35 cities. And this constitutes no threat to North Vietnam. It is building the basis for political freedom and independence. We have built an entire road system. We have financed the purchase of railways and equipment. We have built a big powerplant south of Saigon, not as a threat to North Vietnam but to build for peace. The U.S. Government has built 50 factories in South Vietnam that now employ 13,000 people. We have put a textile industry in South Vietnam, built a national network of seven major radio stations. None of this constitutes a real threat to Vietnam, but is for peace.

Consider this American record and ask, "What does America get out of this?" People talk about America's bad record, people talk about our imperialism—the Communists talk about our imperialism—why have we poured in billions of dollars? Why have we sacrificed hundreds of our young men who have died in South Vietnam? Why have we risked the lives of thousands of others? Do we want Vietnam's money? Do we want oil? Do we want any food? Do we want an economic advantage? Not even the Vietcong can charge us with that. Our hands are clean.

What do we want? What we want is very simple: (1) We want the independence of South Vietnam—what is wrong with that? (2) We want peace and freedom in Asia and in the world, and what is wrong with that? (3) We want to stop Communist aggression, and what is wrong with that? American policy is not reckless. It is not an all-out military policy, just as it is not withdrawal. In this controversy, the real division is not between those who want to withdraw and those who would blast North Vietnam and China off the face of the earth. Our policy is more realistic than either of those. Our policy is to measure and restrain military action, to build for peace, and to stay in South Vietnam for years and years no matter how long it takes to out-work, to out-educate, out-serve, and if necessary, but only if necessary, to out-fight. To pay any price. It has been said this is too much * * * this is too big a burden * * * we cannot afford it. Our responsibilities all over the world are too widespread.

Can we afford it? Is it too big a burden? The fact is that this Nation has just had the biggest tax cut in our history, an \$11 billion tax cut. Can we afford it? The defense budget is less this year than it was last year, and less last year than it was the year before. Can we afford it? The President has just submitted the lowest foreign aid program since the beginning of this program 15 years ago. Can we afford it? Bureau of Labor Statistics show unemployment is at the lowest level in 8 years. This is the greatest prosperity in all of American history. We have never had so much income after taxes, even allowing for inflation. Can our will to defend freedom be so feeble that this rich country cannot afford a fraction of what we spend on cosmetics to stand up to communism? And, of course, military and even economic assistance is not enough. All the time it is true that we must press night and day for conditions permitting a basis for negotiations that will bring independence for South Vietnam.

What has been President Johnson's position on peaceful negotiations? I know President Johnson, and I have disagreed

with him far more than I have disagreed with my distinguished colleague, Senator MORSE. Senator MORSE and I both know President Johnson well. He speaks honestly and sincerely when he says that he will go anywhere at any time, see anyone, if he thought it could serve the cause of peace. Until very recently there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam. Before we began to use our power in the last few weeks, the principal foreign offices in the world said negotiations were impossible. The British Foreign Secretary at the White House recently told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations. The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations have been fruitless; they have been rebuffed by Hanoi and Moscow. The Canadians report that their officials cannot even get in to see the Communist leaders in North Vietnam. Until very recently, if one is talking realism and not some nice theory that we would like to have, there has been only one basis on which we could stop, and that is withdrawal.

If we withdraw, what happens in South Vietnam? Thousands and thousands of brave people who have fought for years would be murdered. What happens in the rest of the world? You do not have to list the rest of the areas of the world, just go to China. Just last week, Mao told the London Observer, "After a Communist victory in South Vietnam, the conflict will be aggravated." The Communists do not look forward to peace after South Vietnam. They say, "This is a beginning. If we win here, then we really aggravate the conflict * * *"

What makes this situation very difficult for Americans to understand, or Americans to defend, is that we are facing a new kind of aggression. These people are not just walking across the border as clearly and simply and obviously as the Hitler march. This is an invisible, subtle, and apparently indigenous kind of aggression. We fall into the trap that this is civil war, and wherever this terrorist infiltration tactic is developed in the future, we will take it to be a civil war. These are the types of terror tactics the Communists have perfected, tactics involving kidnaping of officials, deliberate murder of mayors and leaders of villages, the murder of thousands of Vietnam exofficials. If the Communists win here, if this kind of action can prevail, there is no reason why the Communists should not use it elsewhere—in Asia, in Africa, and in South America.

This is a far crueler, tougher war. It seems as though we are losing or have lost. The fact is that we can win. The military situation is bad. I think it is true that this administration and the last administration were very wrong in not telling us the true situation about how we were losing in South Vietnam. But it is a fact, as every reporter I have heard has reported, that morale in South Vietnam is now rising. Not only do the Catholics and the business communities support our position, but the Buddhists, the students, and the labor people are supporting recent developments in Vietnam. Most promising of all, now that we have shown that we not only have the greatest power in the world, but that we have the will to use it, North Vietnam seems to be taking a different view of negotiation. The New York Times recently reported that diplomats of the non-aligned countries said privately that North Vietnamese officials might be willing to agree to a new Geneva conference on Indochina. The indications were private—publicly, the North Vietnamese officials indicated withdrawal of U.S. officials mandatory before negotiation. There were no conditions in the

private approach. The British Foreign Secretary declared that there is more hope of negotiation than even a day ago, that there has been a change in the attitude of the Communists toward negotiation. Meanwhile, the President maintains the posture, which he sincerely believes, that this country must persist with all its might to resist aggression in South Vietnam, and to defend freedom there with its military strength. But far from being inconsistent, it seems to me that the posture the President has assumed is essential to finally creating peaceful negotiations. This is the same administration that has made proposals for economic development of all southeast Asia, including perhaps North Vietnam, in the event of peace. This is the same administration which indicated there would be no direct reprisal for the bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, specifically no attack on Hanoi. This is the same administration that directed Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland to say that the United States would be willing to have the United Nations, specifically U Thant, act in negotiations in Vietnam.

It is true we did not go to the U.N. before. We did not go because, as the Senator from Oregon implied, Russia has the veto in the Security Council, and frankly, we could not get a two-thirds vote in the Assembly. U Thant said in a press conference in Ottawa on May 26, 1964, "I feel that the situation in southeast Asia is such that I have my own doubts regarding the competence of the United Nations to undertake the task which is being advocated by some members of the United Nations." The Secretary General of the United Nations said that the U.N. could not act under these circumstances and, it has been clear that when the United States of America clashes directly with countries like North Vietnam and Red China, which are both outside the United Nations, there is no precedent. The precedent of the Gaza strip, the precedents of the Congo and Cyprus are terribly different. This is the same administration that had Secretary of State Dean Rusk give a respectful reception to the proposal of 17 so-called nonaligned nations that petitioned us to negotiate. All of this is good. It indicates that we do not have a policy of simply pounding away hoping something will happen. We are carrying an olive branch in one hand as well as arrows in the other. But we have those arrows, and the fact is that vinegar is just as essential as the oil of peace. We stand prepared to continue bombing if defense requires it. Not only do we have a massive, awesome power, but we have the will to use it. The President pledged that we will stay in South Vietnam for 10 or 20 years, if necessary, to stop communism.

This resolution may be as significant as President Truman's resolve in Berlin in 1948, in Greece, in Korea, when against criticism and under very different circumstances, he decided to stand against the Communists. It may be as significant as John F. Kennedy's resolve in October of 1962, when we discovered that the Soviet Union had planted missiles in Cuba. This resolve, which has been so denounced, could stabilize the last great front of Communist aggression, and I predict that this U.S. persistence in South Vietnam will drive Hanoi to the bargaining table. On the other hand, had President Johnson chosen the withdrawal option, and that is the realistic option, peace as well as freedom would be in far greater danger throughout the world. He has chosen the tough course, the painful course, but the right course. You do not need a graduate degree to understand what, basically, is going on: this is aggression. This is the kind of aggression the free world, at its terrible regret, failed to meet in Austria; and the Sudetenland and Manchuria, the kind of aggression that re-

sulted in the violence and death and the agony of 4 long years in World War II. In South Vietnam we are meeting it. We are meeting it with military force, but with restrained force. We meet it with military force at the same time that we're building an economically stronger and better future in South Vietnam, as I documented. And, we meet it with the olive branch of negotiations in the other hand.

Let us not forget that it was not Lyndon Johnson who 4 years ago stepped up our military commitment to South Vietnam. It was the same John Fitzgerald Kennedy who gave the finest speech on peace of this generation at American University in May 1963—the same John Kennedy whose greatest monument is a test ban treaty that begins the first hopeful step toward the control of nuclear destruction of the world. It was the same John Kennedy who, however, recognized that the price of peace and freedom can sometimes be cruel and terrible, that there are times when we must face aggression, and that a cruel and terrible price must be paid. And John Kennedy, with all his intelligence, with all the massive information only the President of the United States can have, saw that South Vietnam is the place that this generation must pay it.

Question: "Why, Senator MORSE, in your opinion, has President Johnson not asked Congress for a declaration of war following constitutional procedure, instead of using the last summer's Senate resolution authorization for action in Vietnam?"

Senator MORSE. As you know, I have taken the position over and over again in the Senate, that if we are going to make war we ought to first declare it. There is not the slightest justification under the Constitution of the United States for our making war in South Vietnam. Under the Constitution, the President of the United States has the responsibility and power to proceed immediately in the defense of this Republic to meet an emergency which has occurred by way of an attack on the United States, as Franklin Roosevelt did at Pearl Harbor. But, he does not have the right to make war in the absence of the declaration of war. Under article No. 1, section 8 of the Constitution, the power to declare war is vested in the Congress of the United States, and not in the President. * * * I was one of two Senators who voted against what I considered to be but a scrap of paper under the Constitution, when last August the Congress passed a resolution to authorize the President to take whatever steps he deemed necessary to protect the security of this country. The Congress, in my judgment, has the duty to decide whether or not American boys were going to be sent to the battlefield, and they should not send them to die in battle in the absence of a declaration of war. I think that it is a great mistake that we have not had a public declaration.

Moderator JONES. Senator PROXMIER, would you like to comment on that question?

Senator PROXMIER. The fact is that the Congress of the United States as Senator MORSE implied, did act on a resolution last August. The resolution was to give Congress the opportunity to go on record for or against our actions in South Vietnam, including whatever military action the President decided was necessary. That resolution passed 512 to 2. It was greatly to his credit that Senator MORSE had the courage to be one of the two men who voted against it. But the fact is that the Congress of the United States was consulted, the Congress of the United States did act, and it seems to me that under these circumstances our course in South Vietnam is clear. Wherever we act in a hostile situation, wherever military force is involved, it is not necessary to always have a declaration of war. This is a bad situation—there have been Americans who have died; the latest count was something like 315 or 320. That

is a terrible situation. At the same time, I think we must recognize that under these circumstances, traditionally, we have not required a declaration of war. The action taken by the Congress of the United States was not only overwhelmingly passed, but since that time there has been only one other resolution entered and modified, that by Senator JAVRS. That resolution supported the administration right down the line, simply saying that the administration should at the same time seek negotiations. * * *

Question: Senator PROXMIRE, there seemed to be some confusion in your speech, the same confusion which has appeared in the statements of the Government, concerning whether our goal is to stop aggression or whether it is to stop communism. Most of the aggression, as you call it, is indigenous aggression—80 percent is being done by South Vietnamese. If we could get, by force or by agreement, the North Vietnamese to stop assisting the Vietcong, would we then move out of Vietnam and allow the South Vietnamese Communists to take over the country? If not, how do we justify intervening in a civil war on the side of a very unpopular government?

Senator PROXMIRE. We have made it clear that our policy in South Vietnam is designed to stop aggression. As a matter of fact, Adlai Stevenson has said in the United Nations that if North Vietnam will stop its aggression, we will do our best to remove our military presence. Of course there are indigenous Communists in South Vietnam. That is a well-known fact. It is also well known that tens of thousands have infiltrated from the North, including the officer cadre, including the plans, and lately, including most of the weapons. That was not true some years ago, but it certainly is true now without any question. The New York Times has reported that something like 90 percent of the replacements for the Vietcong are coming from the North. At any rate, if the North Vietnamese cease their aggression, then we feel that our military job is done, and the South Vietnamese will be able to handle the situation themselves.

Moderator JONES. Senator MORSE, would you care to comment?

Senator MORSE. I want to point out that, although it is perfectly clear that the primary objective of the administration is to seek to prevent the advance of communism on a unilateral basis, it cannot be done by the United States, because you are dealing here with a population that is involved in a civil war. They (the administration) does not like to talk about a civil war, but if I marched a hundred Vietnamese across this platform, 50 North and 50 South, you could not tell the difference. You are dealing in a war in South Vietnam with a father on one side and some of his sons on the other; brothers on one side and brothers on the other; uncles on one side and some of their nephews on the other. You are dealing with a war among Vietnamese, and the 17th parallel is a perfectly artificial line that divided this country. Our problem is to have them set up their own system of government, whatever they choose. It will probably be some form of communism or socialism or totalitarianism. But, that raises the fundamental issue: whether or not the United States is now going to set itself up on a unilateral basis to police the world against communism. If that is going to be our position, we have neither the manpower nor the resources to do it * * * we are writing our own decline if we start to make that approach. That is why I am pleading for multilateral action. I had hoped SEATO might do this job, but SEATO has become a paper tiger. SEATO countries agree that they would act together in maintaining peace in this area of the world—they

wrote in certain words of art in that treaty, known as protocol agreement, in which the signatories thereto considered Vietnam an area of vital concern and of mutual interest. Of course, what your Government is not telling you is that there was a sleeper by way of a side agreement, and if the sleeper was to have a concerted action, there had to be a unanimity among the signatories to SEATO. Where are our SEATO partners? Who are they? Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, Great Britain, and France. You cannot get them to come in to be of assistance to the United States.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan spoke at the Washington Press Club just a few months ago. When asked if Pakistan, into which the United States has poured hundreds of millions of dollars for military buildup, was going to come in and help us, he said: "No. That is a U.S. problem. Our problem is with India." When the Secretary of State was before the Foreign Relations Committee last summer, I made the point that the SEATO allies were not helping us—we were doing it all alone. You could not get help out of France, out of Great Britain, out of New Zealand, you could not get it out of any of them. But he said, "Oh, Mr. Senator, Australia has just doubled its commitment under SEATO to help us in South Vietnam." I said, "Mr. Secretary, you just insulted my intelligence. Now, before you insult the intelligence of the rest of the committee, would you like to have me tell them what that understanding involved?" (He did not know I knew.) "Do you want to deny, Mr. Secretary, that this Australian commitment is to increase its manpower commitment to South Vietnam from 30 men to 60 men, but with the understanding that they won't go near the battlefield? Do you want to deny, Mr. Secretary, that you got a commitment out of them that within the next few months they might make available four to six cargo planes to take material from Australia into South Vietnam?" The sad, ugly fact is that the SEATO nations have left us cold. * * * Tell it to Burma, tell it to Indonesia, tell it to Australia, New Zealand. The fact is that in Australia and New Zealand, the press have been greatly concerned about American escalation in North Vietnam. * * * I never thought I would read in American history of the dropping of napalm bombs on jungle towns, killing civilians—men, women and children. The United States is guilty, and history will so find us guilty and condemn us. I never thought my country would send soldiers into South Vietnam, and have taken the pictures that have been shown us in the Foreign Relations Committee, of American soldiers standing by when the most horrendous brutalities are committed upon the Vietcong. And what's the answer? "Why, the Vietcong uses a reign of terror—they commit atrocities and brutalities upon South Vietnamese." They do. But, we are a party to it when we do not use our force to prevent this kind of violation of the Articles of War. The Secretary of State tried to justify the use of gas on the grounds that it protects women and children. Let me say that the use of gas is a clear violation of the convention of 1925, because it violates the Articles of War. Why was all gas prevented in that treaty? This is the kind of gas that was used in World War I, along with lethal gas, because this gas incapacitates the soldiery and makes them easy to kill while under its influence. My country is trying to alibi that at which it got caught, and we have been caught frequently. Do you think our Government would apologize to Cambodia if that American plane had not been shot down within Cambodia after it had dropped napalm bombs on a jungle town, killing civilians? It is pretty hard for us to face up to ugly realities, but the sad fact is, our hands are not clean, our hands

are dripping with blood in Asia, to our everlasting discredit.

Moderator JONES. Senator MORSE, that was a long and extended answer—I am therefore going to alter the procedure for a moment to give Senator PROXMIRE an opportunity to respond.

Senator PROXMIRE. What Senator MORSE has just said is that we cannot stop communism throughout the world. The next thing he said, as I understand it, was that we cannot count on SEATO or others to help us. The implication of that to me is that nobody is going to stop communism. I say we can stop communism, and we will. We have not begun to feel the burden in this country. Now, about this situation of using weapons * * * there is nothing in the world that is perhaps easier to do than to make an attack on the weapons of war; I think it serves a good purpose to do so, and I think it should be done. I agree that we made a tragic and stupid blunder by using gas in South Vietnam. There is no question about that. But let's be fair about it. While it was stupid, and it gave the Communists a propaganda victory, let us recognize the circumstances under which that gas was used. I have a clipping from today's newspaper. "London, April 1, Colonial Secretary Anthony Greenwood told Parliament today that British colonial police used nontoxic gas 124 times in the last 5 years. That doesn't make it right, but I imagine that tear gas could be used here in Portland. You can buy it. Any police force can have it and does use it. When this gas was used, and it was used on three occasions, it was totally ineffective on every single occasion. It was used so that it would not be necessary to use other weapons that are far worse—so that we would not have to use napalm, so that we would not have to use machineguns, so that we would not have to kill people. Civilians were being used as shields, and it was thought necessary to provide some method of saving the lives of civilians so it would be possible to step in and overpower the others. Nevertheless, it was stupid for one other reason. In a military situation, you can count on escalation. We use a gas that is a tear and nausea gas. They—the enemy—use a gas that is a little worse; we use gas which is little worse; and the first thing you know you have bacteriological warfare—you have mustard gas, you have some weapons which, fortunately, have not been used since World War I. It was a bad mistake, but at the same time, I think it should be put in perspective.

Question: "Senator MORSE, assuming that SEATO and the United States do not want to assume the responsibility in southeast Asia, should the United States at any time, along a unilateral basis, stand against Communist aggression in southeast Asia? If so, where do we draw this line?"

Senator MORSE. We will not know until we take it to the United Nations, first through the Security Council, and then to the General Assembly. I am satisfied that at least 85 nations, and probably not more, would vote to take jurisdiction if given the opportunity to take jurisdiction, because they are scared, too. They know what this great threat in Asia means for all the rest of the world. They know that if you start a massive war with Red China it will not be over for a quarter of a century. I am satisfied, also, that basic in the philosophy of many of our military, is the sincere conviction (but I think dead wrong from every standpoint), that you have got to fight China sooner or later, and this is the time to fight her. I am satisfied that we are following the course of action of a provocateur, and that we are going to step it up until finally China makes a misstep. And when China makes the misstep, get ready for the bombing of China. The first target will be the

nuclear installations, but do not forget, they can be rebuilt. It may take 10, 15, or 20 years to rebuild them, but when they are rebuilt, they will be rebuilt with a vengeance, and we will leave a heritage to future generations of American boys and girls of the hatred of the Chinese for the next 1,000 years. That is why I want to take my country out of the unilateral course of action—that is why I want to bring in others to help maintain the peace. China is not going to stop for us, but line up 85 to 90 nations around this world against her, and in my judgment, she will think a long time before she follows a course of action of nonnegotiating an honorable settlement.

I believe that the fundamental purpose of our policy in Asia is to establish an American foothold. * * * It goes right back to Dulles wanting France to get out of Indochina, to his wanting Great Britain to come in with us—back to his refusal to sign the Geneva accord of 1954, although he said we would live up to its tenets—and we have violated one after another ever since. * * * I cannot give you any assurance that, if the U.N. does not take jurisdiction, you are not going to have very serious trouble in South Vietnam, but I will face the ugly question. If we are put to the point where we, and we alone, are going to have to fight a war in Asia, then the first thing we should do is try to work out an arrangement where the people would not be massacred. Then, and only then, would I have the United States withdraw, because South Vietnam is not in the perimeter of America defense. If we got into a war with Russia tomorrow, we would not leave an American boy in South Vietnam any longer than it took to get him out, because South Vietnam is not vital to the United States in time of war. * * * Western nations better face up to the fact that Asians are not going to allow them to stay in Asia.

Senator PROXMIER. The United Nations is now paralyzed. As Senator Morse said, we have to go to the General Assembly. The Assembly cannot meet until next September. We have to draw the line against the Communists. We can say, "Take it to the United Nations"—I do wish this were a practical solution, but the fact is that the U.N. is not in session, and will not be in session. The Secretary General has indicated that this was a question that was, in his estimation, probably too big. Furthermore, if we try to get the United Nations involved on the basis of having to take jurisdiction between North Vietnam and the United States of America, there is about as much chance that North Vietnam would stand still for that as there is that the Oregonian is likely to name the Senator from Oregon as mediator in its next labor contract. The fact is that North Vietnam was invited to sit in on discussions by the Security Council at the time of the Tonkin Gulf episode. North Vietnam was urged by the Soviet Union, by the United States, and by members of the Security Council. She flatly refused, and said that she would have nothing to do with it, and would not be bound by any decision of the Security Council. Under these circumstances, how in the world can we get the U.N. involved?

Question: "Senator PROXMIER, you said that the aggression in South Vietnam is of a subtle kind, and is invisible, and I would agree with you. What can Congress do if the terroristic attacks against Americans in the last few months turn out to be inside jobs by those who disagree with the policy of restraint that you advocate and the President hopes to carry on?"

Senator PROXMIER. We are acting in North Vietnam militarily. We decided to take overt military action very recently. It has been stated over and over again by President Johnson by Secretary Rusk, by Secretary McNa-

mara, and others, that we have done so because of the infiltration and invasion from North Vietnam. This is not just a pipe-dream—this is not a guess. It is true that this is a subtle kind of war, but the fact is that the invasion has been documented. The International Control Commission has found that there has been aggression from the north. They have said so—they have found it—it is a fact of life, and this is what we are trying to stop. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the man who planted the bomb to blow up the Saigon Embassy admitted that he had been paid by the Vietcong to do it. It is true that the evidence, under war circumstances, is never the kind of thing that one would like to have in court. However, we do know that there is invasion from the north, and that is what we are trying to stop.

Senator MORSE. There is nothing that stops the United Nations from being called into session from within 10 to 15 days. Just read the charter. It calls for an extraordinary session of the United Nations, and we ought to call for an extraordinary session of the U.N. immediately. As to aggression in South Vietnam, within 3 weeks of the filing of the white paper, witnesses before the Foreign Relations Committee continued to testify that this was primarily a war from within in South Vietnam, by South Vietnamese, using American weapons. In recent weeks there have been some weapons coming in from the north, but there is still no showing of any substantial number of North Vietnamese military men out of the North Vietnamese Army. Of course, there has been some training of South Vietnamese up in North Vietnam, but we are the last country in the world that ought to talk about training soldiers of another country. We have been doing it all around the world, and we have been doing it in South Vietnam for a long time.

What we do need to face up to is that, in South Vietnam, we have been guilty, time and time again, of aggression on our part. Take the Tonkin Bay incident. The first propaganda of the administration was that the American ships were 75 miles from those North Vietnamese islands 3 to 6 miles off the coast of North Vietnam, which were bombed by South Vietnamese vessels—vessels which we equipped, which moved with the full knowledge of our Embassy and of U.S. Navy ships in Tonkin Bay at the time. Our administration said they were 75 miles away. Well, if Russia had a destroyer 75 miles from Key West, for example, and Castro sent over a destroyer to bomb Key West, you know what we would do to that destroyer 75 miles away. We would give it one chance to come into port, and if it did not come to port, we would sink it, because we would know that it was there for a cover. The 75-mile issue blew up in their face, because we—the Foreign Relations Committee—got the log of the ships, and when the bombing of the islands took place, that American vessel was within 13 miles of the islands. That is why I say we acted as a provocateur. Of course, our ships were on the high seas, and had the right to be where they were, as far as the high sea laws were concerned. But, we had no right to be there as a cover to those South Vietnamese vessels. Time and time again, we have been participants in a violation of the borders of Cambodia, of the borders of North Vietnam, and, as is usually the case when you get into a dirty war, both sides play dirty. We have been playing dirty along with the Communists.

Moderator JONES. In accordance with the procedures of debate, each Senator will have an opportunity to make a brief summary remark.

Senator PROXMIER. My good friend Senator WAYNE MORSE is a great Senator and a great debater, but it seems he has failed to distin-

guish the difference between our action in South Vietnam and that of the North Vietnamese. We are there because we were invited by the duly constituted and recognized Government of South Vietnam, a Government that has been recognized by over 100 nations in the world. Although there have been five successive governments, each one has wanted us to stay, and every element in this Government today has asked us to stay there. On the other hand, the North Vietnamese are there to subvert that Government, to overthrow that Government, to destroy that Government. I think there is all the difference in the world on that basis. Senator MORSE has offered us an alternative, but what an alternative. He has said the U.N. Charter indicates that we can call the United Nations together in 10 or 15 days—but why is the U.N. paralyzed? It is paralyzed because the nations cannot vote. It is paralyzed because the problem of the Russian dues to the U.N. will not be solved until September. I wish it were not so—I wish we were living in a different kind of a world. Oh, how I wish we had an international court of justice, and that we could take the Communists to that court. How nice it would be if we could get 85 nations to join us in South Vietnam. But, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, we cannot even get the SEATO nations to join us in South Vietnam. If communism is going to be stopped, we have to stop it. Finally, the position of the administration in this perplexing, complex, and difficult situation, is that negotiation, and the will to try and hope and pray and work for a peaceful solution through negotiation, is important. But that is not the only important element. When dealing with the Communists, in the kind of real world in which they are operating, you have to have two other legs to this stool, too. One of those legs is the kind of hard, tough, grinding assistance we are developing in Vietnam so she can develop her independence, so that she can have the seedbed of political freedom. The third leg, and the one that is so hard for Americans who live peace to accept, is that of force and power—the force of military muscle and the will to use that military muscle. What the administration is doing is to use our military force, use our economic ability, and at the same time sincerely and honestly work to create a situation in which negotiations will be possible, but negotiations that can permit a free and independent South Vietnam and stop Communist aggression.

Senator MORSE. When my very close friend Senator PROXMIER talks about our being invited into South Vietnam by the Government of South Vietnam, I would ask him, "Which one?" "When?" No government has been set up by the people of South Vietnam. We saw it that that did not happen in 1956. We stopped the government from being set up in South Vietnam. We set up our own puppet, and a whole chain of puppets. Senator PROXMIER says a hundred or so nations have recognized that government. Well, we have spent \$100 billion now in foreign aid to some 100 nations and they are not going to offend us very quickly. I want to say that it is pretty difficult for this great power of the United States to find very many people taking positions that they will not recognize a puppet. * * * We never have been called in by a government of the people of South Vietnam. I am for a procedure that will give the people of South Vietnam their own government, not an American-imposed government, which they have had ever since 1954.

The United Nations is in a position to work. Read the charter. Who is responsible for the fact that the U.N. went out of session? It was what Ambassador Stevenson called a procedural vote on article 19, the most substantive vote that could be cast in that gen-

eral session. That is why the students of the United Nations are severely criticizing the United States for our course of action on article 19, and they should criticize. That is why your Senator led the fight in the Senate against the policy of our Government, backed up by a surprising number of Senators, when I said "You should hold the nose of Russia and France to the grindstone in the United Nations—not let them out of it, and insist on a vote on article 19." But I am talking about an extraordinary session of the United Nations, an extraordinary session called for the nations to carry out their responsibility to keep the peace. I have no doubt what the General Assembly would do if reconvened, if there was any hope of maintaining the peace by the United Nations sending whatever number of divisions of the U.N. troops necessary to enforce the peace in southeast Asia. They would quickly waive any obligations regarding any money if they could get this matter decided; then they could go back to the debate on article 19.

I did not come here, and Senator PROXMIER did not come here, to ask for agreement. We came believing that what is needed in this country on this critical issue is the thought of the American people—to get the American people away from their dogmas and their slogans. Remember, you, too, have a responsibility of statesmanship. Yours is the responsibility of citizen-statesmanship. Never forget that foreign policy under our constitution does not belong to the President of the United States. That is one of the myths or bubbles that needs to be burst. Foreign policy belongs to you, the people. The President is the administrator of the people's foreign policy, subject to the checks of Congress. We now have to think about American boys and girls 100, 200, 500, and 1,000 years from now. It is my deep conviction that if we follow this course, we will never leave a heritage of freedom to our grandchildren.

Moderator JONES. Thank you, Senator MORSE, and particularly for that final word. It has been our privilege to listen to a discussion of truly historic proportions this evening, for which we thank both of our guests very warmly.

SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENT TO THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Senate adopted a most significant amendment to the voting rights bill. The amendment, sponsored by Senator KENNEDY of New York, will enfranchise thousands of Spanish speaking citizens. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY deserves the gratitude of all those dedicated to equality in voting for directing his great abilities to the passage of this amendment.

This amendment would prohibit the denial of the right to vote in any election of any person because of his inability to read, write, or understand English if he has successfully completed the sixth grade in a public or accredited private school in any State, territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant

classroom language was other than English.

The amendment provides:

No person who demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade 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 in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, except that in States in which State law provides that a different level of education is presumptive of literacy, he shall demonstrate that he has successfully completed an equivalent level 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 in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.

Mr. Speaker, Congress certainly has the power to pass this literacy test amendment under the enforcement clauses of the 14th and 15th amendments.

The 14th amendment to the Constitution guarantees that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." In New York State thousands of American citizens have been denied the equal protection of the laws.

New York State requires a prospective voter to take an English language literacy test or to establish his literacy by showing an eighth grade education at a school conducted in English. As a result of this requirement thousands of American citizens of Puerto Rican origin do not register to vote. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY estimated that there are approximately 730,000 Puerto Ricans in New York, of whom approximately 480,000 are of voting age. Less than one-third—about 150,000 are registered to vote. While it cannot be said that all the other 330,000 are not registered because of the literacy test, there is no doubt that a substantial number do not register for this reason.

The New Yorker of Puerto Rican origin has every opportunity to be as well informed a voter as his English-speaking neighbor. There are Spanish-language newspapers, televisions, and radio. The schools in Puerto Rico teach civics and American history. The English-language literacy test is an arbitrary requirement for voting and should be abolished.

I have sponsored legislation throughout my service in Congress to abolish the literacy test completely. In this Congress my bill to eliminate the literacy test is H.R. 2477. I testified at length before the House Committee on the Judiciary on this question. I believe the least we can do in this session is to adopt the literacy test amendment sponsored by Senator KENNEDY of New York.

Unfortunately, this amendment is not included in the voting rights bill which has been reported out by the House. In view of the action taken by the other body, I hope the House will adopt it, and I urge the distinguished chairman of the

Committee on the Judiciary to accept the amendment when the voting rights bill is on the floor. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in this fight to bring full rights of citizenship to thousands of Americans who speak Spanish.

COMMUNITY SERVICE SOCIETY AND THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

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, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the testimony of Mrs. Barbara Reach before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mrs. Reach is staff associate of the Community Service Society, the oldest and largest voluntary family service agency in the country. We will shortly be debating the administration's Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and I believe that this testimony will add to our deliberations. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to read the following testimony:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON S. 1354; H.R. 5840, APRIL 9, 1965

(By Barbara Reach, committee on housing and urban development)

My name is Barabara Reach and I represent the Committee on Housing and Urban Development of the Community Service Society of New York.

The Community Service Society, founded in 1848, is the oldest and largest voluntary family service agency in the country. It has always combined a program of social action with its direct services to troubled families and individuals. From the earliest years, its workers recognized the influence of housing conditions on the quality of family life and began to attack the slums in which the poor of New York City were forced to live. The committee on housing and urban development was formally organized in 1898. Since then its interests have broadened to include not only the establishment and protection of housing standards, the provision of new and rehabilitated housing for persons of low and middle income, and the organization of humane and efficient means of relocation, but the planning and administration of the whole urban environment in which an ever-growing majority of our citizens live. The committee is therefore a body that can speak with authority on the legislation now being considered.

My comments will be confined to sections of the bill which we consider of primary importance to our work in New York City. I should like to begin by saying that we are glad to see that the administration recognizes the crucial importance of dealing constructively with the many problems besetting our cities. But we feel that in many respects the specific proposals of this bill do not measure up to the magnitude of the urban crisis.

TITLE I

Section 101, authorizing rent supplements for certain families, recognizes a technique

which the committee has studied in some detail. We believe that it can be of great value, not as a substitute for existing programs of public and publicly aided housing, but as a complement to them. However, we disapprove of section 101 in its present form.

It limits this aid to persons whose income is too high for admission to public housing but too low for middle-income housing. This group is indeed in need of help; but there is another group whose need is even greater. I refer to the many people whose incomes are so low that they cannot pay even the rents in public housing. Their desperate situation must not be ignored.

We therefore recommend that this section be amended to make all persons who are eligible for public housing eligible for the rent supplement program under certain conditions. These conditions should be that, for the ensuing 3 years, the anticipated number of applications for public housing in the area under consideration exceed the anticipated supply by 10 percent, and that the applicants be in all other ways qualified for the rent supplementation program (under "qualified tenant" subdivision (2)).

We consider this amendment an important one for two reasons. First, as I have already stated, we believe that the housing need of the additional persons thereby included is very great and that it should be met in the present program. Secondly, it would facilitate the integration of families of differing economic status, which this committee considers one of the prime assets of a rent supplementation program. The restrictions now in section 101 would, conversely, aggravate the segregation by income that now prevails in public and publicly aided projects and that has had well-known and regrettable effects on the families living there.

A second recommendation on the subject of eligibility requirements concerns the provisions for the aged. We appreciate the importance of offering special consideration to older persons, but we would suggest that the annual income certification be continued for the elderly until they reach 72, the age at which income certification is no longer required under social security.

We disapprove also of a third provision, which restricts rent supplements to housing built with the aid of FHA insured section 221(a)(3) market-interest-rate mortgages. In our opinion the supplements should be available also for housing built with the aid of mortgages carrying interest below the market rate, and also for the type of limited dividend, limited profit, and redevelopment company housing now included in the New York State housing program.

We recommend adoption of section 103, authorizing the use of urban renewal capital grant funds for rehabilitation grants in certain hardship cases; this fills an obvious gap in existing provisions for rehabilitation. We likewise approve of section 104, which would make various public housing provisions more equitable by extending to handicapped persons certain benefits that are now available only to the elderly.

Section 105 authorizes, for persons and businesses displaced by federally aided mass transportation projects, the same relocation benefits now provided under the urban renewal and low-rent public housing programs. The committee, which has been responsible for several pioneering studies that proved the social and economic importance of sound relocation procedures, is glad to see the present benefits made available on a uniform basis to all those who are forced to make by various Federal activities. This provision corrects an obvious inequity. However, we want also to point out that small businesses in urban renewal areas are given very inadequate recompense, and to urge that the Congress establish higher benefits for them.

TITLE II

In title II, dealing with FHA insurance operations, we are particularly interested in section 203, which authorizes higher mortgage limits for dwelling units with four or more bedrooms. We consider this section of great importance and support it strongly. In many cities large families are among the neediest and at the same time have the greatest difficulty in finding decent housing within their means. The law as it stands discourages the construction of proper accommodations for them, and the proposed change is urgently needed.

Section 204 is intended to encourage rehabilitation of rental housing in urban renewal areas by liberalizing the provisions of section 220. We approve of the new provisions as far as they go, but would suggest a further easing of restrictions. At present, when an owner is to occupy part of the building, benefits are available only if the rehabilitation provides from 5 to 11 units. This requirement is too rigid. For example, in the New York City West Side Urban Renewal area there is now great interest in remodeling brownstones. In some of these, one apartment to a floor is a good arrangement; but in smaller buildings one floor is not enough for family occupancy. We therefore urge an amendment that would make section 220 loans available for buildings with as few as three units.

TITLE III

Turning to title III, Urban Renewal, we are glad that the administration recognizes the importance of this very valuable tool for the revitalization of our cities. However, we are deeply disappointed in the specific provisions of section 302. The increase in authorization for capital grants for this program is in our opinion entirely inadequate. There is a huge backlog of desperately needed projects that are waiting for survey and planning funds. We therefore urge the Congress to increase the authorization to an amount more commensurate with the need.

TITLE IV

The provision of low-rent public housing has been a leading interest of the committee for many years, and we believe that all possible means of increasing the supply should be explored. We therefore approve section 402, which would encourage greater use of existing private housing by facilitating the purchase, purchase and rehabilitation, or leasing of private units. Application of these provisions could add more units to the supply and at the same time bring welcome variety into the low-rent housing program.

The framers of this bill obviously anticipate that a great proportion of public housing units added to the supply in future years will be in new buildings constructed specifically for this purpose; with this prognosis we agree. However, when we study the table presented in the section-by-section analysis on section 403, we find that the number of additional units planned can only be described as grossly inadequate. In all 3 programs—regular construction, purchase, and leasing—the expected total for the entire country is 240,000; in the regular program, the total is 140,000. To anyone aware of the need for public housing, to anyone who knows that in New York City alone there are 100,000 families on the waiting list for public housing, it is obvious that these totals can hardly begin to meet the need.

We furthermore consider it very important that the bill in its final form establish no hard-fast rule as to how public housing units are to be distributed among the three programs. In New York City, for example, purchase or leasing can be of little use because of the overall shortage of housing. We recommend that the Congress specifically declare that the funds authorized for

any State may be directed to whichever program or programs best meet the needs and resources of that State.

Turning to section 403, we note particularly in the section-by-section analysis the statement that housing authorities will be authorized to provide counseling and other necessary services, in cooperation with other agencies, to the tenants of public housing. This is already done to some extent, but we welcome official recognition, which will encourage expansion of the program. We believe that these services can help to bring about what we all hope for: not only better housing for low-income families, but a better life as well.

While discussing low-rent public housing, we want to urge—as we have before—repeal of the existing provision that limits the amount for any one State to 15 percent of the total. This arbitrary figure means that the program cannot be responsive to need, which varies widely from State to State. Furthermore, the provision is particularly prejudicial because the limitation is in terms of money, not of dwelling units. Therefore a State in a high-cost area, like New York, gets proportionately fewer units than States where costs are lower. We consider the limitation inequitable and urge that the Congress amend the present bill to eliminate it.

The construction cost limits per room on public housing were established some years ago and are now unrealistic. They are \$2,000 per room, with a possible rise to \$2,750 in high-cost areas; the corresponding figures for apartments for the aged are \$1,000 higher. The latter figures we consider reasonable, but the other limits should be raised.

We have learned also that there is an administrative ceiling on the total cost of an apartment, regardless of the number of rooms it contains. This of course means that fewer apartments are built for the large families whose need for decent housing is so great. It would be helpful if the Congress would formally state its approval of the construction of large apartments where they are in demand, so long as the cost limits per room are adhered to.

Allocations for the development of open spaces of a public housing site are almost always inadequate. It appears that the importance of a pleasing and healthful environment for public housing families is consistently ignored in budgeting a project, and that site development is given only such moneys as may happen to be left over when construction is completed. This is in no way consistent with the emphasis on urban beautification and improvement shown in title VIII, and betrays a very shortsighted view of the purpose of public housing. We urge that this situation be remedied.

Finally, we would point out that the public housing administration does not now take advantage of the full amount of subsidy authorized. That this practice should be followed when many people cannot afford public housing at prevailing rents is obviously ill advised. Congress should declare specifically that the full amount authorized should be used. Otherwise the persons most in need of decent subsidized housing will continue to be deprived of the help they should have.

TITLE VI

The committee has long realized that the provision of "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing is not enough in itself to create a better life for the tenants. Only too often it has resulted in barren, bleak projects with the atmosphere of a ghetto. We therefore believe that section 603, which authorizes grants for various types of neighborhood facilities, is a very valuable step toward a good urban environment. It would encourage good planning and stimulate local effort.

Section 604, authorizing grants to assist in advance acquisition of land for public works or facilities, is another excellent provision. Advance acquisition has made valuable contributions to orderly planning and growth in other countries, and we urge that this section be kept in the bill.

TITLE VIII

Being concerned, as we are, with the influence of the total urban environment on the lives of city families, we are glad to find that the administration recognizes the value of beauty, amenity, and recreation. Section 804, providing grants for acquiring open-space land in built-up urban areas, could be extremely useful and must be kept in the act. We likewise approve strongly of section 805, which would authorize matching grants for urban beautification and improvement. Both of these valuable sections, like those we have discussed in title VI, could be of incalculable influence in stimulating sound urban planning.

TITLE X

Finally, the committee welcomes and thoroughly approves section 1002. Federal-State training programs have already proved their worth in contributing to the development of sound community planning, and we believe that the increased authorization is well justified.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Two important matters have been ignored in the framing of this legislation. First, it does not authorize direct loans for rehabilitation, and we strongly recommend adding such a provision. Second, we believe that nonprofit nursing homes should be made eligible for the aids now available to other types of housing. The need for this type of accommodation is already great, and it will inevitably increase with the increase in our elderly population and with the increasing consideration of nursing homes, when medically appropriate, as a less costly alternative to general hospitals. These facilities, once built, can be self-supporting in respect to current operating costs, but there is great difficulty in financing the construction. We therefore urge authorization of either mortgage insurance for low-interest rate loans or a program of direct loans for nonprofit nursing homes.

In conclusion, I wish to add on behalf of the committee that we are greatly encouraged by the administration's recognition that, as the President has well said, "the future of the American city will play the most vital role" in the quest for a better life in this country. This bill authorizes some valuable new approaches to housing and to urban problems in general, and these we welcome. But in its present form the measure is both inadequate and ill-proportioned, giving the most help to those least in need of it and falling to cope with the urban crisis on the scale that the facts demand. If the much-heralded war on poverty is not to dwindle into a minor tactical skirmish, there must be a massive and coordinated attack on the decay of our central cities.

Many millions of city-dwellers are existing in intolerable conditions that are the result of generations of greed and neglect. It will be difficult if not impossible for the poverty program to reach these millions if no change is made in their demoralizing environment. A new and effective Federal program for improving both housing and the whole development of our cities could give them new hope and a real chance for a better life. The situation thus poses an enormous challenge, and we are forced to say that the administration bill in many respects does not meet it. We hope that the Congress will welcome this challenge and seize the opportunity it offers.

CLERGY RESPONSE TO CHARGES ABOUT RECENT SELMA-MONTGOMERY CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, the largest circulation weekly news magazine of the Episcopal Church, the *Witness*, for Christ and His Church, has published as its story of the week in the May 20, 1965, edition, volume 50, No. 19, a most thorough news report about the clergy response to charges about the recent Selma-Montgomery civil rights march. In addition to very careful and complete reporting by the editors of this Episcopal Church publication, headquartered at Tunkhannock, Pa., the editors have printed an editorial entitled "Fiction Versus Fact."

The highest officials of the churches entrusted responsibility for preparing the clergy reply to two outstanding churchmen. One is the Rev. W. Rodney Shaw of the Methodist Church who helped insure a thoughtful, spiritual approach to answering the serious charges made against the clergy. The other is a layman of the Episcopal Church, Frederick H. Sontag, a public relations and research consultant of Montclair, N.J., within my congressional district, a long-time leader in the civil rights movement, who initiated and coordinated the clergy effort.

All too often the men and women who actually carry through the difficult assignment of accomplishing such a project must remain without recognition. The editors of the *Witness* have performed a service by giving credit where it is due. In addition to sharing the *Witness* magazine article and editorial with the Members of Congress, the press, persons interested in civil rights throughout the Nation, and serious students of our legislative process, I would also like to include a list of the organizations and men and women who in varying degrees made the clergy for Alabama truth project possible.

[From the *Witness* for Christ and His Church, May 20, 1965]

ALABAMA CONGRESSMAN ANSWERED BY CHURCH GROUP

A fast-moving interfaith religious team effectively began answering the charges of sex orgies, drunkenness and general misbehavior during the Selma-Montgomery civil rights march as they were made on the floor of the House of Representatives by Congressman WILLIAM DICKINSON of Alabama.

The Episcopal Church, through its clergy and laymen, took a leading role in organizing and staffing what is widely regarded as one of the most effective joint interfaith congressional efforts recently. A couple of Episcopal priests, Roman Catholic monsignors and a nun and a Protestant minister flew to Washington from as far away as San Francisco, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, etc., to work together as a team with eastern-based laymen on the joint congressional effort. The all-faith Selma team issued (1) a joint statement on morality, (2) a fact

and fiction sheet and (3) released some of the many telegrams from clergy and religious leaders from all parts of the United States and including most major religious groups, defending the civil rights marchers' behavior and answering the Alabama Republican's attacks.

On March 30, Congressman DICKINSON made his first major House speech against the Selma civil rights marchers. Frederick H. Sontag, a public relations and research consultant of Montclair, N.J., a long-time leader in the civil rights movement and a leading Episcopal layman, was deeply concerned that for several weeks afterward no answer to Congressman DICKINSON's attacks were made before the House. When Congressman DICKINSON sent advance notice to his colleagues during April that he would give another major speech with reportedly supporting affidavits, Mr. Sontag decided that the time to clear the good name of the clergy and lay people who participated in the overall civil rights efforts, and especially the Selma-Montgomery march, had come. At the same time he received word from several top prelates that they wanted some action in Washington clearing the name of the clergy, defending their close associate, Dr. Martin Luther King, and taking the civil rights movement off the defensive and back onto the track for a constructive civil rights bill.

On Thursday evening, April 22, a private decision was made that an effort should be attempted. The following day the first quiet exploratory calls were made to obtain the cooperation of some of the Washington area clergy leaders and by Saturday a hard core nucleus of dedicated churchmen and civil rights leaders was in formation. A natural-born clergy leader, the Reverend W. Rodney Shaw of the Methodist Church, was recommended as the operations officer for the clergy civil rights task force. With only 1 hour's notice, Mr. Shaw appeared before a closed door meeting of representatives of nine moderate Republican organizations. At that time a young Episcopal layman, Douglas Weller 3d, executive director of Yale Republican Advance, volunteered to assist in Shaw's office for the next several days.

During the weekend telephone calls fanned out all over the Nation to select the best team which could quickly come to Washington to answer the Congressman's Tuesday speech and then go on the offensive the next day.

By Monday, April 26, the clergy representatives had arrived in Washington with the blessing and support of their superiors and Shaw offered his Methodist Building office as working headquarters for the group. Right across from the Capitol, this was a most convenient and congenial location. Frederick Sontag in the meantime had carefully researched the correct procedures to be followed by the clergy group and these had been approved by civil rights and congressional supporters. After meeting together first Monday noon for joint consultation and sharing of experiences, the clergy group visited with Congressman WILLIAM DICKINSON at his office. He explained why he was making these attacks on the clergy in the march and, under the leadership of Sister Leoline, several of the clergy carefully examined the uncaptioned, unidentified photographs which he claimed would support his case. After several questions about these photographs, Congressman DICKINSON decided the next day not to use them on the floor of the House, perhaps having been shaken in their believability by the clergy reaction. Although the clergy, in a forceful, quiet and dignified session did not change Congressman DICKINSON's mind, there was an exchange of opinion and fact before the next day's attack by the Alabama Congressman. That afternoon and evening the clergy,

working in several teams, went over the points made by Congressman DICKINSON and then wrote up their own statement of conscience, analyzed the statements made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD against the civil rights marchers by several Congressmen and thought through with Episcopal layman Sontag the strategy to be followed for the days ahead.

FORD AND M'CORMACK

On Tuesday morning the clergy group had a 40-minute private interview with House Republican minority leader, GERALD FORD, an Episcopalian, at which time they presented to him the united religious viewpoint and supporting materials about the march. Congressman FORD stated to the group that he doubted that he would be able to contain Congressman DICKINSON and he did not offer or promise a defense of the clergy during this friendly and courteous interview.

Having failed to receive assurances of Republicans against Congressman DICKINSON's statements of sex orgies, communism and drunkenness, a small group then notified House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK of their intention not to take Congressman DICKINSON's attacks lying down. The clergy group then divided into teams fanning out all over the House office buildings to visit as many Congressmen of both parties as were known to be interested in civil rights and in the time still available who would consider asking challenging questions and bringing out pertinent facts during DICKINSON's late afternoon attack.

TEAM MOVES FAST

Then, moving with fast military precision, the press kit of the clergy statements and telegrams were released to the press by Frederick Sontag a couple of hours before DICKINSON spoke so that they would be sure to be considered by responsible press media in their coverage of the DICKINSON speech. The clergy group then assembled in the House gallery, substantially reinforced by misogyners, priests, nuns, Protestant clergymen and church lay officials.

Speaker MCCORMACK, who was white with anger at advance Dickinson text, decided that he personally would preside during the special order hour-long presentation. This is quite unusual, as normally a regular Member of the House handles the special orders which follow the regular House business. During DICKINSON's speech the Speaker continually glanced up at the galleries, where a large group of Washington Roman Catholic friends had joined together to be with the Roman Catholic representatives of the clergy team. Looking furiously down at the floor and turning around sharply in his chair while passing notes, MCCORMACK made clear that he was getting ready for action. In contrast, Minority Leader GERALD FORD sat relaxed, leaning back next to his campaign manager, Congressman ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan. Halfway through DICKINSON's speech, FORD left the floor of the House reportedly to keep another engagement. That was the turning point of the debate politically because one of several men DICKINSON had to yield to on the Republican side would have been his own leader. If FORD had taken the opportunity to report to the House of the visit that morning by nine representatives of all the major faiths and to state to the House that there was another point of view sharply contrasting with that of Republican Congressman DICKINSON, of Alabama, the day's events would have turned out quite differently. None of the FORD assistants or supporters said anything while Congressman DICKINSON spoke. Congressman HASTINGS KEITH asked one question whether Congressman DICKINSON could prove his charges.

TELEGRAM FROM SHERRILL

After the debate was all over Republican Congressman WILLIAM BATES of Massachu-

setts had read into the Record a telegram by the Reverend Goldwaite Sherrill of Ipswich, Mass., son of the former presiding bishop, who had marched the whole way between Selma and Montgomery, denying wrongdoing and praising the conduct of the marchers. The absence of a single Republican voice, liberal, moderate or conservative, to interrupt DICKINSON was a profound disappointment to the clergy, well over half of whom were Republicans. The messages to Republican Chairman Raymond Bliss, an Episcopalian, also had yielded no results.

DEMOCRATS ACT

Now it was the turn of the majority party. Quickly a number of Democrats—WILLIAM RYAN, of New York; JOSEPH RESNICK, of New York; BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois; PAUL KREBS, of New Jersey, and EDWARD ROYBAL, of California, defended the clergy and the march and attacked the undocumented, vague Dickinson affidavits.

Using the clergy materials available in the press galleries the Democratic team began to set the record straight. However, in the Senate a Republican voice of conscience in civil rights, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, was doing likewise alone. The next day he would be followed by Congressman OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York. Once the civil rights speeches in the House were over, the clergy and pro-civil-rights Congressmen gathered around Speaker MCCORMACK and a friendly off-the-record session was held.

PREPARE FOR MEETING

The clergy team then returned to the Methodist Building to prepare their press conference the next day. Throughout the planning of this clergy cooperative venture, Frederick Sontag had insisted that the representatives of the churches of the Nation were entitled to present their point of view at a time of their own choosing separated from congressional charges and countercharges. Although one New York Episcopal church official was afraid that the clergy team could not handle the Washington press corps' questions, the church prelates and Frederick Sontag stood their ground and insisted on a press conference. The clergy team carefully went over questions that could be asked, tape-recorded their impressions of their interviews with the Congressmen they had visited, and through quiet prayer and joint meditation, decided the areas of discussion each could cover best the next day.

On Wednesday morning again each clergyman and layman went to worship in their own respective churches and then joined together as a strong united team for their press conference.

PACKED SESSION

The National Council of Churches room was the largest available and it was packed so tightly with reporters, cameramen, and photographers that some press people had to leave because there was no place for them to sit down. For one and a half hours the team fielded the questions of the Washington press corps' finest. The dean of Washington religious editors, United Press International's Louis Cassels, an Episcopal layman, was joined by such veterans as George Herman of CBS news for the Walter Cronkite program; the Huntley-Brinkley NBC camera crew were there, as well as ABC-TV, etc. Soon nationwide Associated Press and United Press International stories were carrying the strong clergy defense of the march, Martin Luther King, other civil rights leaders, and the vehement denial of sex orgies and the like.

TOP COVERAGE

That night before a stirred audience of clergy staying in various Washington homes, the NBC-TV network on the Huntley-Brinkley program showed film of how their own

reporter and camera crew had retraced the steps of the march, had compared at each place DICKINSON's charges with the statements of the clergy and in the end had found the clergy's position to be correct. CBS-TV news analyst Eric Sevareid, after the clergy press conference films were shown, told how once upon a time there was the class of 1946 in Congress and how out of this came a man named Joseph McCarthy whom people did not take seriously at first when he waved unsubstantiated affidavits. Then the CBS commentator reminded his nationwide audience that now was the class of 1964 with a new group from Alabama, Mississippi, etc., with a Congressman named WILLIAM DICKINSON waving similar charges, photographs, etc. Time and Newsweek magazines carried interview stories with the clergy team in their weekend editions.

SHAW AND SONTAG

While the clergy were doing their own talking and rebuttal as well as making constructive civil rights points, Mr. Shaw and Frederick Sontag were talking with some of the responsible press officials who knew DICKINSON was inaccurate. Soon the UPI management was challenging DICKINSON's statements that their personnel had witnessed sex orgies, including photographer Philip Sandlin, who is not a writer. Honest southern editors and reporters, such as managing editor Robert Craig of the Spartanburg, S.C. Journal and Reporter, told the AP that he had spent the entire march looking for misconduct and had not found any. DICKINSON repeated some of his charges in Montgomery the following Sunday, the same day the Montgomery Advertiser, in a signed editorial by Don Wasson, managing editor, stated that he had not proven his case. Captain Wilson Baker, Selma public safety director, told the UPI that he did not witness the immorality charged in Congress by DICKINSON. Art Buchwald, the humorist columnist, did a piece about this situation in the thought that some humor might be helpful in bringing the light of day into some of the charges.

Congressman GERALD FORD told the wire services that "as a Member of the House, Congressman DICKINSON has the right to make any comment. I believe the comments he made are his responsibility." On the same day that Congressman DICKINSON spoke, FORD issued a press release commenting on Vietnam and the next day during a press conference stated that House Republicans would pick up in 1966 the 44 seats they lost in the 1964 election; but he did not take a position for the civil rights clergy.

As a new week was beginning DICKINSON was repeating his charges, while Democratic Members of the House of Representatives were beginning to make new statements defending the march and clergy and upholding the overall civil rights effort. Ten days after the Dickinson speech two House Republicans, JOHN V. LINDSAY of New York, an Episcopalian, and SILVIO CONTE of Massachusetts denounced the Alabama Congressman's charges.

As the various clergy returned to their regular assignments, it became clear that the effort to bring the truth to bear against DICKINSON's charges was just beginning. Sontag had just received several calls of appreciation for a job well done when he went through Philadelphia and stopped by at the Episcopal diocesan convention. He was shocked to find that clergy and lay people had received reprints of the Dickinson charges with an unsigned transmittal note urging the Philadelphia area Episcopallians to believe DICKINSON and to repudiate the work of their own church and highly respected and beloved bishop.

The joint clergy effort answering DICKINSON showed that with professional advice and assistance church leaders and groups

could work most effectively in Washington following sound and accepted procedures to strengthen the civil rights cause. With so many roadblocks still ahead, the operation described above will probably be a landmark in efficiency, effectiveness, courtesy, and speed. Many others like this will be needed in the years ahead.

[From the Witness for Christ and His Church, May 20, 1965]

EDITORIAL: "FICTION VERSUS FACT"

(Sister Mary Peter, of Chicago, was one of many Catholics who were on the march from Selma to Montgomery. Many of them were asked by the Reverend John Cronin, of the National Catholic Welfare Council, what they thought of the charges made by Congressman WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama, which we report on page 3 in this issue. We have read all of the 50 or more telegrams sent in reply and, without exception, they give the lie to the Congressman. Sister Mary's wire stood out because it was different. She said: "We believe what we want to believe. Having itching ears that delight in vicious gossip we make up or frame up what we want others to believe. Malignant fables of sex orgies on the Selma march fool only those of the slanderous segregated mind. I was there, I know." Her wisdom is attested by this fiction-fact statement released by 10 religious leaders, 5 of whom marched the entire way from Selma to Montgomery, including the Reverend Morris Samuel, Episcopalian, of Los Angeles, who was the head of the security detail for the entire march.)

Fiction: Congressman WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama, stated (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6333, Mar. 30) that Rev. Norman Truesdell, of Dubuque, Iowa, left the Selma-Montgomery march in disgust over the "immorality" on the march.

Fact: Statement by Truesdell, Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa (daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A1596, Apr. 1): "This (the above charges of Congressman DICKINSON) is a blatant lie. I saw no evidence of this alleged immorality. * * * I was not disillusioned, but inspired by the freedom marchers responsible Christian conduct * * *."

Fiction (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6333, Mar. 30): The Congressman stated that Rabbi Richard Rubenstein, of Pittsburgh, left the freedom march in disgust over the "immorality" on the march.

Fact (daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A1819, Apr. 13): Rabbi Rubenstein was not even on the march. He was in Pittsburgh at the time of the march. He had been in Montgomery March 15 and 16, a week prior to the freedom march, and said, "I can testify that the moral conduct of our students was beyond reproach." Rabbi Rubenstein on April 27 wired Bishop John Wesley Lcrod of Washington as follows: "Representative WILLIAM DICKINSON has incorrectly stated I left Selma-Montgomery march because disgusted immoral conduct of marchers. I was never on march. In phone conversation Representative DICKINSON promised correction. To date he has failed to fulfill promise. I was in Montgomery with 130 Pittsburgh college students. Saw absolutely no immoral conduct. Students behavior beyond reproach."

Fiction (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6333, Mar. 30): The alleged text of an alleged circular inviting marchers to a burlesque review each evening is included in Congressman DICKINSON's statement and described by him as having been "actually handed out to the marchers by some of those participating in the march."

Fact: No such leaflet or anything remotely resembling it was seen on the march or at any other time by the undersigned nor by any of the many participants in the march questioned on this subject by the undersigned, nor has the Congressman making the

charge yet produced any proof that such a leaflet was produced or circulated by the marchers.

Fiction: The above leaflet stated that "tent 9 will be pitched each evening ahead of the march, * * *" (for a burlesque show).

Fact: There was no "tent 9" nor any other tent for entertainment purposes. There were four tents, one for women and one for men, one for food and one for the press. All these tents were under the steady surveillance of the security guard during the night. Many of the tent, cleanup, supply, and other workers (mostly ministers, priests, and seminary students—all male) slept in the food tent (and in the press tent when that was not occupied by reporters). A notarized document substantiating these items, and signed by seminary students who were working with the march is available from the San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif.

Fiction (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6333, Mar. 30): Congressman DICKINSON states that "drunkenness and sex orgies were the order of the day" on the road to Montgomery.

Fact: The Birmingham News, March 28, after reporting various alleged immoralities prior to the march, stated, "The charge that similar activity took place at the various campsites during the march to Montgomery could not be substantiated." The Birmingham News had a reporter accompanying the entire march.

A news truck was constantly and immediately in front of the marchers. Cameramen, with long-distance lens, rode up on the bed of this truck and could bring the entire line of march into the focus of their cameras. Helicopters with news cameramen frequently hovered low over the marchers. Reporters and news photographers from major news media, including the Birmingham News, went constantly up and down both sides of the marching line, looking for unusual and newsworthy items. Just the sight of a marcher cooling his feet in a roadside pool was enough to bring a dozen photographers to the scene.

Surely it is obvious that, under the close and continuing surveillance described above, any illicit activity such as the Congressman described as being "the order of the day" would have immediately been spotted by newsmen and have brought a score of cameramen racing to the scene. But, to this day, no picture and no report of any such alleged illicit act on the march has come from any of the many newsmen accompanying the march.

Fiction (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6333, Mar. 30): After alleging that drunkenness and sex orgies were the order of the day, Congressman DICKINSON said, "photographs were taken of this, I am told. I have not seen the actual photographs, but they are being processed and compiled."

Fact: The photographs at last being produced by the Congressman as evidence should be closely examined by all to see whether they actually reveal illicit activity or are deemed worthy of attention by the Congressman simply because they show interracial fellowship.

Other photos are of unidentified objects, such as one that shows an ash tray stand with debris piled on the floor at its base. In this debris is a contraceptive device that could have been put there by anyone. The context of the picture gives no clear indication where in the United States the ash tray and the debris are located. Yet we are asked to accept this photo as evidence of debauchery by those on the march.

Fiction (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6334, Mar. 30): The Congressman states that only the Communist party could weld together into one force the many diverse groups he describes as being a part of the march.

Fact: To the charge that the civil rights movement is Communist influenced U.S. At-

torney General Katzenbach replied (Associated Press, April 4, 1965) "I don't think it is true at all * * * Communists and leftwing people have been remarkably unsuccessful in actually influencing any decisions and certainly have not captured any of the leadership."

Signing the statement:

The Reverend Richard F. Dickinson, missionary, United Church of Christ in Japan, studying at San Francisco Theological Seminary, California. Was on night security patrol and marched most of the way to Montgomery. Was in Selma 1 week before the march. Has been in Camden, Ala. the last 4 weeks. (Disciplines of Christ)

Sister Mary Leoline, B.V.M., Kansas City, Mo. She marched the entire way. (Roman Catholic)

James Martin, President of the student body of the San Francisco Theological Seminary. He represents 60 students from that school who worked each day on the tent and cleanup crews. (Presbyterian)

Msgr. Victor G. Moser, pastor of Annunciation Church, chairman of the Kansas City, Mo., council on religion and race. He was in Alabama during the entire march and marched 3 days. (Roman Catholic)

The Reverend Dom Orsini, rector, St. Luke's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. He marched all the way. (Episcopal)

The Reverend Morris Samuel, director of the parish of E. Los Angeles, and head of the security detail for the entire march.

The Reverend Canon Kenneth Sharpe, National Cathedral, Washington, D.C. He was in Selma 3 days before the march. (Episcopal)

The Reverend William R. Shaw, director of the department of economic life, general board of Christian social concerns of the Methodist Church. He marched the entire way. (Methodist)

Norman Truesdell, a ministerial student at the Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa. (American Lutheran Church)

Frederick H. Sontag, Episcopal Layman, who was not in Selma but who researched the material for the above statement.

CLERGY FOR ALABAMA TRUTH PROJECT—LIST OF PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

From Friday, April 19, through Wednesday, April 28, clergy and laymen of all communions from all parts of the country participated in an effort to bring to the attention of Congress, the press, and the people of this Nation the facts regarding the Selma march. Although it is impossible to list everyone who has participated in this voluntary effort, special appreciation is due to:

The general board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, particularly Mrs. Mary Fraser, Mrs. Carol Ross, and Manuel Espartero who did all the typing, Sam Griffin, Bill Cobun, Andre Parks, and Dale Ridgway who did the multilithing and collating and Rodney Shaw, who worked in the planning and execution group.

The National Catholic Welfare Council, particularly Fr. Cronin, assistant director, Department of Social Action.

The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice and Mr. Mathew Ahmann, executive director.

Several bishops of the Episcopal Church and canons of the National Cathedral, and the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, particularly the Reverend John F. Morris, executive director and Frederick H. Sontag, public relations and research consultant, who played an invaluable role in initiating and executing this project.

The Washington Council of Churches, particularly Virgil Lowder.

Several congressional offices, and several prelates who encouraged and supported this project from the beginning and whose prayers and assistance sustained this effort throughout.

A REPORT ON "THE GROWTH OF THE U.S. POPULATION"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker this morning the National Academy of Sciences issued a report on "The Growth of the U.S. Population" which showed rapid population growth is an American problem in addition to being a world problem and one which our country can no longer afford to ignore. The international aspects of the population explosion are already well known. It is becoming increasingly clear that all our efforts to improve the world standard of living in order to promote a stable world order could be undone by the fantastically rapid growth in world population. The foreign aid program we will be debating today will do little good if the population explosion is not brought under control.

Because of both the domestic and international aspects of the population explosion I am today introducing a bill which will:

First. State a congressional finding regarding the urgency and importance of the problems associated with the population explosion and declare it the policy of this Government "to more effectively deal with rapid population growth throughout the world."

Second. Authorize the President to call a White House Conference on Population Problems to promote informed discussion and increased attention and activity regarding population growth. Grants will also be made for State meetings prior to the White House Conference.

Third. Establish two new assistant secretaries for population affairs in the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide the vitally needed high-level coordination regarding both the international and domestic aspects of population growth.

This bill is intended to help fulfill President Johnson's pledge in the state of the Union address to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population."

There can be no doubt regarding the seriousness of this problem. At the time of Christ the earth's population was one-quarter billion; by 1830 it had risen to 1 billion; by 1930, only a hundred years later, it was 2 billion; and by today, 1965, it has taken only 35 additional years to add another billion. And in another 35 years, by the year 2000, world population will actually double and reach 6 billion people.

In considering the incredible results of the world population explosion, let us not forget the conclusions of the National Academy of Science's report on U.S. population growth; we in America also have a serious population problem. We are all aware that many parents have families that are larger than they can properly raise. As a result both parents and children face lives of constant strug-

gle and anxiety. We must develop birth control methods that are effective, and acceptable to all.

In addition we must see that such methods are fully publicized. All of us firmly believe that family size is a decision to be made solely and privately by husband and wife. But I also believe that husband and wife should have available the full information necessary to assist them in making informed and responsible decisions about the size of their families.

Both because of the international and domestic aspects, we need increased attention and concern about population growth.

I have already spoken to Chairman WILLIAM DAWSON of the House Government Operations Committee about holding early hearings on this bill. Hearings themselves would be helpful in many ways. Hearings would provide a forum to further the informed and responsible dialog between all religious and social groups which has finally replaced the previous situation of embarrassment and mutual suspicion. This problem is too vital for both our country and the world for us to hide from it any longer. In addition, the hearings would help determine whether the executive branch has the authorization to do all the things necessary in the way of research and dissemination of information and also whether we have the proper coordination regarding population problems among the various executive agencies and with State and local governmental agencies and private groups.

I want to state how proud I am to be associated with Senators ERNEST GRUENING and JOSEPH CLARK and Congressmen MORRIS UDALL, CHARLES DIGGS, JR., and PAUL TODD, who have introduced similar bills.

I want to particularly congratulate Congressman TODD for his determination to greatly increase research about human fertility by both governmental and private agencies. PAUL TODD's vigorous and effective leadership in such a usually sensitive area has gained him a great deal of respect among his colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and early hearings on the population explosion.

SILVER DOLLARS NOT TO BE MINTED—SOUND DECISION

Mr. FASCELL. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past week I have on three occasions brought to the attention of the Congress the lack of any justification for issuing silver dollars in the present circumstances. Although the Congress had authorized the expenditure of \$600,000 for their manufacture, the circumstances which may have warranted such expenditure last summer have completely changed.

Last July, then Secretary of the Treasury Dillon believed that a large quantity of silver dollars should be coined for issuance in the Western States, where they have historically circulated and where they were then in short supply. Putting new silver dollars into circulation in the West could, he felt, greatly alleviate the heavy demands which were being made on the quarter and 50-cent pieces.

The scarcity of silver dollars in circulation has spread throughout the country, and as the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations found in its studies of the coin shortage, most of the silver dollars that the United States has ever produced are being hoarded. There is now every indication that if the Government were to produce 45 million silver dollars at this time none of those would remain in circulation. In fact, as I pointed out in a statement printed in the May 24 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there was a widespread feeling among bankers, numismatists, and others who are cognizant of the coin situation that the silver dollars would never actually circulate.

Ample evidence of that probability is reflected in the fact that coin publications already contain advertisements offering the silver dollars on a when-issued basis, at premiums of \$4 and \$5.

The changed circumstances since last summer when the Congress authorized the silver dollars to be made are that they would not in any manner relieve the coin shortage. What we would be doing would be to subsidize speculation, by spending \$600,000 to manufacture the coins, and using up a full year's domestic production of silver in the process.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] also strongly objected to this minting and the Appropriations Subcommittee of which he is a member held hearings on this yesterday.

There can be no quarrel, it seems to me, with the wisdom of the Treasury's decision of yesterday to hold back on the manufacture of the dollars at this time. This decision followed the appropriations hearing and I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], for his perseverance and accomplishment.

The Treasury's decision not to mint the dollars at this time requires no congressional approval. However, the \$600,000 appropriation to cover costs of minting the silver dollars will expire on June 30, 1965.

There is another reason why the Treasury's decision seems wise. For a long time the Treasury has had under study the necessity for changing the metallic content of dimes, quarters, and halves, because of our diminishing silver supplies.

Its report on the silver situation which it is obliged to make to the Congress, has been delayed. The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee in its most recent report on the coin shortage—House Report No. 195, 89th Congress, 1st session—recommended to the Treasury that it delay minting the silver dollars until the Congress had received the Treasury's

report and had had opportunity to decide on the new alloys for subsidiary coins.

We also urged the Treasury to make its report to the Congress on the silver and coin alloys at the earliest possible date. As chairman of the subcommittee I would again urge the Treasury to expedite its report.

FULL DISCLOSURE DEMANDED

Mr. HARSHA. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, a full disclosure by the State Department and AID officials should be made to the American public on what sums actually go into our total foreign aid program. The State Department has been misleading the American people by claiming that the foreign aid bill is a "barebones" request of only \$3.4 billion. In addition to this sum requested in the act for 1965 there are additional requests totaling over \$2.5 billion through such programs as the Peace Corps, Public Law 480, Inter-American Development Bank, and International Development Association, plus sums buried in many of the budgets of Federal agencies for some sort of foreign aid program.

Furthermore, after June 30 there will be over \$9 billion of unexpended balances available in our foreign aid program. The American people are not being told the complete story on foreign aid. The drain on the U.S. gold stocks is a direct result of the aid program. The contention that the foreign aid program does not have an effect on the U.S. balance of payments, since 85 percent of the dollars made available for foreign aid are reportedly being spent in the United States is a spurious contention. This

would be true only if the dollars spent resulted in an increase in exports and, unfortunately, this is not the case. For example, in six countries receiving so-called program loans, expenditures totaled over \$567 million in 1964, yet U.S. exports to those same six countries increased only \$60 million in the same period. Also, our aid to Latin America has increased since 1956 to 1963 by 300 percent, yet our imports to those countries has declined annually 1 percent per year for that period.

In fairness to the American taxpayer, a clean breast of the total amount of money spent in this program annually should be made and the expenditures should be curtailed to offset our unfavorable balance of payments.

SEVENTH DISTRICT MISSOURI STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 of this year, the first meeting of the Southwest Missouri Youth Advisory Council was held on the Drury College campus in Springfield, Mo. A total of 83 southwest Missouri high schools were represented with a junior boy and girl from each school in attendance. Each school was responsible for the selection of their delegates to this meeting, the purpose of which was to establish a closer liaison between the young people and their Congressman.

Four major topics were discussed during the meeting. These topics were: the draft, aid for higher education, school dropouts, and the Peace Corps and Job Corps programs. I found the discussions and exchange of information to be both enlightening and heartening. The

young men and women in attendance demonstrated a real interest and concern over current problems. They were anxious to learn as well as to express themselves.

Following the day's events, a questionnaire was given to each student. The results are most interesting, and I will insert them at the conclusion of these remarks. I am of the opinion, for example, that when the Congress is considering legislation which has a direct bearing on young men and women, we should invite young men and women to appear before congressional committees so that our actions will be based, not only on what the adult community recommends, but also on the recommendations of those most directly affected.

Note, for example, on question No. 19, 80.6 percent of the students believe the primary reason for school dropouts can be attributed to lack of parental supervision. Only 9 percent believe primary responsibility for resolving the school dropouts problem should rest with the Federal Government.

Though most questions sought opinions, a few were on questions of fact, so as to determine whether opinions were based on solid understanding of fact. In this area, one definite weakness became evident. On question 24, for example, almost 80 percent of the students believe the average percentage of profit in relation to sales in private business in the United States is 10 percent or greater. Forty-four percent actually thought the average percentage of profit was 20 percent or greater. I am advised that these results are not very different from other similar tests that have been given to students around the Nation. This suggests, Mr. Speaker, that, while much publicity has been given to the need for more classes in explaining the Communist system, a far greater need exists to give students a better understanding of our own economic system.

The questionnaire and the results follow:

Results of questionnaire given to 7th District Youth Advisory Council, May 1, 1965, at Drury College, Springfield, Mo.

A total of 83 schools were represented, with a boy and girl from each school in attendance. Following are the questions asked and the percentages of yes and no replies:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe the draft as presently constituted is the most equitable method of insuring an adequate military force for the United States?.....	65.4	34.6
2. Would you favor a system of universal military training, under which all young men serve a limited period of basic training?.....	53.2	46.8
3. Do you think that a deferment should be granted to married men under—		
A. The present draft?.....	74.0	26.0
B. A possible universal military training program?.....	43.7	56.3
4. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee a college education for all qualified high school students?.....	48.3	51.7
5. In the event that such a Federal assistance program were adopted, do you believe it should be—		Percent
A. On a loan basis, with payback to the Government over a specified period of time?.....		87
B. On a grant basis with no payback required?.....		13
6. Do you believe that private loan programs for college education (banks, savings and loan associations, etc.) for those without adequate financial resources are preferable to Federal aid?.....	54.5	45.5
7. Do you favor a limited program of Federal assistance for higher education, such as the present National Defense Education Act, under which qualified students compete for Federal assistance with aid going to the most qualified?.....	63.0	37.0
8. Do you believe college attendance is a matter of individual choice and responsibility with no Federal assistance programs justified?.....	26.8	73.2
9. Do you believe the Peace Corps, as presently constituted, is a good program?.....	94.9	5.1
10. Do you believe that students volunteering for the Peace Corps should be assigned to—		
A. Only countries favorable to U.S. policy in the cold war?.....	22.8	77.2
B. All countries which will accept such assistance?.....	83.0	17.0
C. All countries, except those clearly allied with the Communist bloc of nations?.....	43.0	57.0
11. Do you believe that countries which accept Peace Corps aid should be required to pay all expenses of U.S. personnel assigned to them.....	19.6	80.4
12. Do you believe Peace Corps volunteers should be exempt from the draft?.....	68.2	31.8
13. Do you believe the Domestic Job Corps, under the war on poverty, is a legitimate Federal function?.....	84.1	15.9
14. Do you believe that public agencies, which utilize Job Corps volunteers, should be required to pay them the minimum Federal wage of \$1.25 an hour?.....	63.0	37.0
15. Do you believe the Domestic Job Corps is a desirable method of training young men and women for gainful employment in the future?.....	73.5	26.5
16. Do you believe establishment of the Domestic Job Corps will—		Percent
A. Alleviate the school dropout problem?.....		46.5
B. Further complicate the school dropout problem?.....		31.0
C. Not affect the school dropout problem one way or the other?.....		22.5

Results of questionnaire given to 7th District Youth Advisory Council, May 1, 1965, at Drury College, Springfield, Mo.—Continued

A total of 83 schools were represented, with a boy and girl from each school in attendance. Following are the questions asked and the percentages of yes and no replies:

	Percent	Percent	
		Yes	No
17. Do you believe primary responsibility for resolving the school dropout problem should rest with—			
A. The Federal Government?	9.0		
B. The State and local governments?	39.4		
C. The family of, or the individual concerned?	51.6		
18. Do you believe the schools are doing all they can, under their present authority, to minimize school dropouts?		19.4	80.6
19. Do you believe the primary reason for school dropouts can be attributed to—			
A. Financial hardship?	9.7		
B. Lack of ability?	9.7		
C. Lack of parental supervision?	80.6		
20. Do you believe that laws adopted by the Congress should—			
A. Be restricted to those clearly constitutional?		68.9	31.1
B. Be restricted only by the test of whether they will solve an alleged need?		58.9	41.1
C. Contain methods of financing, plus termination dates?		72.3	27.7
21. What do you believe is the average percent of profit in relation to sales in private business in the United States today?			
A. 3 percent	4.8		
B. 5 percent	16.4		
C. 10 percent	34.9		
D. 20 percent	26.1		
E. Higher than any of the above	17.8		
22. Do you believe the percent of profit in business should be regulated by—			
A. The Federal Government?	13.8		
B. The law of supply and demand and competition?	86.2		
23. Under the free enterprise system, the profit motive has contributed to job opportunities and our standard of living through incentive, competition, and risk. What do you think constitutes a fair margin of profit?			
A. 3 percent	2.8		
B. 5 percent	14.1		
C. 10 percent	28.9		
D. None	1.4		
E. Whatever market factors and competition will permit?	52.8		
24. Do you think the responsibilities of citizenship are best fulfilled when a citizen—			
A. Joins and actively participates in the political party of his or her choice?	30.3		
B. Remains an "independent" voter and votes "according to the man"?	69.7		
25. Do you believe that—			
A. Prayers should be permitted in the public schools, so long as they are voluntary and nondenominational?	93.2		
B. No prayers should be allowed in the public schools?	6.8		
26. To the best of your knowledge, did the recent Supreme Court decision prohibit all prayers in the public schools, which may be approved by a local school board?		54.2	45.8
27. Do you believe that individual States have the authority, under the Constitution, to set voting requirements, so long as they are applied without discrimination?		74.5	25.5
28. Do you believe new Federal legislation is necessary to insure that no citizen is denied the right to vote?		71.1	28.9
29. Do you believe literacy tests are a proper requirement for voting, so long as they are applied without discrimination?		77.8	22.2
30. Does Missouri have a literacy test for new voters?		17.7	82.3
31. Do you believe the voting age in Missouri should be lowered from 21 to 18 years of age?		38.3	61.7
32. Do you believe that all citizens should be required by law to vote in national elections?		17.1	82.9
33. Do you favor present U.S. policy in Vietnam?		69.9	30.1
34. Do you believe our foreign aid program has been an effective instrument of U.S. policy?		50.0	50.0
35. Do you believe Government service offers an attractive and desirable career?		77.5	22.5
36. Do you believe our present complex society requires a larger and more dominant role by the Federal Government?		40.0	60.0
37. Do you believe the 50 individual States are "archaic" and that the various States should serve primarily as an administrative arm of the Federal Government?		43.0	57.0
38. Do you believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to furnish all persons with the necessities of life, such as food, clothing, shelter, etc., if their own efforts are inadequate?		46.4	53.6
39. Do you believe the Government should permit discontinuance of passenger train service if such service cannot be provided without an economic loss to the carrier?		68.7	31.3

SILVER DOLLARS AND THE SILVER SITUATION

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join my good friend and colleague from Florida. I was gratified to receive word that the Treasury Department has announced it will not mint any new silver dollars at this time. I was forced to take the floor of the House last Wednesday to denounce the directive to mint, for the first time since 1935, new silver dollars. It was apparent to me that the minting of new silver dollars at this time was sheer folly.

I believe that the decision is a clear vindication of the position which I have taken with regard to the minting of silver dollars at this time. I also believe that it is a vindication of my long fight to relieve the shortage of coins and to insure that the mint does nothing which would aggravate the situation.

The minting of these dollars would have had no effect on the coins available

as a medium of exchange in our Western States.

The minting of these dollars would have, however, consumed 35 million ounces of silver from a supply that is rapidly being depleted, adding to the critical shortage of silver that already exists.

There could have been no clearer example of a wrong decision being made at the wrong time to the betterment of no one and to the detriment of all.

But, the about-face by the Treasury Department on the minting of these silver dollars does, by no stretch of the imagination, leave everything coming up roses for our coinage system. We do have a critical shortage of coins at a time when the available supply of silver for the minting of coins will be exhausted within 3 years.

We do have an increasing industrial use of silver at a time when both the silver used for coinage and the silver used in industry are in excess of the total annual free world production of that precious metal.

It is encouraging to me that the problems that are yet to be overcome for our coinage system have not been compounded by this ill-timed and ill-advised directive. But, the problems are still

with us. And we must meet these problems head on.

Yesterday, a story appeared in the New York Times announcing that the Secretary of the Treasury will send to the President this week a proposal to reduce or eliminate the silver content in dimes, quarters, and half dollars.

There must be immediate action on such a proposal. We cannot continue to double our production of coins next year as we have done this year, doubling the annual consumption of the dwindling supply of silver used in minting these coins.

We cannot continue to feed the parasites who are drawing off the lifeblood of our coinage system. These hoarders and speculators are just lying in wait for the day that our need of silver for coins will send the market price of that metal up and they can step in for a "quick kill."

We cannot yield to the pressures of special interest groups who call for no change in the silver content of our coins.

And, we cannot merely procrastinate, trying to prolong the life of our present silver supply by making a minor reduction in the silver content of our coins.

Let no one impress upon you that a stopgap measure at this time will solve

these problems. We must make a complete change in the metal we use in our coinage system. Silver coinage is a luxury which this country can no longer afford and if we do not face that fact today, here and now, we may be without the means to do so 1 year, 3 years, or 5 years hence.

PROPOSED EXCISE TAX CUTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning an editorial appeared in the Washington Post raising doubts that the proposed excise tax cuts on new automobiles might not be passed along to purchasers after the initial 3-percent retroactive tax reduction is made, since the tax is levied on the manufacturer rather than on the individual taxpayer.

During the years that I have been working for the repeal of the tax, similar reservations have been expressed from time to time. In order that the intention of automobile manufacturers would be crystal clear, last year shortly before the excise tax hearings were held by our Ways and Means Committee I wrote to each of the major automobile manufacturers and made a specific inquiry regarding what their policy would be should the tax be repealed or reduced. The replies were unanimous in stating that any tax relief would be passed on immediately to dealers and, presumably, to purchasers. These answers were incorporated in my statement before the committee beginning on page 412, part 3, "Hearings on Federal Excise Tax Structure," July 21-August 3, 1964.

In order to dispel any doubts which may have been raised by the Washington Post editorial of May 25, with permission, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial and the assurances from American Motors Corp., Chrysler Corp., Ford Motor Co., and General Motors Corp., indicating their intended policy of passing benefits from the reduction or repeal of the automobile excise tax to automobile purchasers:

[From the Washington Post, May 25, 1965]

WHOSE AUTO-TAX CUTS?

Who will benefit from the forthcoming reductions in the 10-percent excise tax that is levied on new automobiles? When income taxes are cut, there is no doubt that the consumer benefits by a greater after-tax income and the economy is stimulated by a higher volume of personal expenditures. But where the tax is levied on the manufacturer, as it is on automobiles, the benefits need not be passed on to the consumers.

The automobile manufacturers have promised to refund the first installment of the tax cut—it amounts to 3 percentage points or an average of about \$68 per auto—to those who make purchases between May 15 and the time that the tax reduction is enacted into law. But once the law is enacted the automobile dealers are not obliged to pass the tax cuts on to their customers. By holding new car prices at the old levels, they can

simply increase profit margins; and profit margins can also be widened by offsetting price reductions on new autos with smaller trade-in allowances on old ones.

The auto dealers' pricing practices will ultimately be shaped by the strength of automobile demand, but they ought not wait upon the sluggish forces of the marketplace. They can gain good will, make an important contribution to price stability, and over the long run increase their profits by announcing now that they intend to pass the full tax cuts on to their customers.

AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, June 24, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: We at American Motors appreciate your efforts over many years to relieve automobile buyers from the burden of discriminatory excise taxes on new cars. The announced plan of the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider complete revisor of the excise tax structure perhaps offers the best hope we have ever had to obtain such relief. We, along with the other automobile manufacturers, are anxious to provide the committee with all pertinent information at our disposal that might aid it in achieving sound tax reforms. If called on, we shall be glad to testify at any hearings to be held.

In regard to your specific question on whether a tax "saving" would be passed along to the customer by American Motors, I can assure you that our position has not changed since you last inquired. For several years we have expressed a corporate philosophy we call "progress sharing." This, in summation, simply means sharing equitably the fruits of progress with our stockholders, employees, and customers. We believe strongly in this, and certainly would put excise tax relief in the same category with "progress."

When your letter arrived, a committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association was in the process of preparing a letter to the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, covering the whole subject of automotive excise taxes. This letter, mailed May 27, contained the following paragraph, which reflects the attitude of the industry as a whole: "Any excise tax imposed by the Federal Government on new cars is passed through to the car dealer by the manufacturer. This is a matter of long historical record. A review by some of our member companies of the various changes in excise tax rates on U.S. passenger cars which have taken place since 1926 shows that the changes in excise tax amounts were reflected both up and down in the billing prices to car dealers. There is no reason to expect any different treatment of tax changes in the future. Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the retail automobile markets today, and stimulated by a reduced suggested retail price, the reduction in the excise tax on new passenger cars should be reflected in lower prices to the new car buyer."

I hope this answers your question adequately. If we can provide additional information or be of further assistance in any way, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

ROY ABERNETHY,
President.

CHRYSLER CORP.,
June 18, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Thank you for your letter of May 22 expressing your views with respect to the Federal excise tax on new passenger automobiles.

I appreciate the concern which prompted your question as to the reduction of tax

being passed on to the consumer and Chrysler's attitude in that regard.

If the Congress reduces the Federal excise tax on new passenger automobiles, Chrysler Corp. would reduce its charge covering excise tax appropriately to the dealer. In addition, Chrysler Corp. would reflect the excise tax reduction in the manufacturers suggested retail price label which is affixed to each Chrysler Corp. car for the consumer's guidance, as required by the Monroney Act.

We urge that repeal or reduction of the excise tax be retroactive to the beginning of congressional hearings on this issue to avoid adverse effects upon the economy from tax-induced postponements of car purchases. A practical method of providing legislatively for retroactive refunds to the consumer has been developed by the Automobile Manufacturers Association and will be submitted in the association's statement at the full excise tax hearings later this year. I earnestly solicit your consideration of (and support for) this means of preventing severe sales declines in anticipation of reduced prices resulting from tax reduction.

Sincerely,

F. W. MISCH,
Vice President.

FORD MOTOR CO.,
June 9, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: Your letter of May 22 arrived while I was away from the office and I understand our Washington office indicated to you in my absence that this reply would be forthcoming soon.

We were pleased to learn from your letter that you will be continuing your efforts to reduce or repeal the discriminatory 10-percent excise tax on automobiles.

You asked in your letter if the present position of Ford Motor Co. continues to be the same as in the past on the subject of passing on any reduction in the excise tax to its dealers.

In response to similar inquiries in 1958, I stated that our company would immediately pass on to our dealers the full amount of any reduction in the excise tax. That is still our position. The suggested retail price shown on the price label would also be lowered by the amount that the excise is reduced. We have no doubt that competition for the consumer's dollar would insure that our dealers, in turn, would pass a reduction on to their customers. You realize, of course, that the company has no authority to commit what the dealers' decision on this matter would be, however.

Thank you for your efforts over the years in support of reduction or elimination of the passenger car excise tax.

Very sincerely,

HENRY FORD II,
Chairman.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, May 28, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 22 concerning my views on whether the removal or reduction of the present 10-percent excise tax on new automobiles would be passed along to the customer by the automobile companies.

As you know, our new passenger cars are sold by General Motors to franchised dealers who, in turn, sell to the customer. The price at which this final sale is made is one that is agreed to by the dealer and the customer. The manufacturer is not a party to this transaction and of course the dealer is free to sell at any price agreed to with the customer.

It is for this reason that I cannot speak for General Motors dealers. However, I think that there are good grounds for believing that the savings would be passed along to the customer. In this connection I would like to quote from a letter recently sent by the Automobile Manufacturers Association to Representative MILLS, expressing a view to which I fully subscribe:

"Any excise tax imposed by the Federal Government on new cars is passed through to the car dealer by the manufacturer. This is a matter of long historical record. A review by some of our member companies of the various changes in excise tax rates on U.S. passenger cars which have taken place since 1926 shows that the changes in excise tax amounts were reflected both up and down in the billing prices to car dealers. There is no reason to expect any different treatment of tax changes in the future. Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the retail automobile markets today, and stimulated by a reduced suggested retail price, the reduction in the excise tax on new passenger cars should be reflected in lower prices to the new car buyer."

I am enclosing a copy of the full AMA statement from which this quotation is taken. You will note that the association is proposing that Congress not extend the 3-percent increase in the excise tax authorized in connection with the Korean wartime emergency, and is further urging affirmative congressional action to reduce or eliminate the remaining 7 percent of this discriminatory excise tax. In order to minimize the disruption of the market during the period such a reduction is under review by the Congress, the association is suggesting that provision be made in current tax legislation for the retroactive application of the reduction to the date hearings begin on specific legislation.

I very much appreciate your continued active interest in removing this discriminatory excise tax. I hope you will feel free to call on me at any time that I may be of assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. GORDON,
President.

VIETNAM

Mr. MICHEL. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I received a letter from the Reverend Patrick Morison, pastor of the Hanna City and Limestone Presbyterian Churches, together with a copy of a letter he had addressed to the President. I asked the reverend if I might use that letter and read it into the RECORD and I have his approval to do so.

His letter addressed to the President reads as follows:

HANNA CITY AND LIMESTONE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES,
Hanna City, Ill., April 19, 1965.

President L. B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have received or will soon receive a letter from the Clergyman's Emergency Committee for Vietnam of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. This letter has been circulated among American clergymen to gain their signatures of support. The letter will petition you to seek a peaceful solution to the Vietnam crisis at all costs.

As a Christian clergyman and citizen I oppose this letter for three reasons. First, it vastly oversimplifies a complex cultural, political, and military problem. Second, it assumes that peace is possible if only the United States would pull out of Vietnam and sit down to confer on Communist terms in good faith. This letter contains one of the most arrogant and clerically irresponsible judgments I have ever read: "The United States is actively responsible for the rain of fiery death poured out on a helpless peasantry." Such a perversion of the facts could have been written in Moscow, Peiping, or Hanoi.

Third, the writers of this epistle fail to count communism as an implacable, vicious, cunning, satanic enemy of freedom, democracy, and above all, Christianity. The cruelty, treachery, and conscienceless aggression of communism ought to be obvious to all but the wilfully blind or stupid.

God may indeed use communism to bring judgment upon the West (even our United States), but we cannot make such judgment for Him, and clergymen have no right to "play prophet," speaking authoritatively on that about which they know little and have no revelation. Furthermore, to pervert the picture for purposes of propaganda is dishonest. I am sure our Nation is far from perfect and not always most just, but this does not obligate us to surrender to communism nor to trust it.

Yes, I am dismayed by the war in Vietnam (and in Congo and elsewhere) and I long for peace, but to betray ourselves or allies into Communist tyranny and designs will bring neither peace, nor freedom, nor honor, nor godliness. Only Jesus Christ can bring lasting personal, social, or world peace, He "Who is coming in power and great glory."

Yours truly,

PATRICK MORISON.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE CHARTER OF AFRICAN UNITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, here is the text of the message from the Government of the United States delivered today by Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams to the African nations on the second anniversary of the signing of the Charter of African Unity:

On behalf of the Government of the United States, I extend to the Organization of African Unity warmest congratulations on the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of its Charter. Americans have watched with deep interest and sympathy the steady progress of the OAU in its important tasks of promoting the unity and solidarity of African nations and coordinating their efforts toward achieving a better life for the peoples of Africa. We have every confidence that in the future, as in the initial years, the OAU will continue to play a most useful and constructive role in the affairs of the continent of Africa.

THE PEGASUS B

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report another major success on the part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the exploration and conquest of space. At 3:35 this morning the Saturn booster placed into orbit the Pegasus B meteoroid technology satellite. This is the ninth straight success of the most powerful operational launch vehicle in the world, a remarkable achievement that bodes well for the future of our entire space program.

The Pegasus satellite exposes more than 2,000 square feet of instrumented panels to register meteoroid impacts in the region near the earth. The 3,200-pound spacecraft, attached to the last stage of the Saturn, is in an orbit with a predicted lifetime of over 3 years—the instruments are designed to operate for about 1 year. The achieved orbit with an apogee of 740 kilometers and perigee of 513 kilometers, is within 1 percent of the planned values—an example of the Nation's increasing capability for high-precision space operations. The total weight in orbit is over 23,000 pounds, making it one of our heaviest successful payloads.

The information we will receive from this mission will be important to our total capability for operations in space, both manned and unmanned.

The actual deployment in space of 100-foot panels was televised by a camera mounted on the booster; I am sure many of you will see it before long on your own TV sets.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the industrial and scientific team responsible for this mission for another step forward in the power and prestige of the United States.

Since preparing these remarks, I have been informed that throughout the day the three television networks will show pictures of the Pegasus B.

PECULIAR TREND OF TEXTILE MILL MARGINS

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I today asked the Federal Trade Commission to determine whether the prices of cotton textiles are being fixed in restraint of trade.

The trend of cloth prices and textile mill margins has been so peculiar since the enactment of last year's cotton legislation that a thorough inquiry is in the public interest.

Text of my letter to the Commission:

The trend of cloth prices and cotton mill margins since the enactment of the one-price cotton legislation of last year is so peculiar that I strongly urge that you make an investigation to determine whether the prices of cotton textiles are being fixed in restraint of trade.

The statistics enclosed herewith, provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, show a steady upward trend in cloth prices despite the drop in cost of raw cotton made possible

by last year's legislation. You will note that mill margins jumped sharply when the lower cost cotton became available. There is no indication that consumers have benefited from this legislation, despite official assurances Congress received last year that it would save them more than \$700 million.

Clearly, cloth prices have not responded to substantially lower raw material costs. This of course does not necessarily mean that a conspiracy to fix prices exists, but it is highly unusual in a supposedly competitive industry. Consequently, it seems to me that a thorough inquiry would be in the public interest.

I enclose herewith:

1. A table showing cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962, together with a chart reflecting these same statistics.

2. A copy of a letter dated January 31, 1964, from the Secretary of Commerce to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry giving assurances to the Congress that the proposed cotton legislation would save consumers more than \$700 million.

This has special interest for me because I am a member of the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. We will soon be considering a revision of the present legislation.

Below are copies of two of the documents I enclosed:

Cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962

[Cents per pound]

	Average for 20 constructions		
	Unfinished cloth prices	Raw cotton prices	Mill margins
1962			
January.....	60.63	35.78	24.85
February.....	60.76	35.82	24.94
March.....	61.07	35.98	25.09
April.....	61.23	35.85	25.38
May.....	61.19	36.13	25.06
June.....	61.24	36.34	24.90
July.....	61.29	36.19	25.10
August.....	61.12	35.89	25.23
September.....	60.93	35.23	25.70
October.....	60.71	35.08	25.63
November.....	60.68	35.10	25.58
December.....	60.67	35.30	25.37
1963			
January.....	60.55	35.45	25.10
February.....	60.47	35.66	24.81
March.....	60.49	35.95	24.54
April.....	60.26	36.08	24.18
May.....	60.00	36.16	23.84
June.....	60.11	35.86	24.25
July.....	60.28	35.57	24.71
August.....	60.60	35.33	25.27
September.....	60.99	35.19	25.80
October.....	61.34	35.11	26.23
November.....	62.00	35.27	26.73
December.....	62.29	35.37	26.92
1964			
January.....	62.32	35.47	26.85
February.....	62.37	35.55	26.82
March.....	62.37	35.58	26.79
April.....	62.00	35.63	26.37
May.....	61.62	35.67	25.95
June.....	60.87	35.76	25.11
July.....	60.95	35.60	25.35
August.....	61.00	27.64	33.36
September.....	61.02	26.82	34.20
October.....	61.25	26.80	34.45
November.....	61.48	26.98	34.50
December.....	62.58	27.30	35.28
1965			
January.....	63.24	27.30	35.94
February.....	63.28	27.26	36.02
March.....	63.42	27.26	36.16

¹ Does not include the 6.5 cents per pound cotton equalization payment made to domestic cotton users on all bales opened beginning 12:01 a.m. April 11, 1964. USDA made no adjustment for these payments prior to August 1964.

Source: "Cotton Price Statistics," Cotton Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(Extract from hearings on cotton program before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., pt. II, p. 510, Jan. 28, 29, 30, 31, and Feb. 11, 1964)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1964.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that during the course of your current hearings on the need for emergency cotton legislation, the question continues to arise as to whether or not a reduction of 8½ cents per pound in the cost of cotton to domestic mills would be reflected in savings to American consumers of cotton textile products. When similar legislation was being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, Hickman Price, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, testified in behalf of this Department that savings to consumers would amount to about \$90 million for each cent of reduction. A reduction of 8½ cents per pound would thus result in a saving to consumers of more than \$700 million.

This saving, Mr. Price said, would come with a lag of from 3 to 8 months, the time from first consumption at the mill to ultimate consumer, and would be reflected in either lower prices or higher quality of the merchandise.

Speaking with personal knowledge from many years in the manufacturing and marketing of cotton textiles, I agree that such a raw material cost reduction in the highly competitive textile and apparel manufacturing industries would generate a chain reaction of savings to consumers. It is the best estimate of our Department that these savings would be of the general order of magnitude indicated by Mr. Price.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

REPORT ON LATIN AMERICA

MR. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

MR. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the fact that State Department reports on both the policy and details of the situation in the Dominican Republic might lack complete factualness.

Therefore, I insert into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the Sunday, May 23, Chicago Tribune by Columnist Jules Dubois and a report in yesterday's Washington Daily News by Reporter Hal Hendrix, both of which are on-the-spot reports from professional, competent, and respected journalists:

REPORT FROM LATIN AMERICA: U.S. MEDDLING IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SEEN AS AID TO REDS

(By Jules Dubois)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, May 22.—Exposure to the political meddling by the White House and the State Department in the Dominican civil war has made it easier for this reporter to understand the instability that has afflicted governments in Saigon for so long.

American diplomacy here has created more and more resentment and made enemies of sincere friends of the United States as Wash-

ington contributed to the political turbulence and instability in the midst of what was to have been a final and decisive offensive against the Communists.

Every time the anti-Communist, pro-American forces have had the Reds on the ropes, the United States, wittingly or unwittingly, salvaged the Communists.

The fiction that the overwhelming majority of the people want the 1963 constitution restored is belied by the fact that the rest of the country, where more than 2,500,000 citizens reside, has produced no uprisings in favor of the revolution.

Because former President Juan Bosch and his Communist allies effectively smeared Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin Y Wessin, the United States tried to dump the military man who has been, and who is, the symbol of anti-Communist resistance.

MOVE LAUNCHED TO DUMP HIM

Because Bosch and his Communist allies began to smear Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert-Barrera, president of the government of national reconstruction—whose formation we encouraged—the United States launched moves to dump him.

The United States tried to replace Imbert with an all-civilian junta handpicked by Bosch. As Wessin said the previous week, the United States was about to hand victory here and throughout Latin America to the Communists on a golden platter.

As one bewildered Latin American Ambassador (whose country has been on our side) said to me: "I cannot understand the thinking of the policymakers in the State Department and much less in the White House, which has been most active in this latest maneuver, in trying to dump Imbert. What does the United States expect to gain from that?"

The Ambassador, who said he has been reporting since 1962 to his government about Bosch's anti-Americanism and his alliance with the Communists, issued a warning. He said that if the White House and the State Department fail to untie the hands of the Imbert Government, American troops will have to finish the fight against the Communists.

Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., commander of American land forces here, said earlier that part of his mission was to prevent a Communist takeover and establishment of a government inimical to the interests of the United States.

COULD NOT HAVE DONE MORE TO RILE REGIME

The team sent here by the White House by President Johnson could not have done more to antagonize the pro-American, anti-Communist Imbert regime.

The loyal Dominican navy and air force, whose support was needed by the anti-Communist infantry, were prevented by the United States from taking action because of a cease fire that had long ago become a ceaseless fire.

Because one pilot may have goofed and his machinegun shell fall onto U.S. positions from which 5,000 troops fired back at him and shot him down, an entire air force was penalized by the U.S. Government. The Imbert Government was deprived of two-thirds of its firepower by order of the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 25, 1965]

UNITED STATES FLOUNDERS INTO STRANGE

KETTLE OF FISH

(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, May 25.—Washington's mishandling of the Dominican fiasco seems likely to go down in history as second only to the floundering which permitted Cuba to fall under Communist control.

While the Johnson administration is sending high-powered talent here, it appears to

be moving toward only a temporary solution, at best.

The administration also seems to have discarded most of its collection of civilian and military intelligence data to satisfy politicians at home.

In attempting to pressure a political solution to the month-old conflict the validity of Washington's original assessment of the situation has become much obscured.

More than 21,000 marines and paratroopers were landed here. Their mission, as announced by President Johnson, was to protect American lives and property, and prevent the Dominican Republic from being taken over by the Communists.

That mission has not changed.

But diplomats and politicians now contend that the rebel movement they earlier said was dominated by Communist and other leftist extremists is not controlled by these elements.

On the scene, it has become obvious the switch in the Washington line was made to justify negotiations with questionable personalities within the rebel movement and others close to it.

CORNERED

With combat between rebel forces and troops loyal to the U.S.-created junta now blocked by existence of the American-controlled corridor, the rebel faction is cornered in a small downtown area.

Reports that the rebels enjoy widespread popular support throughout the island simply are not true.

The United States is obviously catering now to the rebel leaders who boasted about distributing weapons to thousands of civilians, including known Communists, pro-Castroites and ordinary hoodlums, at the outbreak of the rebellion.

This "arms for the people" action has resulted in the deaths of hundreds of Dominicans and the wounding of thousands of others. It has also led to the killing of 19 U.S. servicemen and the wounding of 115 more by gunfire from within the rebel zone.

These "constitutionalists" have been charged with more than 1,000 cease-fire violations—provocative shootings into the American-occupied area.

Official sources say Washington has intelligence reports detailing the extent of Communist and Castroite penetration of the rebel movement.

McGeorge Bundy, President Johnson's top troubleshooter here now, says he does not believe Communists now dominate the movement, headed by Col. Francisco Caamano Deno.

IN BACKGROUND

In fact, Dominican Communists are content to remain in the background at the moment. Well-known Dominican Reds and militant members of the pro-Castro June 14 movement avoid rebel press conferences and generally stay out of sight of newsmen.

But the June 14 movement has infiltrated deeply into the rebel group and its parent Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD). It is in full operation inside the rebel zone, with a new headquarters. It was outlawed before the rebellion began.

As a supporter of Colonel Caamano's "constitutionalist" government, the June 14 movement said in the May 15 issue of its newspaper that "the only path to consolidate a democratic solution is to spread the armed struggle through the country."

The newspaper, parroting the movement's alliance with Castro's Cuba, said the "Dominican imperialists and reactionaries only have the support of the Yankee invaders."

The rebels and their allies have made it known they would welcome a settlement under which Antonio Guzman, Minister of Agriculture under the Juan Bosch government, would become president of a coalition proposed by the United States last week.

Senor Bosch is reported to have suggested Senor Guzman in meetings with U.S. officials in San Juan.

A big question among traditionally anti-Communist and pro-American Dominicans now is why the United States attempts to ram Senor Guzman into the provisional Presidency when it was obvious in advance he would be unacceptable to the anti-Bosch and anti-Communist elements, but pleasing to the rebels.

American manipulators argue that Senor Bosch won the Presidency with about 60 percent of the vote in 1962. But they don't discuss how much of this vote was actually against his opponents. At least 40 percent of the voters still are strongly anti-Bosch.

There is doubt here that Mr. Bundy and others involved in settlement negotiations are fully aware of the backgrounds of some of the constitutionalists and PRD figures they are dealing with.

Washington officials, including Mr. Bundy, contend they are distressed by the lack of capable politicians on the Dominican scene.

There are such capable Dominicans as Dr. Eduardo Read Barreras, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and now Ambassador to Rome, and former President Emilio de Los Santos. Both have unsullied reputations and are not vulnerable to attack from either side.

It is also puzzling to many observers why the United States is using such emissaries as Dr. Jaime Benitez, chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico, who is well known in this area for his anti-Americanism. He is here now at Mr. Bundy's request.

Disturbing too is the manner in which U.S. diplomats persuaded Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera and his four associates in the junta to accept the temporary government role, and then attempted to dump them—in an apparent concession to the rebels and the PRD leaders in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, the above reports on the Dominican situation will, I am for sure, arouse the interest of at least a few Members.

MIZE QUESTIONS BILL "RIDERS"

Mr. QUILLEN. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to appear before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to express my concern about the use of omnibus bills. Often these bills combine new concepts with established programs and thus bring into being a new area of Government spending which probably would not be authorized if the new concept was presented as an individual bill.

I have had a bill drafted which I plan to introduce to ban bills and amendments dealing with more than one substantive matter. I realize that this is a far-reaching reform, but the reception I had before the joint committee indicates to me that many other Members share my same concerns about the abuses in omnibus bills.

During the time that this proposal was in the talking stage as far as my office is concerned, the Topeka (Kans.) State

Journal editorialized in favor of this approach.

I appreciate this support by one of the leading and influential dailies in Kansas, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, "MIZE Questions Bill Riders," in the RECORD:

MIZE QUESTIONS BILL RIDERS

Representative CHESTER MIZE, Republican, of Kansas, is on the right track in questioning the fairness and feasibility of omnibus bills and in starting a movement to limit each bill considered in Congress to one substantive matter.

MIZE said this week he has asked that a resolution to that effect be drafted while he conducts research to see if such an approach to legislation would be feasible. If it is, he said, he hopes someone in the Senate will join him in introducing the measure.

In question are two types of bills—omnibus bills and bills onto which riders are attached.

An omnibus bill is one which makes a number of miscellaneous provisions or appropriations. The other type usually contains fewer provisions but can be even more deceptive than the omnibus bill.

Granted, these types of bills have at times served worthwhile purposes by making it possible to enact necessary legislation when it was too late, or for some other reason it was impossible, to do it any other way. But often, MIZE believes, they have served as expedients to slip through measures which likely would have been killed if they had received the undivided, unclouded attention of Congress.

An example of what he is talking about, MIZE said, was the recent education bill, "where the new expanded idea of Federal assistance to public school students and indirect aid to nonpublic schools was tied to the existing programs of aid to impacted areas.

"We saw it in medicare, where compulsory hospital and medical care for the aged was tied to the improvements in the social security system. The same carrot and stick approach will be used in the housing bill, where the accepted programs of FHA financing, college housing and urban renewal comprise the vehicle for a new concept of rent supplements, direct grants for private home rehabilitation and the new cities concept."

The established programs to which new concepts are tied are what MIZE calls sweeteners, to make the new concepts seem more acceptable.

Representatives, of course, are concerned primarily with the House. The Senate, however, has a greater problem, MIZE said.

"An amendment in the Senate does not have to be germane to the issue as it does in the House," he said. One example was last year when a reapportionment amendment was attached to the foreign aid bill. Recently, a proposal to permit delay of 1964 income tax payments was attached as a rider to the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Many measures so camouflaged, especially some of the new welfare concepts which are being added to our system with sometimes alarming regularity, probably could not stand on their own feet if they were held up in the light of Congress as separate and distinct bills. It stands to reason that there would be more reluctance to launch new programs when their merits are questionable. But when these issues are tied to programs already on the books, they can often slide through.

MIZE points out that the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization will begin public hearings next month on ideas to improve the operation of Congress. The committee would do well to study MIZE's ideas on omnibus bills.

GUN LAWS—SOUND APPROACH BACKED BY NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Rifle Association has been wrongfully attacked in some quarters as opposed to all legislation to tighten Federal firearms laws. This is not true. On the contrary, the National Rifle Association is deeply concerned by all questions involving firearms. That is, after all, its reason for existing. The National Rifle Association does recognize the problem and does support sound legislation to restrict the availability of weapons to juveniles and criminals and other irresponsible persons. The Association and millions of other Americans who do not belong to the National Rifle Association do ask, however, that this issue be considered with reason and logic and free of the emotionalism that surrounds a good deal of the debate.

In an editorial published in the May issue of the American Rifleman, the National Rifle Association states its position with forthright clarity. I offer it at this point in the RECORD as a contribution to the discussion on gun legislation. My own position in favor of sound gun legislation but in opposition to the stringent terms of the administration's bill (S. 1592), was set forth in the RECORD of May 4, pages 9424 to 9425.

The editorial follows:

THIS IS OUR STAND

The primary purposes of the National Rifle Association of America, as stated in its constitution and bylaws, are:

"To promote public safety, law and order, and the national defense; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of small arms, and in the technique of design, production and group instruction; to increase the knowledge of small arms on the part of members of law enforcement agencies, of the Armed Forces, and of citizens who would be subject to service in the event of war; and generally to encourage the lawful ownership and use of small arms by citizens of good repute."

In support of these objectives, the National Rifle Association stands squarely on the premise that the ownership of firearms must not be denied American citizens of good repute so long as they use them for lawful purposes.

No other organization does so much to educate our people in safety with firearms, in the home and on the shooting range and in the hunting field. No other organization is so vitally concerned with the training of citizens in the use of the basic weapons of national defense, the individual's personal arm. No other organization so strongly encourages shooting for recreation, in every field and with every type of sporting gun. No other organization does more to promote the rights and responsibilities of reputable citizens who own and use firearms.

For these reasons, the National Rifle Association is vitally concerned with efforts in Congress to amend the Federal Firearms Act to provide Federal control of mail-order

guns. Since 1959, investigations and hearings have been conducted by the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate. In its interim report, ordered to be printed on August 7, 1964, will be found the following statements:

"As our investigation progressed, it became apparent that a major source of firearms to juveniles and young adults was the mail-order common carrier route. This process involves the ordering of the firearm by common carrier. Present Federal law prohibits the delivery of a handgun by mail except to firearms dealers.

"An overwhelming majority of the 69 respondents to the questionnaire (law enforcement authorities throughout the United States) indicated support of Federal legislation to place enforceable controls over the interstate transportation of concealable firearms, which enter their jurisdictions for delivery to prospective purchasers.

"The need for Federal remedial legislation is apparent. As a general statement, it can be said that all of the witnesses who testified recommended Federal legislation to prevent the shipment and delivery in interstate commerce of mail-order firearms to juveniles under the age of 18 years; that proper safeguards be written into the Federal Firearms Act to preclude shipment of these firearms to convicted felons, narcotic addicts, and chronic lawbreakers; and an increase in the Federal Firearms Act dealers' license fee."

Contrary to claims by the antigun forces, members of the National Rifle Association of America and millions of other law-abiding citizens do not oppose all proposed firearms legislation. They have recognized the problems of some local communities created by the availability of handguns to juveniles, criminals, and irresponsible persons through mail-order purchases. They have supported legislation prepared and proposed by the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency (S. 1975, introduced on Aug. 2, 1963), to establish Federal controls over the transportation of concealable firearms in interstate commerce. They do support properly drawn legislation to outlaw dangerous devices such as bazookas, bombs, and antitank guns. They do support properly drawn legislation to curb the flood of cheap foreign firearms that are being dumped in America. They do support properly drawn legislation to impose heavy penalties for crimes involving the misuse of firearms. They do support the strict enforcement of existing laws at all levels of government.

The National Rifle Association of America supports properly drawn legislation that is proposed to accomplish these purposes, and this is our stand.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOSEPH MARTIN

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last night in Newton, Mass., I was privileged to attend the seventh annual achievement meeting of the Newton Chamber of Commerce. This meeting was more than another meeting of a local chamber of commerce to honor a local dignitary. It was a testimonial to a man we all know and respect. It was a meeting that tried to express in some way the almost boundless admiration that Massachusetts and the Republican Party has for this man.

I am speaking, of course, of Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the former Speaker of this House.

I can only speak for myself and express my deep feeling of respect, admiration—yes, even of love—for this outstanding American who for so long has given of himself to this House and to this Nation. Ever since I came to Congress some 7 years ago, and even before, his guidance and counsel has been invaluable—and unrepayable. His example as a Republican and as a Member of Congress has continually guided my actions and my contacts with my colleagues. A few weeks ago in Westfield, Mass., I addressed a group of young students who were participating in a youth conference. The topic of my remarks was "The Public Servant." I do not believe that there can be a better example of a man in the public service than our colleague, Congressman MARTIN.

At this meeting at which Congressman MARTIN received the 1965 Achievement Award, the major address was given by my friend and leader of the Republican Party in Congress, Congressman GERALD FORD. I can only say that I wholly concur in the remarks that Congressman FORD delivered last night. I would like to share them with you and the Members of this House who were not fortunate enough to be able to attend this ceremony in honor of former Speaker JOE MARTIN: REMARKS BY HON. GERALD R. FORD, AT THE TESTIMONIAL FOR JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., NEWTON, MASS., MAY 24, 1965

Although this is a nonpartisan dinner, I would like to say that I'm particularly pleased to be here because I understand that the city of Newton casts the largest number of Republican votes of any community in Massachusetts. As the leader of the oppressed minority in the House, it's a pleasure to be in such a friendly environment.

While everyone knows that it was Nathan Hale who said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," tonight I would like to add a modern corollary to that famous statement. It is this: "The Republican Party regrets that it has but one JOE MARTIN to give to our country." All would agree that more Joe Martins would make America even greater.

I feel a special kinship for our guest of honor. JOE MARTIN once said, "the position of minority leader of the House of Representatives is the most thankless job in Washington. I would not take 10 times \$10,000 to return to it." And now I'm the fellow who's trying to fill the giant shoes that Joe wore for so long, with such distinction, dedication, and ability.

But JOE MARTIN and I have something else in common. We have both been avid amateur athletes. I was once a fair football player at the University of Michigan, and he was once a very good semipro baseball player.

Many of you may not know that JOE has maintained his contacts with baseball through the years. When the great Washington Senators' pitcher, Walter Johnson, ran for Congress, his friend JOE MARTIN wrote two campaign speeches for him—one to give before labor groups, and the other to give before farmers. Unfortunately Johnson was a better pitcher than politician. He got the two speeches mixed up, delivered the labor speech to farmers and vice versa. Needless to say, he lost the election, which perhaps proves what JOE MARTIN learned a long time ago: It's easier to be a great Washington Senator than a Member of the House of Representatives.

The man we honor tonight has had the most remarkable record of public service of any person currently active on the political scene. So, if he will forgive me, I would like to turn these remarks into my version of "This Is Your Life."

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was born on November 3, 1884, the day before Grover Cleveland was elected President for the first time. His father wanted to name him Grover Cleveland Martin. But his mother, a staunch Republican, said, "Grover's a dog's name."

His father was a hard-working North Attleboro blacksmith whose earnings were never more than \$18 a week.

Since the family was poor, young Joe started to work outside of school hours at the age of 6. One of his jobs was to brush the flies off the horses while his father shod them. Another job was as a delivery boy for the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. (Now probably every newsboy dreams of one day becoming the owner of the paper. But JOE MARTIN was one young man who was to make this dream come true.)

He got his political start by marching in a torchlight parade for William McKinley in 1896. At the time, a family friend told his father, "Don't let that boy go into politics—he's too good a boy."

Joe, who was otherwise a fellow of extremely good sense, did not listen to this sound advice. Traveling by horse and buggy, he campaigned for the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1911, and was elected—age 27.

In 1916 he began attending Republican presidential conventions. This would become a habit of more than 50 years' duration. And today he holds the record—unsurpassed in either party—of having been five times the permanent chairman of national conventions.

His gentle humor has broken many tense moments at conventions, as all of us recall who were at San Francisco in 1956 when a Nebraska delegate tried to nominate "Joe Smith" for Vice President.

But not all moments at national conventions are so supercharged. At his first convention, JOE woke up in the middle of the night to find that a poker game was in progress in his hotel room. And to his astonishment, he discovered that the dealer was none other than the legendary Diamond Jim Brady.

By 1924 JOE was running for Congress, and he's held that office as your Representative ever since.

Those were the days of great orators in the House of Representatives. However, not all Congressmen could keep from wallowing in clichés. JOE remembers that one of the first great speeches he heard began: "I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that politics makes strange bedfellows. Especially since women got into 'em."

JOE was put on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course, he really wanted to be on the Post Office Committee. (But not all freshmen legislators could be that lucky.) Interestingly, at that time the Foreign Affairs Committee spent a full week debating such earth-shaking questions as to whether or not to authorize \$20,000 for an international poultry show in Tulsa.

The new Congressman began to establish his lifetime reputation as a fighter for New England. But he also learned the pitfalls of his office. After getting a new post office for Fall River, it turned out that the building contract went to a firm in St. Louis. The building was constructed not with Fall River granite, but with Indiana limestone. And to top it all off, the job of night watchman was given to the father of Joe's Democratic opponent.

Yet, despite such temporary setbacks, he kept getting reelected to Congress. A dairyman from Taunton once said, "I vote the

straight Democratic ticket, except for Congressman MARTIN. I always vote for him because my father told me to, 15 years ago." Indeed, JOE MARTIN had become a vital institution in his district.

Much deserved recognition came often to JOE MARTIN. In 1936 he was chosen Republican national committeeman from Massachusetts. In 1938 he was elected chairman of the national Republican congressional committee. In 1939 he became the Republican leader of the House. In 1940 he was considered a dark horse candidate for the Presidency, and received 44 votes at the convention. Although he never sought the office, this is what the great Kansas editor, William Allen White, said of him: "He will make * * * if the dice roll right, a liberty-loving President."

When Wendell Willkie was made the 1940 nominee, he begged JOE to become chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Putting devotion to party above personal wishes, as usual, JOE accepted the post. As chairman he had the rare distinction of seeing the committee evicted from its building when it was purchased by an organization that hasn't been too friendly to most Republicans. However, although he was far from a wealthy man, JOE took over another building and obligated himself as a personal liability for the \$33,000 lease. (Is there any wonder why Republicans love JOE MARTIN?)

The greatest tribute came to JOE MARTIN in 1947 when he was first elected Speaker of the House. Next to the President, as most students of government know, the Speaker is the most powerful elective official in the United States.

But what most people don't know is that besides presiding over the House, the Speaker has a great many other duties, such as supervising a Capitol bank with assets of \$4 million. The Speaker also has responsibility for four barbershops and a beauty parlor. But JOE, as a confirmed bachelor, told a colleague, "I think I'll let you run the beauty parlor. You are more experienced with the women than I am."

This question of experience with the opposite sex was to change rapidly. For under the new law of presidential succession, Speaker MARTIN was first in line if anything happened to President Truman. (There was no Vice President when Truman succeeded F.D.R., you will recall.) Of course, the possibility of a bachelor President was a great temptation to the single ladies of this country. JOE MARTIN was deluged with offers of marriage. (One proposal that particularly amused him came from a woman spiritualist in Clarksburg, W. Va., who wrote that the deceased Wendell Willkie had told her to marry JOE.)

There are a great many reasons for JOE MARTIN's success. But I would like to mention just two of them.

The first is his adherence to the old New England principle of thrift. Once JOE MARTIN invited a President of the United States to his office for lunch. He called a caterer for some box lunches and was told that they would cost \$2 apiece. Well, this seemed a bit high to JOE, so he shopped around until he found a man who would provide a box lunch for \$1.19. I am sure that this makes JOE the only man in American history to entertain a President at such a bargain price. And, of course, JOE has always applied this same principle to the taxpayer's dollar.

Second, JOE MARTIN is a very likable person. Even those who are his political opponents have come to have a special place in their hearts for him. For example, there is quite a collection of GOP elephants in JOE's office, and one of the most handsome was given to him by Harry Truman. The story behind this is that someone sent it to the White House, and President Truman told his secretary, "Take this up to JOE MARTIN.

I don't want any damned dancing elephants around here."

JOE has served our Nation with great skill. He has been a major force in some of the most crucial decisions of our times. To cite just one instance: During World War II General Marshall came to him and asked for \$1.6 billion to manufacture an atomic bomb. JOE's job would be to try to get this money from Congress, largely on faith—for the greatest secrecy had to be maintained. Thus, to a large extent, JOE MARTIN was responsible for putting through a program that eventually shortened the war and saved millions of American lives.

But speaking to you, in a sense, as a representative of JOE MARTIN's party, I would also like to say a few words about "JOE MARTIN—Republican."

When he was first nominated for House leader in 1939, it was said of him: "We are doing more than electing a floor leader. We are choosing a symbol of the Republican Party."

And JOE MARTIN has been a magnificent symbol of integrity, dedication, honor, and patriotism.

Through the darkest days of Republican Party history, he has played one of the most significant roles in keeping the two-party system alive and functioning.

The dedication of JOE MARTIN's autobiography reads: "To the millions of Republicans—and to the many Democrats and independents as well—who fought with me through the years to maintain the two-party system of government in the United States."

This has been JOE MARTIN's greatest fight. And all Americans, regardless of party, are very much in his debt, and owe him a lasting vote of thanks.

From all of us, JOE MARTIN, thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

ILLINOIS 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to announce today the results of our 18th Congressional District poll. Of 90,000 questionnaires addressed to individuals, some 81,000 ultimately reached their destination. We have received an exceptional return to date of just a shade under 15,000 or 18 percent. Rather than simply taking a random sample of the returns and projecting the figures, we have gone the extra step of tabulating each and every questionnaire, so as to give a most accurate account of the returns.

As we debate the foreign aid bill today, I believe it appropriate to point out that in my congressional district the consensus is overwhelmingly in "favor of a sharp reduction in the foreign aid program." As a matter of fact, in answer to this question, 74.5 percent voted yes, 20 percent voted no, and 5.5 percent undecided. So far as "favoring continuing aid to Communist-leaning countries, such as Egypt, Algeria, and Indonesia," 86 percent say no, 9 percent say yes, and 5 percent undecided. Even on the issue of "giving away or selling for foreign currencies our agricultural surpluses to Communist countries," 72 percent of those returning questionnaires said no;

20 percent said yes and 8 percent were undecided.

On the burning issue of South Vietnam and what to do there, we had six questions and I would call your particular attention to those last six questions in this compilation.

The most lopsided reply came on the question of whether or not my constituents "favor insisting that all members of the U.N. pay their dues or lose their General Assembly vote." On this question 90 percent of my constituents said yes, 7 percent said no, and 3 percent were undecided.

And the question in which we find the least disparity is whether or not my constituents, "favor a further reduced annuity if Congress provided for a voluntary retirement at age 60 instead of 62." Here the results show 45 percent in favor, 45 percent opposed, and 10 percent undecided.

We are now in the process, Mr. Speaker, of further evaluating the returns of our questionnaire, so that on each question we will have a breakdown by occupation, and it may be at a future date we may want to publicize these findings if they are significant.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire tabulation, by number and percent, for each of the 31 questions asked, in the RECORD at this point:

ILLINOIS 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

MEDICAL CARE

1. Do you favor 60 days of hospital and nursing home care for those over age 65 financed by added social security taxes under a compulsory program?

	Percent
Yes (2,443)-----	17.0
No (11,162)-----	76.5
Undecided (967)-----	6.5

2. Do you favor medical, surgical, hospital, nursing home, and drug benefits for those over age 65 financed by a tax credit or from general revenues for private insurance under a voluntary program?

	Percent
Yes (9,616)-----	66
No (3,510)-----	24
Undecided (1,446)-----	10

SOCIAL SECURITY

3. Do you favor an increase of 5 percent in social security benefits paid for by an increase in social security taxes?

	Percent
Yes (5,176)-----	35.5
No (8,594)-----	59.0
Undecided (802)-----	5.5

4. Do you favor mandatory retirement at age 65 of all those under social security?

	Percent
Yes (4,383)-----	30
No (9,450)-----	65
Undecided (739)-----	5

5. Would you favor a further reduced annuity if Congress provided for voluntary retirement at age 60 instead of age 62?

	Percent
Yes (6,586)-----	45
No (6,601)-----	45
Undecided (1,385)-----	10

EDUCATION

6. Do you favor Federal aid to grade and high schools?

	Percent
Yes (4,309)-----	29.5
No (9,522)-----	65.5
Undecided (741)-----	5.0

7. Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?

	Percent
Yes (3,110)-----	21.5
No (10,734)-----	73.5
Undecided (728)-----	5.0

8. Do you favor Federal loans for college students?

	Percent
Yes (8,320)-----	57
No (5,574)-----	39
Undecided (678)-----	4

9. Do you favor income-tax credits for parents paying college tuitions?

	Percent
Yes (10,326)-----	71
No (3,626)-----	25
Undecided (620)-----	4

TAXES

10. Do you favor a repeal of the wartime imposed excise taxes on such items as cosmetics, luggage, handbags, jewelry, furs, automobiles, and telephones?

	Percent
Yes (9,668)-----	66.5
No (4,220)-----	29.0
Undecided (684)-----	4.5

11. Do you favor having a balanced budget before further cuts in taxes?

	Percent
Yes (11,401)-----	77.0
No (2,255)-----	15.5
Undecided (916)-----	7.5

AGRICULTURE

12. Do you favor a continuation of the present farm program with respect to price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas on a limited number of crops?

	Percent
Yes (3,147)-----	21.5
No (9,593)-----	66.0
Undecided (1,832)-----	12.5

13. Do you favor a gradual withdrawal by the Government from acreage restrictions for farmers?

	Percent
Yes (10,787)-----	74
No (2,313)-----	16
Undecided (1,472)-----	10

14. Do you favor more Government spending programs to keep so-called marginal farmers in business?

	Percent
Yes (2,031)-----	14
No (11,045)-----	76
Undecided (1,496)-----	10

15. Do you favor giving away or selling for foreign currencies our agricultural surpluses to Communist countries?

	Percent
Yes (2,869)-----	20
No (10,510)-----	72
Undecided (1,193)-----	8

LABOR

16. Do you favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact right-to-work laws?

	Percent
Yes (4,046)-----	28.0
No (8,670)-----	59.5
Undecided (1,856)-----	13.5

17. Do you favor an increase in the minimum-wage law to \$2.00 an hour?

	Percent
Yes (4,471)-----	31
No (9,298)-----	64
Undecided (803)-----	5

18. Do you favor extension of the minimum-wage law to workers not now covered?

	Percent
Yes (8,352)-----	57.5
No (5,059)-----	35.0
Undecided (1,161)-----	7.5

IMMIGRATION

19. Do you favor continuation of our present immigration quota system, based on national origin?

	Percent
Yes (9,025)-----	62
No (3,917)-----	27
Undecided (1,630)-----	11

20. Do you favor changing the present law to permit entry of additional thousands of persons regardless of their individual merit or their national origin?

	Percent
Yes (1,285)-----	9.0
No (12,344)-----	84.5
Undecided (943)-----	6.5

FOREIGN AID

21. Do you favor a sharp reduction in the foreign aid program?

	Percent
Yes (10,898)-----	74.5
No (2,888)-----	20.0
Undecided (786)-----	5.5

22. Do you favor continuing aid to Communist leaning countries such as Egypt, Algeria, and Indonesia?

	Percent
Yes (1,264)-----	9
No (12,550)-----	86
Undecided (758)-----	5

UNITED NATIONS

23. Do you favor seating Red China in the United Nations?

	Percent
Yes (2,424)-----	16.5
No (11,381)-----	78.0
Undecided (767)-----	5.5

24. Do you favor insisting that all members of the U.N. pay their dues or lose their General Assembly vote?

	Percent
Yes (13,157)-----	90
No (979)-----	7
Undecided (436)-----	3

25. Do you favor continuation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency?

	Percent
Yes (7,086)-----	48.5
No (4,261)-----	29.0
Undecided (3,225)-----	22.5

VIETNAM

26. Do you favor withdrawal of our forces in South Vietnam and take the consequences?

	Percent
Yes (1,999)-----	13.5
No (11,048)-----	76.0
Undecided (1,525)-----	10.5

27. Do you favor an outright commitment of our full air and sea power to quarantine South Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes (8,437)-----	58
No (3,641)-----	25
Undecided (2,494)-----	17

28. Do you favor retaliatory strikes into North Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes (10,217)-----	70.0
No (2,261)-----	15.5
Undecided (2,094)-----	14.5

29. Do you favor going one step further by way of strategic bombing of targets in North Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes (9,595)-----	66.0
No (2,546)-----	17.5
Undecided (2,431)-----	16.5

30. Do you favor support of a guerrilla force in North Vietnam made up exclusively of Asian volunteers?

	Percent
Yes (9,013)-----	62.0
No (2,966)-----	20.5
Undecided (2,593)-----	17.5

31. Do you believe it imperative that we guarantee the territorial integrity of South Vietnam in the name of freedom at any cost?

	Percent
Yes (8,171).....	56.0
No (3,839).....	26.5
Undecided (2,562).....	17.5

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR GRADUAL REDUCTION AND EVENTUAL ELIMINATION OF TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on telephone service.

The telephone excise tax is primarily a temporary wartime tax originally designed to raise funds and curtail use during a critical period. The tax served its purpose in that wartime period but the time has come to reduce and/or remove this tax. You might say that this tax also has a relationship to another war into which we are embarking—the war on poverty—and if repealed, this tax, which hits hardest at the low income groups, could provide additional purchasing power to these families. Figures show that 53 percent of the households with telephone service had incomes less than \$6,000 per year and that the food and apparel industries, providers of basic living necessities, are the biggest business excise taxpayers. I might also add that telephone service is the only household utility so taxed.

In Philadelphia, over \$11 million in telephone excise tax is paid annually and the people of my congressional district pay over \$3.5 million. The reduction and eventual elimination of this tax would provide a much needed and long overdue reduction in the cost of a vital household service for low income families.

Included herewith are a table and fact sheet on this subject:

District	Bell	Independent	Total
1.....	\$1,043,506		\$1,043,506
2.....	3,596,254		3,596,254
3.....	3,989,326		3,989,326
4.....	1,388,806		1,388,806
5.....	1,465,582		1,465,582
6.....	1,716,400	\$317,439	2,033,839
7.....	2,779,116		2,779,116
8.....	2,394,204	99,672	2,493,876
9.....	1,700,508	384,363	2,084,871
10.....	919,791	420,258	1,340,049
11.....	1,133,184	142,140	1,275,324
12.....	648,144	746,995	1,395,139
13.....	4,118,988	8,201	4,127,189
14.....	3,049,992		3,049,992
15.....	719,280	204,335	923,615
16.....	1,328,472	228,201	1,556,673
17.....	1,049,352	364,360	1,413,712
18.....	2,116,440	114,867	2,231,307
19.....	326,928	1,221,237	1,548,165
20.....	1,470,344		1,470,344
21.....	1,086,404	227,516	1,313,920
22.....	338,724	750,448	1,089,172
23.....	692,916	527,660	1,220,576
24.....	403,358	452,798	856,152
25.....	1,162,840	463,361	1,626,201
26.....	1,261,872	165,327	1,427,199
27.....	2,088,996		2,088,996
Total.....	43,986,727	6,839,178	50,825,905

COMMUNICATIONS EXCISE TAX FACT SHEET NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED

Of all U.S. households, 83.9 percent (or 47,246,000) have telephone service. There are 55 million residence and business telephone customers.

AMOUNTS PAID

In 1964 the amount paid in communications taxes was \$994,066,000. Of this the amount in general telephone service was \$582,355,000.

Long distance, telegraph, and miscellaneous service was \$411,711,000.

The average Federal excise tax paid in 1964 by communications customers was \$18.51.

Total taxes—Federal, States, et cetera—paid in 1964 by the telephone industry and customers (includes excise tax) was \$3,081,002,000, or an average per customer of \$70.78.

EFFECT ON LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Telephone excise tax hits hardest at lower income levels. Bureau of Census figures for 1960 show that of households with telephones (a) 20 percent (approximately 7,800,000) had incomes of less than \$3,000 per year; (b) 53 percent (approximately 21 million) had incomes of less than \$6,000 per year; (c) only 14 percent (approximately 5,500,000) had incomes of \$10,000 and more per year.

BENEFITS OF REPEAL

Removal of the tax means automatic reduction in cost which would—

Increase public purchasing power;
Enable many of the 12 million households without telephones to afford service; and
Stimulate demand for telephones resulting in increased construction and many new jobs.

BUSINESS USAGE

Business usage of telephones represents approximately 47 percent of excise tax total.

The biggest business excise taxpayers are the food and apparel industries—providers of basic living necessities.

STRONG HAND AT THE HELM

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Chamber and of its Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am privileged to spend many hours each day dealing with the intricate problems of America's relations with her neighbors all over the world. From this vantage point, I view both the comprehensive and the fractional pictures of our foreign affairs. In the course of it all, I am deeply impressed with the direction President Lyndon B. Johnson is giving our foreign policy in the cases of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

The U.S. Constitution provides that the President shall be the sole organ of the Nation in international affairs. This is as it should be. At the same time, the Congress of the United States has numerous responsibilities in this field which it has performed very well throughout the course of American history. The present time is no exception to this record of executive-legislative cooperation.

To its credit, the recent editorial commentary of the Philadelphia Evening

Bulletin, on May 3, 1965, is both timely and accurate. So that it receives the distribution and attention it so richly deserves, I include it within the scope of my remarks, as follows:

STRONG MAN AT THE HELM

In the Dominican crisis, as in Vietnam, President Johnson is demonstrating that this country has the means, as well as the will, to resist Communist subversion wherever our interests seem to be threatened, just as we found—in dark and dangerous days in Europe and the Middle East a decade and more ago—the ways to contain outright Communist aggression.

To be sure, there still is room for debate about the nature and extent of the national interest; but it is clear enough in the Caribbean, and in Vietnam it has at least been inescapable.

Thanks to the modernization and strengthening of our fleet and of our strategic army and marine forces, begun under President Eisenhower and pushed hard by President Kennedy, flexible, measured responses have been possible in the Cuban crisis, Vietnam, the Congo and, last week, in the Dominican Republic.

But the essential ingredient, the most important weapon in the arsenal of this unconventional warfare, is a President who is alert, wise, and courageous enough to take the difficult decisions—often with unprecedented but imperative swiftness—and be able, at the same time, to keep Congress, the country, and our allies largely with him. On all counts, Mr. Johnson has made high marks.

Last week's crisis showed how terribly difficult it can be. Suppose American lives had not been clearly in danger (in fact, they were), yet a Communist takeover still had seemed imminent. Not even the President may know how he would have met so awkward a situation. But in mincing no words about our larger concerns in his televised remarks, he has made it plain his hands will not be tied in a crisis by mere diplomatic niceties, or by the risk of giving Communist-led mobs new excuses for rock throwing. In short, we do not bear freedom's torch merely to warm our hands.

Congress is finding it difficult to sort out its proper role in the conduct of such operations. But Mr. Johnson seems acutely sensitive to its frustration and has had the wisdom to consult often and promptly without, at the same time, asking Congress to decide matters which are his responsibility.

Similarly, although some believe he might have gone sooner to the Organization of American States with the Dominican crisis, he may have recognized that tacit or partial assent was the most he could expect and that he had to commit the United States first, risking the inevitable protests of members too weak to offend Fidel Castro.

To the people, Mr. Johnson has conveyed an impression both of firmness and prudence. He speaks as one who expects understanding and support and by so speaking, commands it.

Missteps are a constant risk. But there is no safety in delay, compromise, or withdrawal. The challenge of Communist takeover incubates in evolving societies around the globe, nurtured ceaselessly by Moscow, Peking, or both. Our capacity to counter this threat to ourselves and to peoples emerging from colonialism or native dictatorships is a considerable one; with impressive skill, energy, and insight, without recklessness or bravado, a strong President is putting it to use.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXVI

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second article in a series on drug addiction in the "New York City in Crisis" series and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 2, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: HEROIN TRADE, GLOBAL VEINS

(NOTE.—The greatest city in the world is also the gathering place for the largest number of criminal addicts located anywhere in the Western World. Why do half the U.S. addicts live in New York? The answer is simple: because the "stuff" is here. In this, the second of a series of "New York City in Crisis" articles on New York narcotics problems, Paul Weissman traces the course of heroin from an opium bulb to an addict's arm—and after.)

(By Paul Weissman)

Raphael did not like being 15 years old. It was the year his father went back to Puerto Rico. His teachers didn't "like" him and his mother was never home. So one day he didn't say "no." He went to the men's toilet of Patrick Henry Junior High School during the lunch hour when he was supposed to be somewhere else and "popped" his first bag of heroin. It cost him \$5 and it made him sick.

Raphael is 22 now. He does not remember whether that first pop was because he was mad or because he felt sick or because he thought it would make him feel good. He is sure that he knew he wouldn't get hooked. And now he was shivering on the corner of 103d Street and First Avenue in Harlem in a pair of tight chino pants, a little Rex Harrison snap brim hat, and a new duffle coat. His eyes were bright and even though he was shivering, nothing bothered him at all.

"H," he said, "is my love, my baby, my sweet tool. I got a good bag of — this time, baby, I got the best, the most precious, the everything, the only thing. You think I could be anything without 'H'? I'd be a bum, baby."

In the palm of Raphael's brown hand was a strip of folded translucent paper no larger than two knuckles of an infant's pinky. The white powder inside contained three grains of heroin.

No one knows exactly how many tons of heroin Raphael and an uncounted number of other New York City addicts pump into their veins every year. Federal and municipal law enforcement authorities do know that the contraband heroin market has become one of the most lucrative illicit businesses in history.

The three grains of "everything" Raphael pumps into his left arm four, or five, or six times every day are the end product of a well-organized international drug network that provides enormous profits to every businessman, smuggler, wholesaler, and pusher who has found his way into the hierarchy. It is a well-financed cash business that functions with money that may come from any number of different sources.

It is a business that usually begins somewhere in Turkey where a farmer is waiting for the leaves to fall off a little, white, pagoda-shaped bulb that looks not unlike an exotic tulip. This farmer is licensed by the Government to grow just so many kilos (1 kilo equals 2.2 pounds) of opium. Opium is worth \$5 a kilo to a pharmaceutical firm that manufactures morphine for medical use. But because restrictions are lax, the farmer

secretly grows a second crop. It is worth \$500 a kilo in the black market.

When the leaves fall, the farmer will instruct a worker to delicately knife an incision in each flower and collect the latex-like substance that oozes out. He will have other workers boil it and set it in molds. Raw opium is shipped in reddish brown bricks and it travels in a hundred different ways. A year ago, Iranian police found a shipment of 20 kilos sewed inside the hump of a camel in a desert caravan. The shipment was confiscated, the smugglers executed on the spot.

Though a dozen Middle Eastern countries attempt to stop traffic—frequently with such summary tactics—they are largely unsuccessful. The main black market route is the frontier that separates Turkey from Syria. It is 830 kilometers long and opium can be transported not only by camel but in tractors, agricultural equipment, and private cars. Police estimate 4 to 5 tons were smuggled through the border last year.

The city of Aleppo in Syria is a principal storage center. From there, opium is smuggled to Beirut, capital of Lebanon, a free port with free trade in foreign currency and a legal system that conveniently conceals the identity of bank depositors. In Lebanon, raw opium is converted to morphine base. Because France once had influence in the Middle East, its businessmen have organized sailors, tourists, and ship's captains into purchasing and smuggling rings.

Police believe that most of the heroin that comes to the United States is shipped from Beirut to clandestine laboratories near Marseilles, where morphine base is converted to heroin. A kilo of heroin is worth about \$5,000 after processing in France.

It is sold for \$8,000 after processing in France to New York and the man who buys it knows he can resell a single kilo of heroin for \$16,000 to \$20,000 wrapped, untouched in its original package.

A HOPELESS TASK

This smuggling can take place so easily because of the huge traffic flow to New York. In 1964, 37,235 planes and 9,556 merchant vessels entered the port of New York from all over the world. The Federal Narcotics Bureau has fewer than 300 men to protect the city from contraband and admits that even with the entire Army, Navy, marines, and merchant marines at its disposal, all shipments of heroin coming to New York might not be stopped.

In order to buy heroin, a financier usually makes contact with the mafia in New York, which refers him to the proper source. But the deal must be made with cash at a meeting in Milan or Rome, Florence, or even Paris. When the deal is consummated, half the purchase price is paid in cash. A 200-kilo shipment requires an \$800,000 deposit. Then an additional \$800,000 is deposited in a secret, numbered Swiss bank account.

The enormous quantities of untraceable cash required in such transactions, police believe, can only be "black money" (unreported winnings) from Las Vegas gambling tables or other businesses, most of them illicit but some of them entirely aboveboard.

One of the difficulties police have arresting traffic in heroin is that while merchandise is traveling in one direction, money is going in another. No direct exchange ever takes place. The mafia chieftain or the Las Vegas gambler who has the black market cash to finance a shipment, never sees it and never touches it. Only his money does.

The actual transaction may be as simple as this: Once someone has gone to Europe and put down an \$800,000 deposit, he is told to go back to New York; he is told when his package arrives he will be notified; he is told someone will give him the key to a coin locker, a steamer trunk, or even a car, in which the shipment has been secreted in

specially built traps; he is told the moment he receives the key he must call the Swiss bank and arrange for the transfer of the second \$800,000 payment. Then the transaction is completed. It is a business transaction which almost does not exist at all.

WORK TO BE DONE

But it does. And so Raphael's "everything" is now in New York. But his "nickel piece" has not been "bagged" yet. It is still uncut and still wrapped in brown grocery paper. Now the financier must arrange for distribution of the shipment to the men who have struggled to gain key positions in the immensely profitable narcotics hierarchy that has grown in New York since World War II.

Here is how that hierarchy is set up:

At the very top, is the financier. He talks only to his business agent, never on the telephone and never in restaurants or bowling alleys that he thinks may be "bugged." A private automobile has become a relatively safe business place and so police have begun carefully recording the license plate numbers of all private cars that are owned by people that come in contact with anyone believed to be dealing in narcotics. The names of a world famous actor-singer, a New York nightclub entertainer and a local disc jockey among others, are in these files.

The financier needs only give his business agent less than 2 dozen names of men trusted through long association or blood ties. Only they are permitted to buy in substantial lots. These are known as the "5 kilo" and "kilo" men and they put up \$20,000 in cash for every kilo they buy. Each in turn will sell his share to another 2 dozen trusted confidants. A quarter-kilo buyer will pay \$10,000, an "ounce man" about \$750. It is a business conducted at its highest level only among men who know and trust each other. One contact that leads to a major purchase can be worth \$100,000 in quick profit. It is that simple.

As heroin is broken into smaller "pieces" in New York's narcotics hierarchy, the risk becomes greater but so do the profits. There are 15,400 grains in every ounce of pure heroin and before the heroin is "bagged" it will be "cut" from four to eight times. By the time it hits the streets, a kilo that enters the Port of New York can be worth up to \$400,000.

An "ounce man" or a "quarter kilo" man puts it there. Somewhere in Harlem or Bedford-Stuyvesant, on the upper West Side of the East Bronx, he has a room in a rundown hotel that for a few days can be used as a "plant." The location may change every week and so will the workers he employs. The factory hands who work in the plant, while they work, get \$40 a day. For 8 hours, they stand at a big surgical table and mix heroin with pure milk sugar. Actual dosage depends on how greedy a "cutter" may be, how many successive times the heroin is cut and how carefully a plant handles its packages. Dosage usually, but not always, is one grain that is 10 to 20 percent heroin in a \$3 "bag," 3 grains in a \$5 "bag." The workers mix it by slowly stirring the dry mixture with a spoon. With a half-ounce cooking scoop, they fill glassine bags, gently, carefully. Then the bags are folded over twice and sealed with Scotch tape. Fifteen \$3 bags are wrapped with a rubberband. It is called "half a load" and is usually sold for \$25. A load is 25 \$5 bags and costs \$75. Because heroin can be sniffed as well as injected, workers can become addicted in less than a month and must be replaced.

THE "EVERYTHING"

Raphael is about to get his "everything," because the heroin grown as raw opium in Turkey nearly 5,000 miles away is about to go to New York's retail market. Pushers have been fabricated as the great villains of narcotics addiction, but it is a villainy that has grown largely from society's need to

identify its enemy. Most pushers are themselves addicts. They have a connection and so are able to purchase a \$75 supply, sell half for \$60 (by selling individual lots) and only have to steal a little to support their habit. One problem they do not have is finding customers. It is, obviously, a seller's market.

New York's junk world is almost a microcosm of the international trade in narcotics. A pusher rarely exchanges heroin directly for cash.

"I go to 116th," Raphael says, "and I see a connection. Not just any connection, but one that's got real—. The first time I walk by, I just nod and he nods back and maybe I keep walking for a block or two. When I come back, I hand him maybe a 20 so if the Man (a police officer) sees me, I can say it was a gambling debt. When I come back the third time, he tells me where he's goin' to leave it. It could be a letter box, in a garbage can, anywhere."

(This type of "drop" is similar to those shown not too long ago on a CBS television program. On some occasions—as in some instances on the show—police narcotics agents pose as addicts to obtain evidence against pushers. The CBS program, contrary to a report in yesterday's Herald Tribune, did say that some of the "customers" it filmed were undercover policemen.)

Raphael was sitting on the brown-stone steps of a tenement, tapping his feet as if he were trying to keep warm. He pulled the duffle coat hood over his head and reached into his back pocket for a handkerchief. His eyes and nose were running and he looked as if he had a bad case of the flu.

"I don't know why I got started on —, man. It's no good. It's no good at all. One of these days I go find my father in San Juan and kick it. I get off. I'm through for good."

Raphael has been off heroin before. He does not believe that his father will help him kick the habit. He thinks that if he goes to Puerto Rico, where possession of any amount is punishable with a 5-year sentence, he will be afraid to use it. In New York, he knows that as long as he does not have more than an "eighth" (one-eighth ounce) at any one time he is only committing a misdemeanor.

WHAT'S NECESSARY

The single "bag" of heroin was in Raphael's hand. He had had a "bag" at home for a "wake up" and now he stood up, shined one scuffed shoe on the back of his pants leg and nodded his head in the direction of his house across the street.

"You want to know about —," he said, "you got to turn on. Nobody ever got hooked on one little skin pop. You got to share with me."

Raphael did not want dinner and he refused to drink. He was tired of talking and he wanted to go home. The house he lived in smelled as though someone had been cooking in the halls in the morning and urinating in them in the afternoon. Garbage spilled over the pails on the second-floor landing and Raphael kicked an orange juice container down the stairs. He had to open two locks to get inside his one room on the fourth floor. Clothes were scattered everywhere. Burnt wooden matches—a residue of the "cooking" process—littered the floor.

"I do pretty good, man," he said, opening a closet door. Inside were 4 radios and perhaps 20 pairs of pants. Raphael likes tight pants.

"Are you chicken or are you gonna turn on?" he said. "You just gonna sit there?"

He went on for about an hour and then for fully 10 minutes stared out the window at the lights of cars moving below.

"I gotta turn on alone?" he said shrilly. "I thought you was a hep square."

Then Raphael got up and took off his duffle coat. He brought a glass mirror from the

kitchen, split the small "bag" of heroin and poured it on the glass. He moved it slowly with his finger as if it suddenly had become twice as much. The world beyond his fingertip ceased to exist.

Then he began a ritual that almost seemed part of a secret religion. First he got a handful of wooden matches from the medicine chest and arranged them on the arm of the chair with the sulfur heads pointing in one direction. He took a leather belt from the closet and draped it over the back of the chair. He took a black wine bottle cap, forced it between the prongs of a hairpin, and carefully slid the white powder from the mirror into the cap. Then he went into the bathroom, and from inside a capped pipe, brought out his set of works: an eyedropper fitted with the nipple from a baby pacifier and a subcutaneous syringe. He put them in a jelly glass filled with water and brought them out. All of these tools were neatly arranged in some special order before he sat down in the chair.

READY TO COOK

Raphael was ready to "cook" now and so he took the eyedropper out of the jelly glass and attached the needle. He tied the belt around his upper arm and wound the leather out of his way. There was sweat on his forehead as he squeezed an eyedropper of water into the bottle cap "cooker," not fast, very, very slowly. Wooden matches gave a hotter flame and now Raphael lighted one with his thumbnail and began to heat the cooker.

Raphael's T-shirt was soaked. He clenched and unclenched his fist to raise the vein in his arm. When it bulged up, he filled the needle in the cooker and slid it very slowly toward the vein. He tried once and missed, then stopped to wipe his forehead with his arm. The second time, the needle went in the vein. Raphael squeezed the bulb very slowly. Stopped. And then sucked blood back into the eyedropper. Another drop, and he began to play with the needle in his arm. In and out. In and out. Two minutes later the syringe was empty and Raphael was leaning back, his eyes closed and his mouth open. Everything was perfect. He was "on the nod."

Addicts and even some medical people talk about "highs" and "euphoria." Dr. Michael J. Saliba Jr., a California physician who has made an extensive study of the physiological effects of addiction, described the sequence of events this way:

"The tiny particles, called Nissl's granules, composing the brain and spinal nerve tissue, normally receive and send out impulses from and to the ears, eyes, nose, tongue, skin, the digestive system, respiratory and circulatory systems, the muscles and the bones.

"When heroin begins to cover up these particles, the individual feels a tremendous exhilaration. The nerve impulses which cause normal apprehensions are the first to be muted. Worries disappear; a pleasant, warm, almost mystical sensation sets in—temporarily. With continued use the narcotic throws the whole sensory apparatus out of line. Pleasing perceptions are magnified, unpleasant ones diminished. An agreeable 5 minutes seems like an hour. Ordinary noises sound like music.

"By the time he takes his second or third dose the narcotic covers over more and more nerve tissue particles. The body's defense mechanisms go to work to replace them. He becomes hypersensitive. The amount of narcotic which muted the original number of Nissl's granules will not cover the new particles. The addict must take more drugs.

A BOMBARDMENT

"Soon there are several hundred times the number of normal nerve tissues particles. He feels under terrible bombardment, as though his head were about to explode, his bones ache, his muscles jump uncontrol-

lably. Intense vomiting and diarrhea begin. Sounds are deafening, taste nauseating."

All of this first began to happen to Raphael years before. He was 15 then, 22 now. At 16, in order to support his habit, Raphael became a "crib cracker" (burglar). He drew a "pen bit," 3 years, and when he got out he was caught again. This time, he was sent to Napanan, a juvenile correctional institution. Later, he was committed to Rikers Island for a year and 8 months. The day he got out, he went back on heroin. He has had himself voluntarily committed to the Federal narcotics hospital in Lexington, Ky., and been detoxified by the board of health at least twice at New York's Manhattan General Hospital. Nothing worked. Each time he got out there was a problem and the solution was heroin. This is how his life—and the lives of tens of thousands of other New York addicts—went.

Raphael was awake now and he wanted to tell about how he became the cat burglar of the East Side. It was not very clear except that two or three mornings every week, he would take a "fix" before he shaved and dressed up to go to work. His work was in the nineties between Park and Madison Avenue.

"Single people live there," he said at one point, "nobody home in the morning."

THE PROBLEM: RESALE

Raphael goes to the east nineties, he says, because he likes nice houses. "They got record players, watches, good clothes, all kinds of things you can sell around here." Raphael has a simple method of operation. He looks for an open door in a brownstone house. If he can get in, he goes to the top floor and knocks on a door. If someone answers he asks for Mr. Smith and then apologizes and goes away. If there is no answer, it takes him less than 10 seconds to pry open a lock with a screwdriver.

"Very few guys can steal like me," he says. "I'm a cat. I'm fast. No cop can catch me and I never get scared."

As soon as Raphael finds something he can carry he leaves the apartment and goes up on the roof. He does not want to go out the same front door he came in. A roof takes him to another building. As soon as he is back on the street he finds a taxicab.

"Nobody ever asks questions, no matter what you're carrying. The only real problem you got is getting what the stuff is worth. Even when you sell it to the neighbors, they try to cheat you. There are just too many junkies out stealing."

Raphael talked all night long about all the great times he had had and all the great times he was going to have and about how awful it was to be a junkie. "They goin' to make it legal some day," he said—"it was now 2 a.m.—"and then nobody will have nothing to do for kicks."

He talked about cold turkey and he talked about the pills a doctor gave him before he was taken to court. He talked about "Article IX" (the Metcalf-Voelker law which permits a convicted addict to choose voluntary civil commitment instead of jail under certain circumstances) and he said it was for suckers. "You got to do 5 months and then you get on parole for 3 years," he said. "I can do a year if I get caught and be finished."

He talked about his last prison term when he got a bus ticket to New York and \$7. It made him angry to remember that the authorities would not give him the money until he got on the bus. When he was tired of talking about all the cribs he had cracked, he talked again about Puerto Rico and kicking it for good.

"Next week I go to San Juan," he said. "Then I'm through for good."

By 5 a.m. Raphael had fallen asleep, his speech now almost incoherent. He could not decide whether he should plan bigger

jobs than crib cracking, and take the risk of a bigger penalty, or go off drugs for good.

He woke up at 9 a.m., tense, nervous, and sweating. "It isn't so bad when you got stuff," he said. "I can wait. I can wait a long time."

GETTING READY

He did. Instead of using the last bag, Raphael carefully shaved, brushed his teeth and began to dress. He wanted to look perfect. When he was dressed, he draped his suit jacket across the back of the armchair and began the ritual of his fix all over again. He did not dawdle now, and when he was finished, he did not shut his eyes.

"Let's go," he said. "I'll teach you how to crack a crib."

On the street, Raphael took a deep breath. "Man, this is my city," he said, "I own it. I got it made. Fifty bucks is all the bread I gotta make today and I'm good for 3 days. I'm gonna cop a mink coat and some diamond earrings. I can feel it. I know it."

At 96th Street, Raphael turned west. "Baby, I'll be back in an hour with the bread," he said. "I'm gonna make a big one, baby, a real big one. This is my day."

An hour later, Raphael had the money from whatever he had stolen. He would use it to buy another supply of heroin, and in doing so in his small way contribute to keeping the international flow of drugs and money going. Like the thousands of other addicts in New York, he probably didn't care how his small transaction fitted into the greater picture. For him it was only another day, another 24 hours dedicated to the search, acquisition, and use of "the best, the most precious, the everything, the only thing."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXVII

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the third part on drug addiction from the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The present article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 3, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—THE CANCER OF NARCOTICS: THESE ARE THE DRUGS

(NOTE.—Even as it is eating away at the heart of New York City, the cancer of dope addiction is spreading outward. Yesterday a countywide raid netted 40 arrests in ex-urban Suffolk County, and while the estimates of "millions of dollars" of drugs confiscated were obviously highly exaggerated, the police crackdown emphasized the dangers to the entire metropolitan community. Just what are the various drugs that addicts use, and what are the differences among them? Reporter Paul Weissman, in his continuing series on narcotics as part of the Herald Tribune's examination of "New York City in Crisis," today describes the drugs which have made this city the addiction capital of the Western World.)

Addiction to "chemical comforters" has been an American problem for more than a century.

The first drug used was morphine and without more sophisticated pharmacology doctors used it to treat almost everything from arthritis to gunshot wounds. Other opium derivatives were included in nostrums,

cough syrups and hundreds of other proprietary medicines.

Thirty years after the Civil War, doctors believed they had a solution to what was becoming a serious program of morphine addiction. They had a new drug called heroin, a synthetic opiate, they thought could be used to wean addicts from morphine. It proved to be five times more addicting than the drug it was meant to replace. Heroin was quickly declared contraband for any purpose whatever in the United States and the first black market developed.

World War II virtually ended America's heroin problem. Without marine or air traffic, drugs were not widely available. The handful of addicts that needed heroin turned to morphine and other, less addictive drugs. In the process, many "matured out," quit drugs and stayed clean.

When the war ended, a new crime syndicate, the Mafia, developed the heroin market. By now, there were also new and more sophisticated "chemical comforters." Here are the major drugs:

Heroin: Black market price: \$5 for a 3-grain "bag" containing 20 percent pure heroin. Street names: To Jews, "shmeck"; in Spanish, "lecata" or "caballo"; in Harlem, "smack," "dogee" or "babagna." Also called "H" and "horse," or a four-letter word by which it is known everywhere, that means excrement. The euphemism is "stuff." A contraband drug in the United States. An addictive drug. A depressant.

Heroin is an addictive drug that users must have as often as four, five and six times every day. Painful physical and psychological symptoms accompany deprivation of the drug. Heroin can either be sniffed from a "quill" (folded matchbook cover); "popped," injected under the skin; or injected directly into the vein. The hypodermic used to inject white powder, after it has been heated and dissolved in water, is a "set of works." The drug has a highly euphoric effect.

Barbiturates: Black market price: 10 cents to 50 cents a capsule. Street names: "blue heavens," "yellow jackets," "red devils" and "green hornets." Extremely addictive. Acts as a depressant.

Barbiturates, or "goof balls," are blue, white, yellow or red pills that are often taken by addicts in quantities of 10, 15, and 20 a day. They have such a strong sedative effect that users can sometimes be detected from the scar tissue on their cigarette fingers, because it is not unusual for heavy users to fall asleep smoking and feel no pain. Withdrawal from barbiturates is far more difficult than heroin withdrawal. Death may occur from abrupt cessation of the drug. Barbiturates are usually favored by addicts who must maintain a tremendous pace, one that they are physically and/or emotionally incapable of sustaining. Some 1,500 types of barbiturates are legally sold on prescription in the United States.

Amphetamines: Black market price: 10 cents a capsule. Street names: "bennies," "copilots," "helpers." An addictive drug. A stimulant.

Amphetamines have almost the opposite effect of barbiturates. They are pep pills, occasionally prescribed as an aid to dieting, that produce a temporary sense of elation, relief of fatigue and a feeling of increased ability. Dieters that use them burn off excess energy. Teenagers find they sometimes induce a sense of physical and emotional superiority. Confirmed users are not infrequently "go-go" salesmen or business executives, overstimulated with false energy, who must keep taking more pills to keep going. Heavy users are subject to periodic blackouts. Desoxy, an amphetamine widely sold on the black market in New York for 50 cents per glass ampule, is used by heroin addicts either alone or as a solvent. The combination is called a "speedball" or "bombita." Amphet-

amines can be used legally on the advice of a physician and are sold on prescription.

Cocaine: Black market price: \$10 per "cap," a small capsule containing two or three grains. Also sold in glassine bags indistinguishable from heroin or wrapped in silver foil. Street names: "C" and "girl." A nonaddictive drug. A sexual stimulant.

Derived from the leaves of the coca plant, cocaine acts as a stimulant on the nervous system. Some scientists believe it increases mental and physical powers, but creates considerable perceptual disturbance that can lead to paranoia. Cocaine addicts frequently carry firearms to respond to stimulation. The drug, a white powder that glistens like small diamonds, is usually crushed and "snorted" as if it were snuff. Heavy users have been known to burn a hole through the nasal septum. Though the drug has become somewhat rare in New York, police who arrest heroin and marihuana sellers frequently find a small supply of cocaine. It is a drug popular with people that frequent after-hours clubs. Cocaine is an illegal drug in the United States.

Marihuana: Black market price: \$100 to \$150 per pound (wholesale); cigarettes, \$1 each. Street names: "weed," "pot" and several hundred others throughout the world. A stimulant. A mild habit-forming drug, if used regularly.

Marihuana, like hashish, originates in various hemp plants grown in almost every part of the world. It is so easy to grow, police have found 16-foot plants in a Bronx backyard and a field of "pot" behind rhododendron plantings on the Merritt Parkway in Connecticut. It is taken for its psychic effect and can be smoked, chewed, ingested, or sniffed.

Some smokers become ill the first time they use marihuana, others notice a lightness, a feeling of power and distortion of time and space. Some confirmed users describe distortions of body sensations with feelings that arms and legs are not attached to the body. In mixed parties, giggling laughter is not unusual, nor are increased sexual drive and a voracious appetite. A favorite cause of intellectuals who disenfranchised themselves from society, and now picked up by college students, is a fight for the legalization of marihuana on the grounds that every individual has the "right" to use drugs if they are not dangerous. A basic objection to the argument is that the drug is dangerous to some individuals, but more important is the basic precept that people should not be permitted to prescribe drugs for themselves. It has also been shown, somewhat conclusively, that young people led to experiment with marihuana frequently need a "bigger kick." They have to give up what hardened addicts call "kid stuff" and try something better: heroin. Marihuana is an illegal drug in the United States.

Cough syrups: Recently, the apparent drug of choice of most New York teenagers. A dozen cough syrups that contain 1 percent codeine per fluid ounce are widely available. "Hydrocan," "Cosanyl" and "Robitussin AC" are the trade names of three of them. Codeine is an addictive narcotic drug that provides a slight "lift." Teenagers frequently use it to wash down goof balls. The law affecting the sale of this dangerous drug requires pharmacists to report sales in a book they must maintain called the "exempt narcotics registry" and limits them from selling more than 4 ounces to one person at one time. A year ago, a bill was introduced in the State legislature that would have made it illegal to sell exempt narcotics to anyone under 21 without a prescription. Pharmacists objected and the bill was defeated. It has been introduced again in 1965 and the Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York has announced it will support it.

Other drugs: These are rarer in the illicit drug market. Opium is almost never seen. Morphine, still used for medical purposes, is rarely used by American addicts, partly because it does not provide a "lift." Paregoric, camphorated tincture of opium, has been used by heroin addicts during a "panic" (shortage). The camphor can be burned off in the top of a mayonnaise jar, leaving a small quantity of morphine.

Recently, hallucinogenic, or consciousness-expanding drugs have been introduced on the American black market. Some are ancient, others are experimental. LSD 25, mescaline and ololiqui are almost as old as Western culture. Some new derivatives are psilocybin and psilocin. All induce sharp changes in states of awareness, perception, self-perception and communication with others, lending to their vogue among people who experiment with drugs. At present, hallucinogenic drugs are used legally almost entirely for research purposes.

THE 700TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF DANTE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, sometime in the middle of May, 700 years ago, the great Italian poet Dante Alighieri was born. The first glimmers of the Italian Renaissance, the movement that was to sweep Europe in the next three centuries, had barely made an appearance in 1265. Yet Dante was, in many respects, the complete Renaissance man. He had magnificent command of the learning of his time. He turned to the works of the great philosophers of Greece and Rome as well as to the teachings of the church for inspiration. He took an active part in the politics of his time. He was an artist—a poet above all—who has come to be recognized as one of the great masters of the written word in the Western World.

This year, colleges and universities, and other centers of learning throughout the world will commemorate the 700th anniversary of Dante's birth. There could be no more ample demonstration of Dante's stature as a universal poet, as a poet whose words speak to us today as they did to the men of his own time. Indeed, the contemporary relevance of Dante's works and his increasing appeal to the modern world were themes that were stressed at a recent symposium held at the Library of Congress. Here, it was pointed out that the part of Dante's immortal "Commedia" that strikes modern readers with the greatest force is probably the "Inferno." For here we can find the darker aspects of modern civilization and the uglier or more pathetic characteristics of 20th-century man rendered in the vivid 13th-century imagery of a master psychologist.

The "Commedia" was undoubtedly Dante's greatest work. But there are two other works that I would like to single out as worthy of attention and reflection during this year of remem-

brance. The first is "De Vulgari Eloquentia." In this treatise, Dante set out to establish the Italian language as a literary tongue. It was his hope that this language, as distinguished from local dialects, would become a bond of unity among the Italian people and would make them a nation, no longer feuding among themselves and distinct from other nations. Thus Dante, preceded by a few, and followed by many others, was an apostle of Italian unity.

The second work that I would like to mention is "De Monarchia." Here we find the dreams of Dante the political philosopher, Dante the man of action whose experiences have turned him to political reflection. Exiled from his native Florence by the victory of an opposing faction, and forced to observe during his wanderings the price paid by the Italian city states for their divisions and their feuds, Dante came to dream of unity and of peace, not only for Italy but also for the nations of the world. He envisioned these nations united under a rule of justice in a new Holy Roman Empire. The particular remedy he sought for the troubles of the time in which he lived is not one that we would necessarily endorse today. But the dream of peace and the rule of law remains with us.

On the occasion of the 700th anniversary of the birth of Dante I would, therefore, like to pay homage not only to Dante the poet, but also to Dante the apostle of Italian unity and to Dante the political philosopher.

PROPOSED CLOSINGS OF TWO NAVAL SHIPYARDS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Members of Congress and U.S. Senators testified before the House Armed Services Committee in opposition to the proposed closing of two of our naval shipyards.

An excellent statement was made before this committee by my distinguished New Hampshire colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire, TOM McINTYRE. Under previous permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert Senator McINTYRE's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOM McINTYRE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON SHIPYARD CLOSINGS

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify here today on the shipyard closings ordered by the Secretary of Defense last November. As a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I am especially aware of the outstanding work of this committee in its contribution to the strength and preparedness of our Nation's Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard should be kept open. I submit that (1) the Nation needs the capabilities now at Portsmouth, (2) that the operational disabilities attributed to Ports-

mouth are inaccurate, (3) that the cost figures comparing navy and private shipyard costs used to support the closing are subject to differing interpretations and do not support the conclusions which were reached, and (4) that the economic impact on the region concerned would cause losses to the Federal, State, and local governments which would far exceed the suggested savings.

I want to make it clear that I shall not suggest that some other Navy shipyard be closed instead of Portsmouth. I have not studied the other bases, and I am not fully familiar with their capabilities. In my testimony I shall mention other yards where the DOD has incorrectly compared them with Portsmouth. My general feeling, which was so well presented in Commander J. J. Meyer's article, "Our Nation's Shipyards," in the November 1964 Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute, is that we need them all, and that one of the reasons advanced for the closing of Navy yards, the preservation of private yards, is the product of erroneous logic.

Now, I would like to speak to the points I have raised.

1. THE NATION NEEDS THE CAPABILITIES NOW IN PORTSMOUTH

Portsmouth has three major capabilities that are of crucial importance for fleet support. These are submarine design capability, nuclear submarine overhaul capability, and nuclear submarine construction capability. I would like to take these one by one.

Submarine design capability

Portsmouth has the only submarine design capability in the Navy, the only other shipyard having design capability being the General Dynamics Electric Boat Co. in Groton, Conn. The DOD says that if Portsmouth is closed, this capability should be retained and established elsewhere (p. 15 of DOD summary). This involves the assumption that submarine design capability can be easily moved.

Mr. Chairman, with your long experience in military affairs, I am sure you know as well as I that submarine design capability is not a commodity that can be loaded into box cars, shipped to a new location, and set up in a few days. What we are talking about is not primarily machines and buildings. What we are talking about is men, men who have spent long years developing the skills and know-how necessary to design submarines. These men are not available in the labor markets of Philadelphia, or Norfolk, or anywhere else, except in one private shipyard. The Navy cannot take its men and their families, tear them up by the roots, and transplant them to some other place. It would take years to build elsewhere the capability for submarine design we now have in Portsmouth, and in the meantime, the Navy would be wholly dependent on the capabilities of one private firm. It would have no standard for judgment as to whether costs were justifiable or not, and even if it did have, it would have no alternative to using the private firm. This submarine design capability is essential to the fleet. DOD agrees. Portsmouth has it now.

Nuclear submarine overhaul capability

Portsmouth is one of the three facilities on the east coast with capability to overhaul and repair nuclear submarines. The others are in Charleston and in Norfolk. The Chief of Naval Operations requires that there be three naval shipyards on each coast capable of overhauling nuclear submarines. Three shipyards are listed in the summary under the heading "Full Capability—presently engaged in This Type of Work" (table I, p. 6a). One of the very important elements of capability is experience of the men who do the work, so we asked Navy to tell us how long each of the yards had had this capability. Pertinent paragraphs in a letter from Admiral

Brockett, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, dated May 14, 1965, read as follows:

"Portsmouth entered the new construction nuclear submarine program in fiscal year 1955. Developing on this base, it acquired the overhaul capability on June 30, 1959.

"The east coast repair yards were brought in later to suit developing needs as shown below: Charleston, June 1, 1963; Norfolk, January 1, 1965.

The fact that the Department of Defense summary dated November 17, 1964, stated that Norfolk had the capability as of the date of the report, and was "presently engaged in this type of work," we will presume to be a stretching of the truth. However, the length of time required to overhaul a nuclear submarine runs at least 12 months, and it takes 4 years to train a journeyman shipyard worker. While Charleston, with about 2 years of experience, could be considered fully capable of performing such work, Norfolk, which had not had time to do even one-half of the job of overhauling a nuclear submarine, much less develop a competent work force with all the skill and know-how required, could not yet be considered a fully dependable facility.

Even if Charleston and Norfolk are considered to be fully capable of handling nuclear submarine repairs, the Chief of Naval Operations has said that three such yards are needed. I am sure that the Navy, now having gone through the very difficult task of setting up nuclear submarine overhaul capability in Charleston and in Norfolk, is aware of the complexity and difficulty of doing so, and if there were not an overriding concern for showing dollar savings, would much prefer to keep the facility operating at Portsmouth, instead of dismantling it and trying to convince men to move to some other base.

The 10 year phasing-out period which is planned, is said to be based primarily on easing the economic impact on the community. However, an immediate closing would leave the Navy with only two overhaul facilities for nuclear submarines of the three required, and only one can be called experienced. It seems to me that the delay is at least as much for the benefit of the Navy as for the community.

There are certain advantages in the facilities now at Portsmouth which do not exist elsewhere. Besides the expertise, built up over the years, the extensive experience in experimental development, and capability for expansion for missile support if needed, Portsmouth has covered ways which permit work with no interruption due to bad weather.

Nuclear submarine repair and overhaul capability again, is not the kind of capability that is primarily dependent on machines and facilities. It is primarily dependent on the skills and experience of the men who provide it. Again, we cannot load this capability into boxcars and ship it where we will. Nuclear submarine overhaul capability is needed in three east coast Navy shipyards. Charleston has it, Norfolk has it, and Portsmouth has it.

Nuclear submarine construction capability

Little is said in the DOD summary about need for this capability. It is assumed that there is not enough work to utilize navy yards at capacity, and that with the need to provide work for private yards, it is likely that utilization will drop to something like 50 percent. This covers both new construction and overhaul work. We do not have figures for how much new construction is needed, but we can assume some will be needed. There are only two navy yards now constructing nuclear submarines, Mare Island and Portsmouth. All others are being built in private shipyards. To abolish this capability in a time of international ten-

sion would not impress the world with the readiness of the United States to defend its interests and the interests of others seeking peace. Portsmouth has completed five nuclear submarines and is now working on four more. Its capability is fully demonstrated. In addition, the skilled work force in Portsmouth has been given responsibility for work on two experimental deep-diving submarines, the *Albacore* and the *Dolphin*. The yard also built five prototype submarines.

The Navy should have inhouse capability to build nuclear submarines on the east coast. Portsmouth has it.

II OPERATIONAL DISABILITIES ATTRIBUTED TO PORTSMOUTH ARE INACCURATE

In the 22 pages of the Defense Department's "Summary of Study of Naval Requirements for Shipyard Capacity," many reasons are given for the rejection of Portsmouth as one of the shipyards to be retained. However, if the summary is reviewed carefully, it can be seen that Portsmouth is ruled out by stipulation, rather than because of a cost analysis or because of a lack of need for its facilities.

The stipulation consists of two parts:

1. Need for drydocks, and
2. Proximity to ships homeported in Boston-Quonset-Newport area.

Need for drydocks

The number of drydocks needed as standbys for mobilization is not stated in the report. However it can be deduced from the statements on page 10 of the summary as being not more than 12. (Philadelphia and Portsmouth could be closed without a deficit, leaving Boston and New York, having six each. Portsmouth has three and Philadelphia has seven.) Thus, if two yards are to be closed, obviously Portsmouth must be one, not because its capabilities are unneeded, but because it doesn't have enough drydocks.

The deficit, however, is not as bad as it seems. The summary goes on to say that in the event New York is closed, the drydock at Bayonne should be retained. This would leave a possible combination of Philadelphia (7), Portsmouth (3), Bayonne (1), totaling 11, just one short of the magic number 12. If we then take the added capabilities needed which are in the process of being acquired or would have to be acquired to make sure that the Navy's "strategic and operational requirements as expressed by CNO" (p. 6a) are met, obviously other drydocks would have to be added. So, the number of drydocks is not really an insurmountable problem.

Proximity to ships homeported in Boston-Quonset-Newport area

After we deal with the first part of the stipulation ruling out Portsmouth, we find a second. The Chief of Naval Operations has stipulated that the closure of both Boston and New York would be unacceptable. All other possible combinations of closures of two bases, given the stated need for drydocks, automatically include Portsmouth. Thus this means that Portsmouth again is being ruled out by stipulation rather than on the merits.

What is the basis of this stipulation? The Navy has found that "Overhauls at substantial distances from homeports adversely affect morale and reenlistment rates." I am sure that no one would argue with this. Everyone agrees that extended distances would cut the time that men could be with their families when a ship is in for overhaul. However, let us look at just how substantial the distances would be for ships homeported in the Boston-Quonset-Newport areas as compared with the acceptable yards at New York and Boston.

If Boston were kept as the open yard for overhauls, the distance from homeport in Boston would be zero, the distance from home ports in Newport-Quonset would be 75 miles. If New York were kept as the open

yard for overhauls, the distance from homeports in Boston would be 215 miles; the distance from Newport-Quonset would be 160 miles.

According to the Chief of Naval Operations (p. 17), these would be acceptable distances from homeports. Now, what would be the distance from homeports if Portsmouth were the overhaul base?

The distance from homeports in Boston would be 50 miles, all super highway. The distance from homeports in the Newport-Quonset area would be 125 miles. These distances are substantially less than the distances acceptable for New York.

Suppose we do abolish the overhaul facilities in Portsmouth, and are able to develop the submarine overhaul capabilities elsewhere, then what? The summary suggests they might be established in Philadelphia. What does that do to submarines homeported in the Boston-Quonset-Newport areas? Submarines homeported in Boston would be overhauled 290 miles away. It seems to me that these distances come close to being substantial enough to adversely affect morale and reenlistment rates. Until such a facility were established in Philadelphia, the nearest Navy shipyard with capability for overhaul of nuclear submarines would be Norfolk, about 600 miles from the Boston-Quonset-Newport area.

Mr. Chairman, the operational disabilities attributed to Portsmouth are not disabilities. The views of the DOD summary do not take the whole picture into account. Instead they tend to pick out elements which would rule out Portsmouth. This kind of reasoning seems to me an attempt to justify a decision rather than an attempt to weigh the facts before arriving at a conclusion.

III. COMPARISON OF PRIVATE AND NAVY SHIPYARD COSTS

It is obvious that a naval shipyard costs money. The DOD, (p. 13) estimates an average saving of \$15 million on closing a shipyard because of fixed overhead and upkeep costs. However, the Department also states that if it were to increase the conversion, alteration and repair work done in naval shipyards from the present level of 65 percent to the former level of about 80 percent overall savings to DOD would be between \$10 to \$15 million annually (p. 12). The Department says that a healthy, competitive, private shipyard construction industry is desirable to produce the lowest cost to it. It further states that if the past average price differential of 16.2 percent in favor of private shipyards continues, use of private shipyards is more economical.

This brings up a question we need to ask. Is the 16.2 percent differential the result of a "healthy competitive private industry?" In a very well done article in the November 1964 U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Commander J. J. Meyer, Jr., USN, points out that we do not have a healthy industry now. In fact, (p. 43) private industry incurred losses on 5 of the 14 new construction ships on which the Anderson report was based, and earned only one-half of 1 percent profit on a sample of 79 ships for which repairs and alterations were contracted.

What will happen when there are fewer naval shipyards than now and the private shipyards need not bid against reasonable competition? I cannot but imagine that their prices will go up, and we, the Congress and the taxpayer, through the Department of Defense, will start paying substantially more for work done in private shipyards than is now being paid in Navy yards.

It seems quite obvious that private shipyards are not healthy, that they are tailoring their bids in order to get work to stay open, not in order to make a profit, and any analysis that assumes that cutting down on Navy shipyards will cure their illness, is just not facing the facts.

Recent statements of Nicholas Johnson, our Maritime Administrator (Navy, Mar. 1965, pp. 12-51) in commenting on the large subsidies for shipbuilders (ranging from 53 to 55 percent) and to ship operators, suggest the possibility of spending U.S. money in foreign shipyards because the product will be cheaper and better. Are we being asked to shutdown Navy shipyards so we can spend money overseas for merchant ships?

In the costs of our naval shipyards, we include items private yards do not need so that we can have the flexibility to meet fleet needs. When a ship comes in for overhaul, work on new construction is frequently interrupted at some expense in order to get the ship back into shape and out to sea again. In emergencies, the entire resources of the yard are brought to bear without regard for the added costs for interruptions of lower priority work. Despite these considerations, despite the fact that the naval shipyard must keep on the payroll its highly skilled work force at times when there is little work to do because it is known from experience that they will be needed, the cost differential is only 16.2 percent in private shipyards. Furthermore, if work is increased in the naval shipyards, even up to 50 percent, the fixed costs do not rise, and the cost differential would not only drop, it would probably be reversed.

If we destroy our in-house capabilities to do this kind of work, and depend on private yards to do it, we will find ourselves paying as much or more for the basic work without the flexibility needed for quick overhauls and emergencies.

Now, what about these cost figures which compare private yards with navy yards? The Anderson report breaks these into two main categories: construction and conversion, and repairs and alterations. I will deal mostly with the part relating to submarines, which is of particular concern to Portsmouth. In the summary (sec. 1, p. 3), the construction costs of several types of ships are listed. The list is as follows:

	Percent by which average private shipbuilders' costs were less than naval shipyard costs to the—	
	Department of Defense	Government
Nuclear attack submarines (SSN 589 class)	10.0	15.2
Nuclear ballistic missile submarines (SSBN 598 class)	12.4	20.3
Guided missile frigates (DLG 9 class)	16.4	18.7
Attack aircraft carriers (CVA 59 class)	25.4	31.4

I assume it is from these figures that DOD comes up with the 16.2 percent average differential between the costs charged at private shipyards and the costs at naval shipyards. These figures are quite impressive. However, let us look at the basis for the figures. In the nuclear attack submarine class, 28 submarines were authorized during fiscal years 1955-62. For various reasons, all but five, were excluded from the sample. Of the five, only one was built in a naval shipyard, Mare Island. The other four were built in private shipyards. While we can assume that four submarines built in private shipyards gives adequate basis for figuring an average cost, it is hardly likely that we can assume that we have reached a valid average cost figure with one submarine built in a navy yard. Mr. Chairman, the use of averages in such a way reminds me of the story of the man who nearly drowned, crossing a river that averaged only 4 feet deep. In the nuclear ballistic missile submarine

class, 29 were authorized during fiscal years 1958-62, of which only five form the sample used to compare costs. Of these, two were built in naval shipyards, one at Mare Island and the other at Portsmouth. This is a better sample, but hardly one which warrants the conclusions drawn in the report and in subsequent actions by DOD.

But there is another fact which is mentioned in the Anderson report (p. 4 of sec. 1). That is that the percentages used are based on shipbuilders' costs and not on total end costs to either the Government or DOD. These total end costs include "non-comparable" design and engineering costs as well as many types of Government furnished material and equipment, and are over and above the shipbuilders' costs by amounts ranging from \$20 to \$80 million. Let us take a look at how these total end costs compare.

[Dollars in thousands]

	Total end costs		Percentage by which private yard costs are lower (or higher)
	Naval shipyards	Private shipyards	
Attack nuclear submarines (SSN)	\$50,541	\$50,282	0.5 percent lower.
Ballistic missile nuclear submarines (SSBN)	111,970	131,275	15 percent higher.
Guided missile frigates (DLG)	61,012	46,400	31 percent lower.
Attack carriers (CVA)	218,832	181,082	20 percent lower.

Even with the lower utilization of Navy yards and the fixed high overhead costs, the total end cost of nuclear attack submarines is almost the same, and the total end cost of nuclear ballistic missile submarines is 15 percent lower. In my experience, one-time and noncomparable costs have a way of recurring. At any rate, the size of the sample and the extreme difficulty of finding comparable costs make the Anderson report an extremely shaky basis for taking steps which may cripple the ability of the Navy to mobilize the fleet support which is necessary in the event of mobilization.

Now, I would like to turn to the overhaul and repair section of the Anderson report. The ships used in the sample are essentially commercial types of ships, including ammunition ships, oilers, attack transports, and cargo ships, and some landing ships. The kind of work used in the study was limited to underwater hull work on these types of ships. No warships were included. In other words, the work compared was relatively simple work which does not require the skilled journeymen who make up the backbone of the Navy shipyards. The DOD recognizes this in their summary (p. 12) which indicates that in many cases it is cheaper to perform such work in-house rather than contracting it out. This is especially true of ships like nuclear submarines, which require the kind of security and safety measures for which few private yards are willing to bear the expense.

A further element is worthy of consideration. In many overhaul jobs, the full extent of the work to be done cannot be determined until the overhaul work is well underway. In a Navy shipyard, if the work is needed, it is done, and it is done quickly and efficiently. In a private yard, new contracts have to be drawn up and negotiated, and must, in legal terms, state all the work which is necessary. If further work is found to be required, further contract negotiations must then be undertaken.

What is the effect of these renegotiations? In the sample of 79 ships reviewed by the Anderson report, the original profit margin in the contracts was 0.4 percent. In the final cost to the Navy, after renegotiations, the profit margin was 4.5 percent, an increase

of over 20 percent (p. 39, sec. 3). The amount of money the Navy had to pay out for the additional profit alone amounted to about \$1 million, or well over \$100,000 for each ship. This kind of ballooning of costs does not occur in a naval yard.

The quality of the overhauls done by private and Navy shipyards is a difficult thing to measure; however, on a sample of 175 ships, the average length of time in service before the next overhaul was needed was 21.3 months for those done in Navy yards and 20.1 months for ships overhauled in private shipyards. For only three types of ships of 15 in the sample was the length of time in service shorter after a Navy yard overhaul, and the maximum was 3 months. For three types the time was the same, and for nine types the length of time in service was longer after the Navy yard overhaul, ranging up to 7 months longer than for comparable ships done in private yards (exhibit 13, sec. 3).

Impact on economy

The DOD summary recognizes that the Portsmouth Shipyard has an impact on the economy of the area. It doesn't show how important it is. Mr. Thomas Prentiss, coordinator of the seacoast regional plan of the States of New Hampshire and Maine, recently spelled out the impact of such a closing in his testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. He made these points:

The naval shipyard is the largest single employer in northern New England, that is, north of Boston. It employs an average of 8,000 workers and has an average annual payroll of \$65 million. Each such job creates another job in local production, and these two jobs generally sustain six people. Thus 16,000 people will be out of work, and 48,000 people of the some 170,000 people in the Portsmouth region are affected—or almost one-third of the population. About 80 percent of the 170,000 live in New Hampshire and about 20 percent in Maine.

Neither New Hampshire nor Maine has the resources to absorb this kind of impact. In a report of "Regional Development Needs of the New England Economy," Elizabeth M. Heibredner, an analyst in the Legislative Reference Service, brings out the following information:

1. In per capita income in 1963, both States are below the average for the United States, which is itself below the average for New England.

2. Manufacturing industries have provided less jobs than before for New England, the 1964 loss being 10,700 jobs. Textile jobs decreased 144,700 in the decade ending in 1959, and 13,300 more were lost between 1960-63. In less than 15 years, New England has lost nearly 170,000 industrial jobs.

As you can see, we do not have the number of jobs in industry that can absorb the number of people who will be affected, much less the kinds of industries that will employ them in the skills that they have learned over the years.

Again, it is very hard for us here to imagine the impact on the community there, so I would like to use a couple of examples with which you gentlemen may be better acquainted.

The Charleston, S.C., metropolitan area includes about 253,000 people. Imagine, if you will, several industries employing a total of 12,000 men with payrolls of about \$100 million moving out of town, and 12,000 others being thrown out of work because of the lost payroll—a total of 24,000 unemployed. Adding dependents, 72,000 persons will be affected.

Or, take the Boston metropolitan area, which includes about 2,595,000 people. Imagine several industries employing a total of 116,000 people with payrolls of \$943 million moving out of town, and 116,000 others being thrown out of work—a total of 232,000 unem-

ployed. Adding dependents, 696,000 persons would be affected.

I know these examples seem extreme. However, it is worse than it seems. The working population is approximately one-third of the total population, and the magnitude of the impact can be seen when we realize that nearly one-third of the work force is being put out of work, and the remaining two-thirds is being expected to absorb them.

Some of you can remember, as I can, the depression and the terrible effects of those years on all our citizens. During the worst year of the depression, one out of four workers was out of work. The entire resources of the United States were brought to bear in that situation of critical need. As a result, slowly and painfully and expensively the Nation began its climb back to full productivity. However, it is well to remember that even in 1941 with the war clouds gathering, unemployment was still almost 10 percent. It took 9 years and a war economy to eradicate the effects of the depression.

If all the shipyard workers stay in the Portsmouth area, our unemployment will be one in three substantially worse than the worst year of the depression. If half the shipyard workers accept employment outside the area, then our unemployment will be approximately 21 percent, or about what it was nationally in 1934.

Can you imagine the Federal resources that will have to be poured into the area if this happens to us? The Appalachia program will be relatively insignificant.

But we are not asking for a tremendous infusion of Federal funds. We are asking for the continuation of facilities and capabilities which are needed for the defense of our Nation. DOD says it can save between \$16 and \$19.8 million annually by closing the shipyard. I believe that within a year, we will be able to show that the Navy will save money if it keeps Portsmouth open as well as having the best nuclear submarine construction and overhaul yard in the Nation.

Improvements at Portsmouth

The Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., is working very hard to improve the cost-effectiveness of the shipyard. They have organized a board of governors with 39 area members from New Hampshire, Maine, and Massachusetts, 26 shipyard members, and 14 community members from the immediate area, and in addition, an advisory council. One of the main efforts of the committee is to help management in a program of cost-reduction, and encourage workers to improve their productivity, both in effectiveness and in efficiency.

This program has just been begun, but it and efforts over the last year are promising to bear fruit. Even under the fiscal year 1964 cost-reduction program, the yard reduced costs by \$5,308,600—over \$3 million more than the goal of \$2,132,400. This was not the best showing, 4 of 11 yards showing greater savings, but it is an indication of real improvement.

The present efforts of the committee are reaching the workers in a very effective way, and the months to come should show dramatic improvement.

Several examples of the kind of service I mean have been brought to my attention.

1. A regular overhaul of the SS *Angler* was completed last winter ahead of schedule and at lower than average cost.

2. The main motor was replaced in the U.S.S. *Blenny* this spring. Portsmouth got the job with a bid which was about three-fourths the amount bid by another yard and requiring two-thirds of the time. The ship was delivered on schedule and for less cost than bid.

3. The SS *Sea Leopard* required replacement of main battery propulsion cables. Portsmouth got the job on the basis of a bid about two-thirds of the next lower bid and

for about two-thirds the time. The submarine was delivered on time despite some additional work which had to be done and at a cost lower than that bid.

These and other jobs done have resulted in expressions of customer satisfaction which have brought much gratification to the personnel of the shipyard and point the direction for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize the fact that I am urging the retention of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. I am not asking that another yard be closed instead. No other yard has the depth of specialization on nuclear submarines which Portsmouth has, and Portsmouth—by deliberate design over many years—does not have certain capabilities which other yards do have.

Mr. Chairman, the skilled craftsmen at Portsmouth are the real backbone of the yard. These men and women have saved through their cost reduction program almost one-third the sum DOD estimated would be saved if the entire yard were closed. And these outstanding workers have only begun.

There is no question but that we need Portsmouth. The Navy yard provides a livelihood for many of our people. But, this is not a one-way street. The fleet needs Portsmouth. It needs its submarine design capability, it needs its nuclear submarine overhaul capability, and it needs its construction capability. Most of all it needs the skilled and dedicated men and women of its work force.

Together, the community and the shipyard have served the fleet well. We will serve it better in the future.

Thank you for this opportunity to bring to your attention the reasons Portsmouth should be retained.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEY-CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS, INC.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has now appeared on the American scene a new and important professional society, the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc.

Some 80 years ago at Saratoga Springs, N.Y., a small group of lawyers organized a new professional society in the United States. That became the American Bar Association, now numbering more than 100,000 members.

To meet the developing needs of our expanded modern economy, there also came into being, somewhat later, a professional group now known as the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

Then, as our business economy and tax systems became more and more complex, it became evident that the public interest is best served by the joint skills of the two professions. Accordingly, many dedicated men and women, giving generously of their time and talent and industry, achieved competence in both professions and attained the dual degree, as lawyer and as certified public accountant.

In October 1964, at Kiamesha Lake, N.Y., this new professional society, the

American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc., was created—by a group of men representing several existing statewide associations and dual practitioners from all parts of the United States, all of them dedicated to their profession. It was organized to safeguard and advance the professional interests of all men and women in America who are qualified as both lawyer and certified public accountant. Only those so qualified are admitted to membership. I venture the prediction that the years ahead will record that the organization of this new society will be remembered as a monumental contribution to professional life in the United States in the interest of the public welfare.

Recognition by the legal profession and by the accounting profession of the high public interest in the joint skills of the two professions brought into being the National Conference of Lawyers and Certified Public Accountants. After a long period of careful study that conference in February, 1951 approved a joint statement of principles. Later in 1951 the statement was approved by the Board of Governors and the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association and by the Council of the American Institute of Accountants, the latter, by change of name, now being the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

The statement of principles so adopted stresses the paramount public interest:

Many problems connected with business require the skills of both lawyers and certified public accountants and there is every reason for a close and friendly cooperation between the two professions. In many cases, therefore, the public will be best served by utilizing the joint skills of both professions. The principal purpose is to indicate the importance of voluntary cooperation between our professions, whose members should use their knowledge and skills to the best advantage of the public.

The regulations of the U.S. Treasury Department admit to practice both lawyers and certified public accountants; and the Tax Court of the United States likewise admits members of both professions to practice in the Tax Court.

It is estimated that there are more than 2,000 persons in the United States who hold both degrees—the law degree and the CPA degree. They constitute a rather select society in American professional life. Those who have thus achieved competence and recognition in both professions are the finest exemplars in the tradition envisioned by that statement of principles of the National Conference of Lawyers and Certified Public Accountants, and the regulations governing practice in the U.S. Treasury Department, and the rules of practice in the Tax Court of the United States.

The right to practice law and the right to practice as certified public accountant are governed by the laws of the several States. Before either of these coveted rights is granted, the applicant is carefully investigated and screened for good character and is required to pass satisfactorily a rigid written examination on technical competence.

Thus, it is evident that the joint skills essential to the competent practice of law and accountancy come neither by chance nor even by superior talent alone. They are the fruits of long and diligent study, application and training, achieved by industry and self-denial, the better to serve the public welfare. Painstakingly, this dedicated group—this group of lawyer-CPA's of America—have established a magnificent tradition of competent service. But what they have done can be done by any one who is willing to pay the price. That price is long hours of hard work. Those lawyers of America who have not yet qualified themselves in accounting may well emulate their achievement and strive to augment their number. The business public, the public of the Nation, will applaud their industry and their skills.

Indeed, the American Bar Association has a laudable program of continuing education of the bar. That program includes the acquisition of competence in the fields of taxes and of accounting. There is ample evidence of recognition of the need for lawyers to achieve accounting skills; here are two examples of that recognition:

The American Bar Association Journal, in August 1962 at page 736, editorially reported:

Louis Brandeis observed that the lawyer who does not know anything of economics and accounting is a public enemy.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (New York), in 1961, in its formal opinion in the case of *United States v. Kovel*, 296 F. 2d 918 at 922, said this:

Accounting concepts are a foreign language to some lawyers in almost all cases and to almost all lawyers in some cases.

Even so, formal admission to the practice of law and to the practice as certified public accountant is not the end of the road; it is only the beginning of a professional lifetime of self-discipline and restraint. In the public interest, both are governed by stern rules of ethics. Those of the American Bar Association are known as the canons, and the canons are paralleled by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' Rules of Professional Conduct.

The nature, the scope, and the purpose of the canons may best be seen by these authoritative quotations:

Canons must be viewed not as a bill of rights for the bar, but, rather, a codification of the more important limitations on legal practice broadly deemed necessary for the protection of clients.

So spoke the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, New York, in 1954, in *Consolidated Theatres v. Warner Bros.*, 216 F. 2d 920, 52 A.L.R. 2d 1231 at 1240.

Our bar associations are "dedicated to uphold the integrity of the bar and the fulfillment of its public responsibilities." So wrote Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., then president of the American Bar Association in the July 15, 1962, issue of *American Bar News*.

The controlling consideration should be the public service, and the right to win the rewards of the profession should be conditioned on fitness to render the public service.

The standard of public service is the standard of the bar, if the bar is to live.

So spoke the distinguished Elihu Root to the American Bar as long ago as 1920 and 1922.

And here is a direct quotation from the preamble to the Canons of Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association:

The future of the Republic, to a great extent, depends upon our maintenance of justice pure and unsullied. It cannot be so maintained unless the conduct and the motives of the members of our profession are such as to merit the approval of all just men.

These rudimentary principles, in the finest tradition of both professions, are stressed and applied in accounting matters by the statement of principles of the National Conference of Lawyers and Certified Public Accountants, in these words:

Frequently the legal and accounting phases are so interrelated and interdependent and overlapping that they are difficult to distinguish. In many cases, therefore, the public will be best served by utilizing the joint skills of both professions.

It is in that tradition that America's new professional society, the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, will serve the Nation.

LAWS RESTRICTING IMPORTATION, INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION, AND TRANSPORTATION THROUGH THE MAILS OF CONTRACEPTIVE DEVICES, INFORMATION, AND ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills to repeal the archaic Federal laws restricting importation, interstate transportation, and transportation through the mails, of contraceptive devices, information, and advertisements.

Despite the fact that time and scientific advances have made overpopulation one of our great concerns for the future of the world and of this Nation; despite a major change in the attitudes on birth control and family planning over the last century, exemplified by a 1963 Gallup poll indicating that 74 percent of the American people favored making birth control information available to anybody requesting it; despite all this, the "Comstock" laws adopted in 1873 remain unchanged.

Dr. Luther Terry, the Surgeon General, in a speech to the World Health Organization in Geneva on May 12, 1965, predicted that, at the present rate of growth, world population would almost quadruple in the next 70 years. There will be 12 billion people in the year 2035. Dr. Terry urged WHO to increase its research on population growth and stated that the United States would increase its program and "will take steps to make

the results of its research fully available to countries requesting assistance."

The last three Presidents of the United States have urged that we make population control information and scientific and technical aid available abroad to governments requesting such assistance. And now, the changing flow of public opinion is being reflected at the State level. In the last several years, Colorado, Indiana, and Kansas have repealed their "Comstock" laws. Similar legislation is being considered in other States. Colorado, Kansas, and Minnesota have recently passed laws providing for programs of State assistance in family planning.

The 18th-century economic philosophy depended on war, famine, and pestilence to serve as population control measures.

We in the National Congress have dedicated ourselves in measure after measure to fight poverty, eradicate disease, and achieve world peace. If we anticipate any measure of success, we must now begin to prevent worldwide overpopulation.

I believe that it is possible to do this without offending the religious and moral scruples of any members of our community.

I am suggesting today only a small measure—the elimination from our law books of two anachronistic statutes that are at total variance with our domestic and foreign policy on family planning and population control, and which have rarely been enforced, since in today's world they are hardly enforceable. Unenforceable laws only encourage contempt for the law.

Court decisions have severely restricted the applications of these laws. Nevertheless, they still have some effect. They help to create a confusion among timid public officials as to what our Government policy is, or should be.

I respectfully urge that we act now to conform our laws to our current practices, and to the national and international consensus that family planning and population control are indispensable to the very world peace, world order, and world plenty, which we all seek.

WHAT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 MEANS TO OHIO

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LOVE] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James H. Pelley, professor of educational administration at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, has been extremely interested in elementary and secondary education for many years.

Earlier this month Dr. Pelley participated in a conference sponsored by the higher education department of the Ohio Education Association. The purpose of this conference was to begin planning Ohio's participation in the

Federal aid program for elementary and secondary schools—indeed, an important beginning to this breakthrough in major financial assistance to education.

In the belief that Dr. Pelley's remarks may be helpful elsewhere throughout the country, I feel his speech should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 MEANS TO OHIO

Even a preliminary analysis of this historic act prompts one to agree with the sentiment expressed by President Johnson when he signed the bill, seated on a crude wooden bench by the old one-room junction school, and flanked by his first teacher, Mrs. Katie Deadrich Lovey. He said on this occasion, "As President, I believe deeply that no law I have signed, or will ever sign means more to the future of our Nation."

He stated also that he had chosen this time and place for the signing ceremonies because, "I do not wish to delay by a single day the program to strengthen this Nation's elementary and secondary schools."

I believe this spirit of urgency should attend our deliberations today. This act (Public Law No. 59-10) becomes operative after July 1, and the necessary appropriations may be anticipated soon thereafter. The increased educational opportunities provided by the act are to be in effect for the coming school year, beginning in September.

While specific guides are not now available, many necessary steps are apparent for communities and States if full benefits of the act are to be made available to children and youth. The spirit of the act encourages local initiative and imagination in devising needed programs, as opposed to prescription by the U.S. Office of Education.

Any single person would be presumptuous, indeed, if he attempted to tell such an audience what this intricate and imaginative new law could mean to a great State like ours. I am convinced that the law will mean only what our educational leaders and citizens, working together will make it mean. This is a basic reason why it would be wrong, indeed, to sit idly by marking time while waiting for directives to be developed by the U.S. Office of Education. To be sure, certain basic guides for administration of the act will emanate from the Commissioner of Education, but, by far, the most important planning should be done at the community level and the State level.

The provisions of the act have been presented to you, and you have seen numerous briefs on the various titles, although the real meaning of these provisions cannot be really known by anyone at this time.

The challenge to one assigned to speak for 30 minutes about this complex act is not what to say but what to leave out. The printed testimony before the Senate committee runs to 3,287 pages.

In trying to be highly selective in how best to use this time, I have established two main purposes:

1. To interpret the philosophy, intent, and potentialities of the act.
2. To stimulate thinking and action on how to organize and plan to implement the act in Ohio.

I will not take time to review the law, title by title. Many helpful summaries have appeared in various publications. Dr. Holt has just concluded a series of regional meetings where the superintendents have received informative briefing on the various titles. Let me say, however, that no one should feel complacent in his understanding because of attending a meeting, or having read, however carefully, a document describing the act. The complexities, the hidden meanings, and the innate possibilities are such that only through prolonged study, experience, and experimentation will we gain understand-

ing of the real meaning of this historic piece of legislation.

INTERPRETING THE ACT

First of all, we err in our thinking if we fail to appreciate that we have not one act, but five distinctly different ones represented in the five major titles. Each title has different purposes; the funds are distributed by different formulas; the various titles will be administered by different divisions of the Office of Education; and there will be different kinds and degrees of involvement by the State educational agency.

To be sure the titles all have in common the improvement of educational opportunities in elementary and secondary schools. My suggestion is, however, that to plan effectively for the implementation of these programs, we should do our thinking and organizing around the five distinctly different titles, providing, of course, for whatever essential coordination their tangential interrelationships may indicate.

ORIGINAL ACT ONLY A BEGINNING

In contemplating the implications of this act, the future is more important than the present. Its real significance is not in the amount of money to be made available for the coming school year—important as \$50 million may be in supplementing our State and local endeavors.

Anyone who knows the temper of the President, or who reads history, knows that the current allocations are only a small beginning in the breakthrough in Federal responsibility for major financial support of education in this country.

We have a sobering responsibility to plan, and to plan wisely, how to relate the local district and the State to a new partnership in which the Federal Government will be contributing untold billions of dollars for generations on end.

To be sure there will be continuing modification in administration procedures, new formulas, increased allocations, and broadened purposes. However, it appears obvious that in the precedent setting initial plan, it is highly desirable to develop sound plans based on certain validated principles. This will be easier than undoing unsound plans and substituting new ones.

ACT WILL STIMULATE INVENTION

Another reason why the act is more important than the amount of money may suggest is the effect that it will have in stimulating new and imaginative programs. In fact, the scope of potential programs under the various titles, transcends the imagination. One may safely predict that there will immediately emerge countless novel innovations to meet needs for which our traditional programs have been inadequate. This new act may well be the greatest stimulus to inventiveness and adaptability in the history of American education.

LEADERSHIP OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO BE STRENGTHENED

An immediate tangible benefit of the act to Ohio will be to virtually double the operating budget of the State department of education. This can mean a doubling of staff and services and leadership.

This expansion has been urgently sought since the creation of the State board of education, but the necessary budget has never been made available from State sources. This belated tooling up of the State department of education is potentially one of the great educational milestones in our State. The planning essential to this development should challenge the entire professional fraternity of the State, together with boards of education and other interested lay citizens.

The entire cost of this development will be borne by the Federal Government during the first 2 years; subsequently, grants will

be on a matching basis, with the Federal share ranging from 50 to 66 percent.

ACT REPRESENTS MANY COMPROMISES

I do not commend this act to you as a perfect law, nor do I think that any of its most ardent supporters, including the President, would do so. I do believe that it is the best law that could be enacted at this time. My view is that a bill on the books is better than a thousand in the hands of a bill writer. Those who have vainly championed a basic general Federal support bill, and this has been attempted since 1870, understand the practical difficulties in this approach.

We have had to settle here for a categorical aid bill and one which compromises some of our traditional concerns about some very basic principles, including preservation of local control, and separation of church and state. We can only hope and trust that these principles are not seriously compromised or threatened. The answer will depend upon the extent to which citizens at the State and local levels engage in responsible planning. It is for them to provide the flesh and the life blood for the act which at present is only a skeleton.

STATE AND LOCAL CONTROL TO BE PRESERVED

No responsible citizen advocates Federal control of education. Various supporters of the act have inveighed against it including the President, Secretary Celebrezze, Commissioner Keppel, Senator Morse, and Congressman Powell. The real threat of Federal control, however, stems from local apathy. Whenever a vacuum is created through abdication of State and local responsibility, then the needs of children will be met by Federal programs and Federal agents. This is a pattern which seems to operate like Gresham's law. Yet there are some who would advocate that we wait until the U.S. Office of Education tells us what we are supposed to do in developing the State plan for implementing the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965.

To be sure there will be certain basic guides to insure that the intent of the act is being met. These, however, might best be developed from the ideas generated at the local and State levels. In any case, the spirit of the act is clear in encouraging the utmost initiative in local and State planning. The prohibition of Federal control is specifically stated in section 604, which provides "that nothing contained in the Act will be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational materials by any educational institution or school system."

NEW RELATIONSHIPS WITH NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 has ushered in a new era in relationships with nonpublic schools. Whether the provisions are good or bad and for whom is yet to be demonstrated.

Certainly one good thing, in my view, is the new necessity to communicate and to plan together for the educational welfare of all children. In this context we should find "more to unite us than to divide us." All Americans must be equally concerned about preserving the separation of church and state as they must be concerned about providing the best possible educational opportunities for all youngsters of whatever race, religion, or socioeconomic status.

We must not be complacent in assuming that all the old controversies about aid to private and parochial schools were resolved through the passage of this law. My own

view is that there are numerous ambiguities as to what the law means, what was intended, and what is made possible. One who reads the testimony at the hearings is struck by the conflicting interpretations. I personally listened to the debate on the floor of the House and heard the unresolved issues and conflicting views as to what this law really means in terms of such matters as what is "special" and what is not, as applied to services that are to be extended to nonpublic schools. The important point to understand is that a wide range of problems are to be resolved, at the district and State levels, about how the benefits of this act are to be extended to children attending nonpublic schools. These issues should not be left to the vicissitudes of local pressures. Duly constituted representative bodies comprised of responsible leaders from public and nonpublic schools should reason through these highly controversial questions and present guide lines for local adaptation.

THE FORMULA FOR ALLOCATION IS NOT THE FORMULA FOR EXPENDITURES

One major source of misunderstanding stems from the inclination to confuse the formula for distributing funds under title I with a formula for spending these funds in the local district.

The distribution formula is based upon an objective statistic that happens to be available through the Census Bureau, and in no way limits or defines eligible beneficiaries of the act. To be sure this title of the act, where over \$1 billion is allocated for fiscal 1965, is designed to equalize opportunities for educationally and culturally disadvantaged youngsters.

In his explanation of the bill to the Senate, Senator WAYNE MORSE stated with reference to title I of the act:

"The programs must be directed toward the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in areas of high concentration. Other pupils in schools having such programs may benefit since there is no intent to label the individual child as deprived, but the main focus of attention is to be on the educationally deprived child."

Such terms as "disadvantaged" and "educationally deprived" are used interchangeably in the official interpretations of the law. Handicapped youngsters are specifically included as beneficiaries under title I. The suggested programs presented in the hearings cover such a range of possibilities as to make clearly evident that programs will extend far beyond this relatively small group in extreme poverty who constitute the basis in the formula for fund allocations by counties.

Certainly the law does not contemplate that the children of poverty are to be segregated, designated, or stigmatized in a manner to further undermine their self-respect. Neither the pauper's oath or any means test should be applied to any child or his parents in establishing eligibility for admission to programs under title I. I believe that only general indexes of poverty and educational deprivation will be used to justify programs. Many children other than those in abject poverty will properly be included in the various programs.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS TO BE DEVELOPED

The term "compensatory education" has only recently crept into our educational terminology, but it is certain to command more of our attention. There is a valid concept which the term implies—that certain youngsters are handicapped by their environment and require special adaptations in the educational program if they are to have equal educational opportunity. Compensatory education refers to whatever changes are

needed in the usual program to compensate for the cultural handicaps that may have caused certain youngsters to be disadvantaged or handicapped. It means tempering the wind to the shorn lamb. There is a tardy realization that youngsters with language deficits, restricted experiences, impaired health status, antisocial attitudes, and stunted intellectual development are truly handicapped—just as the partially sighted, the deaf, or the cerebral palsied.

Unfortunately, the concept of compensatory education is so new that experiences and research findings are lacking for the design of efficient programs. We have available only the crudest indexes of cost and returns for money spent.

Evaluations of the foundation-supported programs under the great cities school improvement projects have been very sketchy. There is urgent need for research and experimentation with which the universities should assist. This evidence is urgently needed in designing the programs that are to be supported under title I of the act.

Some helpful ideas may be gained from the experience in California with programs supported by the McAtter Act. This was the first State-supported program of compensatory education, and the evaluations from the 24 experimental programs are now being completed. A recent report of special interest summarizes the results of these special programs in San Diego.¹

IMPLEMENTING THE ACT

There should be established immediately a coordinated State planning body with task forces for each of the five major titles, and related to similar local bodies and special interest groups.

This structure should include all segments of the profession, appropriate State and local agencies (private and public), and interested lay citizens.

Staff time and resources for servicing these planning groups should be provided by the Ohio Education Association. However, many other agencies should contribute to the work and to financing the studies. Through planned division of labor, the State department of education, the State board of regents, the universities, and other agencies can all play their indispensable roles.

COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY NEEDED

There is the immediate need to launch a comprehensive statewide survey to determine:

1. The number, location, and kinds of disadvantaged pupils.
2. The types of programs indicated to meet specific needs.
3. The requirements of the indicated compensatory programs in money, staff time, and special facilities.

Guidelines for such studies should be developed to enable counties and individual districts to compile such data. This information will be basic to development of district programs and the State plan.

The special report issued on April 22, by the NEA division of Federal relations urges many forms of "advance action" in preparation for implementing the various titles.

These include such activities as—

1. Determine the most vital needs of educationally deprived students in the community.
2. Determine how programs could be coordinated with those of other Federal acts, including the Economic Opportunity Act.

¹"Pilot Project in Compensatory Education: A Report to the State Advisory Committee on Compensatory Education," submitted by San Diego city schools, Jan. 5, 1965.

3. Survey the resources and needs for library and supplementary educational services.

4. Survey the status of the textbook and instructional materials supply, and determine priorities of need.

These are indicative of the kind of studies that should be launched immediately in every community.

TEACHERS SHOULD BE INCLUDED

The Department of Classroom Teachers of the NEA issued a special bulletin to all local association presidents on April 27. In this "call to action" these significant thoughts are expressed: "That those individuals who work most closely with the children—the classroom teachers—should play a major role in assisting in the development and implementation of the many possible programs provided in the school Federal aid measure.

"Local and State associations are urged to work closely with appropriate school officials—school superintendents and administrators, school boards, and the State education departments—and the community as a whole, in formulating and improving educational programs."

These statements clearly suggest the importance of including teachers in the deliberations to develop both the local and State plans.

MANUAL FOR LOCAL STUDIES NEEDED

An abbreviated manual should be developed for use by local committees in organizing and conducting the studies that are necessary for effective implementation of the act.

Most local leaders feel inadequate at present to initiate this obviously needed activity. In view of the short time remaining in the current school year, committees should be constituted that will function during the summer months. I cite, as a good example of what local committees should be doing, the work that has been progressing for several weeks in Cincinnati. A broadly representative committee, drawing upon the resources of the department of research, has been busy studying the provisions of the act, collecting essential data, and laying plans for initiating the new programs. A special telecast to all teachers was presented by the administration and members of the committee.

All districts should be engaged in similar work, but most of them, lacking resources of a large system, do not know how to proceed.

NEED TO ESTABLISH PRIORITIES

Because of the scope of the potential programs is so broad and the funds so inadequate to cover the possibilities, it would appear essential to establish priorities under each title.

This will not be easy, in view of conflicting interests, but the alternative is to dissipate funds on fragmentary programs. An example may be cited in title III, where Ohio is to receive something less than \$5 million for establishing supplementary educational centers and services. Obviously, this will not reach to all communities of the State except in a perfunctory way. It would be difficult to expend this sum on five centers. Some States are thinking of multicounty intermediate districts to serve schools of an area. The desirability for discriminating use of the funds from title II would also seem apparent. Roughly one-third of the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation are without libraries.

This act might well provide the impetus for the long-needed reorganization of the intermediate district in Ohio. Examples may be seen in Iowa and Pennsylvania to indicate the usefulness of properly constituted intermediate units which might be

supported with funds under titles II, III, and IV. Services might include countywide or region audiovisual centers, textbook and library servicing, data processing, and countless other specialized services which individual districts cannot efficiently provide.

The Los Angeles Science Center and the proposed space-age planetarium for Cleveland are examples of imaginative kinds of new facilities that are made possible under title III.

I conclude this paper with a statement which eloquently presents the rationale of title I of the act. This is quoted from the testimony of Marion Sweet, president of the Philadelphia Teachers Association, before the General Subcommittee on Education:

"I wish that you could come with me into classrooms with 40 to 48 children, most of whom are badly in need of individual instruction, care, and attention. I wish that you could come with me into classes of children, most of whom are hungry, not so much for education as for food, many of whom are ill clad, nearly all of whom live in ghettos, are educated in ghettos, and look forward with little hope or expectation to a life or a future beyond the confines of that ghetto. You could come with me to meet children to whom home and society have already done so much harm that they need remedial care and help.

"You could come with me to meet children who, for the first time, in the first grade will handle their first book. You can meet children for whom the home supplies nothing for school and for whom the teacher must find the extra pencils, the paper, the carfare for trips, et cetera. You will meet children from homes dilapidated, cold, and rundown, and visit with them in schools where plaster drops from the ceiling; broken windows go unfixed; adequate toilet facilities are nonexistent; and broken and faulty heaters endanger their health.

"When I was a very young teacher, I once had a class memorize the lines on the Statue of Liberty: 'Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door.'

"But after 1 year of teaching in the Philadelphia public schools, I no longer could bring myself to expect of these children that they be emotionally moved by these lines. They, themselves, could not identify with this promise, and they were not strangers in this land. This is a promise this Nation made to strangers. Can this Nation afford to do less for the children within its doors? They are the tired; they are the poor; yet they are the promise of this Nation."

THE YOUTH FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Labor announced its intent to put into operation a youth farm labor program for the coming summer. With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD copies of the correspondence between Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and myself concerning this program.

APRIL 1, 1965.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: First, I want to express my deep gratitude for the forthright and courageous stand you have taken on the question of the Bracero program and the further importation of foreign laborers to do agricultural work.

As you know, I have fought the Bracero program ever since I first came to Washington as a Congressman. This year, I have been following with intense interest your efforts to resist the demands of the large growers and others that the Bracero program be revived. My own concern has been expressed in the numerous statements I have made on the subject on the floor of the House and the newspaper accounts I have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Enclosed are two recent statements I made for the RECORD on March 26 and March 29. I am also enclosing a copy of my bill, H.R. 2422, to extend minimum wage protection to farmworkers. I believe my bill contains many of your recommendations on the subject.

Again, I would like to compliment you on the tremendous job you have done with this problem.

Second, I would like to discuss a related matter that seems to be looming over the horizon. Recently, efforts within the Department of Labor to form a Youth Farm Labor program have been brought to my attention. Apparently work on this project has gone quite far, although it has not been finally approved. I urge you to consider the consequences that implementation of this program would have.

According to my information, it is now planned that approximately 156,000 youths will be recruited with the aid of the Department of Labor for summer employment on farms this year—4,000 are to come from college campuses, between 3,000 and 5,000 from large cities, the remainder from communities throughout the Nation. I understand that many of those youngsters will be placed on farms near their residences, but that many will be transported hundreds and even thousands of miles. I am also informed that about 25,000 youths will be processed for farmwork through Manpower Development and Training Act projects.

The conditions of substandard housing, hygiene, wages, and other working conditions in the agriculture industry are too well known to bear repeating in this letter. However, I would like to point out that for a decade the bracero program was used to supply farms with a source of cheap labor. The use of foreign farmworkers, because they came from the lower income group and because they were used to low pay and poor working conditions, and because they felt that they were lucky to have any jobs at all, was an ideal way to keep working conditions in the farm industry in the miserable, depressed state that it is in even today.

In my judgment, the use of youths on farms will have the same effect. They too will come from the lower income groups. They too will be used to low pay or no pay. They too will feel lucky to have any jobs at all. Further, it is incomprehensible to me that so long as there are millions of unemployed adults with family responsibilities that low-wage jobs for youngsters would be subsidized by the Government.

The end result of this Youth Farm Labor program could be to raise a crop of domestic braceros in place of the vanished foreign braceros. I do not believe you would want this.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 14, 1965.

HON. HENRY P. GONZALEZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GONZALEZ: Thank you for your letter of April 1, regarding the Department's program to recruit agricultural workers. Mr. Ganz of the Department's Manpower Administration has discussed the matter with Mr. Kaufman of your office.

First, let me assure you that the prime goal is to provide job opportunities in agriculture for unemployed adults under the highest labor standards and the best working conditions possible under existing legislation and authority. Toward this end, the Department is concentrating its major effort to recruit adult workers for farm jobs as close as possible to their places of residence.

The various youth recruitment programs to which you refer will be used merely as supplements if the adult recruitment program does not fulfill all the needs. These, too, will be administered under the maximum standards permissible. I am certain you will agree that this plan is infinitely preferable to resorting to the importation of farmworkers to fill unmet needs.

I will welcome any information and assistance in recruiting adult farmworkers who may be interested in jobs under appropriate standards and working conditions.

Sincerely,
W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

THE SAN ANTONIO RIVER BARGE CANAL

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, soon after my first election to the Congress of the United States, I proposed that studies be made of the feasibility of improving the San Antonio River from the city of San Antonio to the Gulf of Mexico, about 158 miles away. The San Antonio Chamber of Commerce, the business community, and the people in and around the Alamo city were captivated by the idea and have been working toward this goal ever since.

The navigation studies which I urged resulted in the resumption of studies which actually were begun in 1917. In that year the Corps of Engineers made the first study to canalize the San Antonio River. However, the greater need for flood control along the course of the river led to suspension of work on the navigation studies in 1948. Now it appears that the Corps of Engineers will soon complete the economic, engineering, and related studies. I am hopeful that the results of these studies will favor the development and improvement of the San Antonio River in the interests of San Antonio and all of south Texas.

I will continue to make full reports of the progress of this project to my colleagues in the House. I will now introduce for the RECORD, with unanimous consent, a speech by Col. John E. Unverferth,

district engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, delivered at the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce Installation Ceremonies, May 18, 1965, reporting on the work being done on the San Antonio River canal:

REMARKS BY COL. JOHN E. UNVERFERTH, DISTRICT ENGINEER, BEFORE THE SAN ANTONIO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., MAY 18, 1965

Mr. Chairman, Congressman GONZALEZ, Lieutenant Governor Smith, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that pleasant introduction. It is always a delight for me to be in your historic city either for business or pleasure. I am speaking, too, for the employees of the Galveston district who, while discharging their duties through the years, have appreciated the kindness and cooperation of the good people of San Antonio.

My remarks will deal primarily with a résumé of the Corps of Engineers' current study concerning the feasibility of improving the San Antonio River for a navigation channel to San Antonio. We are a long way from having a shovel in hand, but we are making progress.

Dating as far back as 1917, the Corps of Engineers has made several studies of the feasibility of canalizing the San Antonio River. The study authorization, approved in 1938, pertains to a navigation study of the San Antonio River.

In response to the 1938 resolution, an interim report on the Guadalupe River was prepared in 1939. The report recommended improvement of the lower Guadalupe River for navigation to Victoria, and construction of the Canyon Dam Reservoir for regulation of streamflow and to control headwater floods. These projects are nearing completion at this time.

A preliminary examination report on the San Antonio River was prepared in 1946. The district engineer recommended that a survey of the San Antonio River be undertaken to determine a plan of improvement and an estimate of cost, and that the report be combined with the report of survey on the Guadalupe River. Since a navigation channel via either the Guadalupe or San Antonio River would serve the San Antonio trade area, the Chief of Engineers directed that a combined study be made of both rivers to determine their economic feasibility. During the period 1946-48 detailed studies were made of barge canal routes in both rivers. The greater urgency at that time for flood control in the two basins led to suspension of further work on the navigation studies in 1948. However, a favorable interim report on flood control was submitted in 1950, leaving completion of the navigation aspects for a later report. Due to the Korean war and resultant shortage of general investigations funds in the early 1950's, and the lack of local interest, further studies of both the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers were deferred.

Soon after his election, your Congressman, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, began pressing for resumption of the suspended navigation studies. Consequently, an initial appropriation of \$17,500 was secured for resumption of the studies in fiscal year 1963, and subsequent funds have been appropriated for continuing the study to date.

With the cooperation of Congressman GONZALEZ, the San Antonio River Authority and many others, a public hearing was held at the Gunter Hotel in San Antonio in May of 1963. The hearing was attended by 500 people who were enthusiastic about canalization of the San Antonio River. At this hearing, the manager of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority supported the investigation of the San Antonio River for navigation to the city of San Antonio, and made no request

for a study of the Guadalupe River for navigation.

After the hearing we cranked up our program for the survey investigations of the San Antonio River to insure an orderly pursuit and completion of the economic, engineering, and related studies.

Our current economic investigations are comprehensive in scope, and will evaluate the proposed project under current conditions and under conditions which may be expected to occur during the economic life of the project. For economic analyses, this is considered to be a period of 50 years after the waterway project is in operation.

The major economic study involves the appraisal of navigation benefits which could be expected to accrue from the proposed canalized waterway to San Antonio. Detailed investigations and studies are being made to develop present and future estimates of commodities and tonnages which can be accepted as sound prospective commerce on the proposed waterway.

To determine the commodities and tonnage of the waterway, a field traffic survey was made in mid-1964. Four of our men canvassed 87 Texas counties and 2 New Mexico counties which the San Antonio River Authority considers to be the commercial tributary trade area to the proposed waterway. Over 600 contacts were made by these men. Undoubtedly, some of you were among those contacted at your place of business. We have completed the tedious task of screening and rating the information obtained in the field survey. With this information we have made a preliminary determination of the prospective annual tonnages and the savings in transportation cost creditable to the San Antonio Waterway.

To clarify this, we have determined the cost of shipping a commodity between two points by considering the cost of shipping via the proposed waterway versus the cost of shipping the commodity by other modes of transportation, using present-day shipping rates. This is called a rate study. If the shipment is cheaper by some mode of transportation other than the waterway, the commodity is not accepted as prospective waterway traffic. If the shipment is cheaper via the waterway, the commodity is accepted as prospective waterway traffic, and the difference in cost of transportation is creditable as a benefit. The total of all savings in transportation costs constitutes the greatest percentage of benefits to be considered in the economic justification of the waterway.

The economic justification of any requested improvement is determined by a comparison of the estimated benefits that would be derived from the improvement versus the estimated cost of the improvement, both on an annual basis. When we speak of costs, we mean all costs, whether Federal or local. If the estimated annual benefits for a proposed improvement exceed the estimated annual costs, we consider the project economically justified, and worthy of adoption and construction by the Federal Government.

Preliminary engineering studies of the proposed waterway have been completed, giving consideration to a plan of improvement for a canalized waterway from near San Antonio to a connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in San Antonio Bay.

Preliminary studies indicate that the length of waterway between these two points would be about 158 miles, and would require 17 locks and movable gated dams to overcome approximately 420 feet of river fall. To adequately provide for barge operation for projected prospective commerce during the 50-year life of the project, the waterway tentatively would have a bottom width of 125 feet and a depth of 12 feet. On the basis of these features, we have determined the estimated annual charges to be considered

in the preliminary analysis of the economic justification of the proposed waterway.

We have reached a checkpoint in our studies and are now arranging for a meeting with representatives of the Office, Chief of Engineers, and our Southwestern Division at Dallas. Our preliminary studies will be reviewed to determine further courses of action related to detailed engineering and economic studies, which will definitely establish the economic justification of the waterway project. It is anticipated that we will have a decision in these matters during the early part of this summer. Subsequently, local interests as represented by the San Antonio River Authority, will be advised of our findings.

We are planning to continue our current studies to completion. Additional economic studies will include further analyses of the accepted prospective waterway traffic. An estimate of the waterway transportation benefits will be made on the basis of current barge line-haul costs versus current rates of competing overland carriers. The barge line-haul costs will be determined by navigation specialists in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

A traffic consultant will be employed to furnish the rates of competing carriers. Personnel of my office will make a rate study to determine the savings in transportation costs creditable to the waterway. In accordance with a recent directive from the Chief of Engineers, an estimate of the waterway transportation benefits will be made on the basis of projected water-compelled rates. In developing the projected rates or charges, consideration will be given to all data and factors that are likely to modify current rates to take account of the competitive situation anticipated with the waterway in being, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media.

We are also required to make an economic base study of the tributary trade area of the proposed waterway. The purpose of this study is to present an economic analysis of the past, present, and future level of economic development of the tributary trade area.

The study will include comparative historical data and projections for the several economic indicators for the United States, the State of Texas, and the tributary trade area. Studies will be made of population growth, personal income, employment, agriculture, manufacturing and other related economic indicators of the area. The economic base study will provide a sound basis of economic trends and index factors for projection of the current acceptable waterway traffic over the life of the proposed improvement.

A study will also be made of the natural resources of the tributary trade area. Consideration will be given to the development of these resources, their production, existing and potential markets, and present methods of distribution, to determine whether full development of the resources would provide additional prospective waterway traffic.

Without dwelling on specifics and details of the engineering studies to be completed, I shall enumerate some of the major studies:

1. Subsurface investigation of the foundation materials at lock and dam sites and the determination of materials to be encountered in construction of the waterway.
2. Lock size formulation study to determine the most feasible and economical size of lock to be provided from the standpoint of handling maximum prospective tonnage and minimum amount of water for lock operation.
3. Channel size formulation study to determine the most feasible size of channel required for barge operation.
4. Channel alignment studies to determine the most feasible route either via the river

channel or by a combination of river channel and river cutoff alignments.

5. Studies concerning highway and railroad bridge modifications or relocation to provide for passage of barge navigation through the bridges.

6. Studies concerning the relocation of utility lines, including pipelines, powerlines, telephone lines, and other utility crossings.

7. A study of the lands required for the waterway, including a gross real estate appraisal of the rights-of-way, spoil disposal areas, severed lands, lock and dam sites and highway rights-of-way to provide access to the lock sites.

8. Design studies of the various locks and dams including detailed estimates of first costs of these structures and of other construction features of the waterway.

9. A study of the water resources of the drainage area adjoining the proposed waterway, including analysis of the water supply required for lock operation and such losses as evaporation from the water areas between locks, probable seepage losses at lock sites and accidents and operating contingencies at the lock structures.

In planning a canalized waterway project for the San Antonio River, one of the major questions to be resolved concerns the adequacy of the water supply and the water requirements for navigation on the canalized waterway. The operation of navigation would necessitate supplying water at the head of navigation or along the course of the river as may be required to meet the various uses and losses. The size, lift, and location of the locks of the plan of improvement will be considered with a view to minimizing the water requirements.

A preliminary estimate of the water required for maximum tonnage movement on the waterway, including water losses, indicates that on the basis of a lock 84 feet wide, 600 feet long, and 30-foot lift, about 980 acre-feet (or 319 million gallons) of water would be required for daily operation of the waterway. Since a large portion of the water supply for operation of the waterway will be derived from return flows from the city of San Antonio, it appears that a water storage reservoir will be required upstream of the proposed turning basin to assure a dependable source of water supply. Our studies will definitely include a thorough investigation of the various means of obtaining an adequate water supply.

Certainly, local agencies lend a hearty hand in a successful navigation project. Some projects have been abandoned because of the lack of local cooperation. If the canalization of the San Antonio River is authorized and funds are appropriated, some local interests will have to—

1. Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required to include suitable areas for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments.

2. Hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from the construction and maintenance of the project.

3. Provide and maintain, at local expense, adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal basis.

4. Provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas.

5. Accomplish without cost to the United States such alterations as required in sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities.

6. Provide, as may be required, a proportionate share of the cost of railroad and highway bridge alterations over existing channels.

7. Contribute in cash or equivalent work a share of the construction cost if such contribution is required because of special or local benefits.

Before closing, I would like to reiterate that if we continue our studies of the San Antonio waterway, it is presently scheduled that they would be completed in fiscal year 1968. A report on our study will probably be submitted to our division engineer in Dallas by about mid-1969. Subsequently, the division engineer will issue a public notice concerning submission of the report and the findings of the study. Issuance of the public notice means that the studies have been completed at this level and the report is under consideration by higher authority.

I presume you would like to know what action local interests can undertake to advance our studies. At this time, we shall have to delay any action until we know what decision will come from the pending meeting of higher officials this summer.

It is a pleasure to be with you tonight and to inform you of the status of our studies of the San Antonio River waterway. I wish to express both my personal and official thanks to all who have made this meeting possible, and also to thank you for your attention.

LAUNCHING OF THE KENT STATE UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF URBAN REGIONALISM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call to the attention of this body the successful launching of the Kent State University Center for the Study of Urban Regionalism on May 21 and 22, 1965.

Under the leadership of Kent State University's president, Dr. Robert I. White, leaders in Government, education, and metropolitan planning gathered to learn and to teach about the problems of urbanization in the northeastern Ohio area and the Nation.

One of the highlights of the conference was an address delivered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator, Dr. Robert C. Weaver. Dr. Weaver emphasized the importance of local cooperation with State planning programs. He was highly praiseworthy of Kent State for opening its center on regional planning as the means to a brighter future for orderly development of northeastern Ohio.

Dr. Weaver strongly emphasized the importance of injecting plans to develop and maintain existing natural beauty as an integral part of orderly regional development. President and Mrs. Johnson's beautification program will undoubtedly find great support in this program.

The presence and contributions of the Senator from Maine, EDMUND MUSKIE, were immense. He spoke eloquently of the need for careful utilization of existing resources in an urban region. He spoke strongly of the need for massive water and air pollution control and abatement programs for the northeastern Ohio area and others throughout the Nation. Senator MUSKIE pointed out that if techniques and controls are not developed to reuse water now being polluted and wasted that our use of

water by 1970 would far exceed the available supply.

Senator MUSKIE and Dr. Weaver proved once again that they are true champions for the development of the Great Society concept of rendering life of the urban dweller as pleasant and ordered as is humanly possible.

Tom Vail, editor-publisher of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, spoke in like terms of the needs and desires, aspirations and hopes of an urban region such as ours in northeastern Ohio. His eloquence and substance added further to this auspicious launching of the Kent State University Center for Urban Regionalism.

The foresight and imagination which Kent State University's president, Dr. Robert I. White, and his hard-working staff have invested in this project from its inception can mean nothing but success from both the standpoint of its academic and practical or operational success. The people of northeastern Ohio will stand to benefit greatly from the commitment of a great university to the problems of our great urban region of northeastern Ohio.

I wish to include at this point in the RECORD the important remarks of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE and Dr. Robert C. Weaver which were delivered at the Kent State University Conference on Urban Regionalism which signaled the opening of this historic endeavor:

THE URBAN CRISIS AND THE QUEST FOR THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Address by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE before the Conference on Urban Regionalism, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, May 22, 1965)

I am glad to have this opportunity to speak to this conference and to join in commemorating the formal establishment of Kent State's new center for urban regionalism.

The crisis created by the emergence of an urban American constitutes the most important single problem in the field of intergovernmental relations today. It contains the greatest threat to our traditional Federal-State-local relations. Yet, it provides us with the best opportunity to implement President Johnson's ideal of a "creative federalism."

Historians tell us that the old frontier was closed by 1890. But 20th century developments tell us we have a new metropolitan frontier, and the quest for the Great Society is, in large measure, a search for the good life on this frontier.

Let us look at the nature of the metropolitan frontier in human terms. About 2,600 years ago, the prophet, Isaiah, capsuled the problem with this warning:

"Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no more room, and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land."

As we approach the end of the 20th century, Isaiah's prophetic warning must be our challenge.

Our sprawling urban areas can be made stimulating homes for the human spirit. They can provide the environment for the good life. But unless we devote more of our creative energies to solving our galloping urban problems of housing, education, transportation, pollution, recreation, indifference, and others, our cities can choke human growth and entomb the human spirit.

At the heart of our urban dilemma is the phenomenal population growth.

Its impact on housing alone staggers the imagination. In New York, for example, with its massive housing program, 1.25 million residents live in substandard homes. There are 600,000 New Yorkers who are eligible for, but cannot get into public housing. Since 1950, about 800,000 middle-income residents have vacated New York for the suburbs. This, despite the evidence that many would prefer to stay if apartments were larger and less expensive, if schools were better, if streets and parks were safer, and if transportation were less cramped and painful.

Air and water pollution are problems which I have come to know in great detail. They are a threat to our health, to our prosperity, and to our civilization itself; and they are most pronounced in metropolitan America.

We know that smog can be a killer, but do we also realize that air pollution causes \$11 billion in property damage a year, and that long-term low- to medium-level air pollution contributes to and aggravates a host of crippling diseases?

Water pollution is an even more severe problem. Within just 15 years, our demands for water will outrun our supply by at least 85 billion gallons a day. By the year 2000, the daily demand is expected to be 350 billion gallons greater than the supply. This means that we must accelerate our efforts to clean up fouled water and to reuse it, not only for swimming, for fishing, for drinking, but for industry as well.

Statistics are one way of describing the urban dilemma, but behind every decision and program to improve our metropolitan areas must be concern for people, for children playing on a dirty, sunless sidewalk; for families living in crowded flats; for the office girl walking home at night; for the student seeking broader educational opportunities; for the businessman driving his car over snarled highways or riding a commuter train; for boys looking for a lot big enough to play baseball, or for a clean pond to swim in; for citizens looking for leadership; and for many others.

There was a Maine lobsterman who was asked if he was afraid of the atomic bomb. "The only thing I'm afraid of," he said, "is people, and there ain't any around where I work."

People are the problem, and also the reason for our concern and the purpose of our efforts. These problems must be our own, because most of us live in urban regions, and many more of us will in the years to come.

With this greater urban concentration will come a greater dispersion of this population over a wider and wider area. During the decade of the fifties, regions classified as urban by the Bureau of the Census increased from 12,000 to 25,000 square miles in area—and almost one-fifth of that area was accounted for by your own northeastern Ohio urban complex. By 1980 your region will experience a 26-percent population expansion and most of the increase will occur in the outer fringe suburbs.

In 1960, there were 212 regions in the United States classified as standard metropolitan statistical areas. Two-thirds of our citizens lived in these areas, and were served by 18,442 local governments.

After analyzing this national trend, one authority recently predicted that "by the end of the century, the United States will possess at least five supermetropolises which will have the general complexity and geographical extent of the present-day metropolitan area of New York."

The dimensions of this future growth stagger the imagination. To you of this area, however, it must appear only as a national projection of your own experience of the past decade and a half. For northeastern Ohio, with its five standard metropolitan statistical areas and its aggregate population

of more than 3¼ million, is, in fact, in the process of joining one of these five supermetropolises.

I do not have to burden this audience with a long explanation of all the dimensions of this urban crisis.

You are aware of the problems of numerous overlapping and competing jurisdictions of local government, the average number of independent units of government per metropolitan area is 87. There are 1,060 in the Chicago area, and 1,400 in the Greater New York region.

You are aware of the disparities between the costs and the benefits of governmental services among local governments in urban areas.

You are aware of the imperfect performance of such major governmental functions as urban transportation, water supply, sewage disposal, air pollution control, and so on, due to the spread of population beyond the jurisdiction of individual governmental units.

You are aware of restrictive State constitutional provisions that inhibit the easy adaptation of local government to meet present and prospective needs.

And I am sure you are aware of the lack of effective coordination among the many Federal programs that directly affect urban areas.

Yet, awareness is not enough. Central to all these problems is the fact that the metropolitan area has become, in effect, a new kind of community. But it is a community whose members have little or no "feeling of belonging." Wolf von Eckhardt has warned that comprehensive regional planning is useless if it remains a "theoretical exercise confined to study groups, commissions and boards with insufficient political and popular support to make it effective." Unless we can generate a genuine sense of regional loyalty in terms of joint resolve, common effort and shared resources, the pressures to make our urban areas wards of the Federal Government may well become irresistible.

The traditional concept of intergovernmental relations has two dimensions. One presupposes three levels of government—Federal, State and local, with separate powers and personnel and with independent constituencies and decisionmaking processes.

The second stipulates that many governmental activities are shaped by all levels of government and involve each in significant and continuing responsibilities.

Most politicians and many academicians tend to accept one or the other of these views. Yet the record reveals that both are accurate descriptions of the remarkable 176-year history of American federalism.

The urban crisis challenges us to create effective metropolitan planning agencies without divorcing them from the meaningful political bases which have been the foundations of American federalism.

The genius of the American system of government has been that it has enabled us to preserve freedom and, at the same time, deal effectively with our problems.

We have done so in the framework of the Federal system which was established 176 years ago.

The metropolitan area is a problem which does not fit into that framework. We must find a way to govern it which, again, will preserve freedom and, at the same time, deal effectively with the problem.

Some students of our society believe the growth of supercities will erase the traditional distinctions among city-county-State and Federal responsibilities.

It seems to me important to maintain these distinctions while expanding areas of intergovernmental cooperation.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, concluded from a study of metropolitan areas that a single areawide government whose boundaries are coterminous

with the scope of a particular service is neither likely nor necessarily appropriate. This Commission further stated:

"In many situations, it appears more likely that ad hoc, or function by function, arrangements among existing local units will assure that these functions will be performed more efficiently on an areawide basis. Such arrangements will require allocating the costs of services among the independent units on a fair and equitable basis."

I spoke earlier of America's old and new frontiers. Timely cooperation and tough-minded individualism were the keys to survival on the 19th century's Western frontier. They have equal relevance to meeting the dangers threatening us on the 20th century's metropolitan frontier. The experience of your area, in my opinion, indicated that cooperation, as well as independence, can be a dynamic attitude as well as a method of procedure. The balancing of local demands for autonomy against the regional need for coordination and planning is always difficult to achieve, but you are on the right road.

You have found the middle road between the extremes of "standpatism" and a federated metropolitan government by the establishment of regional planning commissions in four of your five standard metropolitan statistical areas.

You have blended the political know-how of elected local officials with the professionalism of the planners and the engineers in the design of these commissions.

And, you here, by creating this new center for urban regionalism and by launching a regional advisory council, will, I am sure, balance the interests of each of these five urban areas with the interests of the northeastern area as a whole.

The combined activities of the regional planning commissions, your center, and its advisory council incorporate the essential elements of a dynamic, voluntary approach to solving your regional problems. These public and private agencies have assumed the responsibility for research, long- and short-range metropolitan planning, technical advice and assistance, and the necessary political leadership. They will strengthen immeasurably the cooperative ideal in this metropolitan area. But they will also provide a broader opportunity for Ohio's traditional individualism to express itself.

The State government also bears a responsibility for strengthening the basis of regional cooperation. As a matter of fact, the ultimate responsibility for easing and resolving these problems rests primarily with this level of government. Nearly a decade ago the Council of State Governments stated the following in a report to the Governors' Conference, of which I was then a member:

"Although the roles of local governments and the National Government are indispensable, the States are the key to solving the complex difficulties that make up the general metropolitan problem. To achieve adequate results the State governments—the legislative and the executive branches, and the people—need to exert positive, comprehensive and sustained leadership in solving the problem."

States have tended to react to the urban crisis in a haphazard fashion. Few have led. Some, by continued inactivity, have been obstacles to corrective action. The fiscal, jurisdictional research and planning needs of large urban centers have commonly been ignored or, when treated, handled on a piecemeal basis. The advisory commission on intergovernmental relations reports that metropolitan areas receive less State aid annually than nonmetropolitan areas—an average of \$9 per capita less.

Such neglect has led to a more direct, and often more responsive, Federal-local collaboration. This alarmed the defenders of States rights more than it has encouraged the proponents of States responsibilities.

Ohio's response is better than that of many other States. Your legislature has enacted many permissive measures, including provisions for interlocal agreements, voluntary transfer functions, and the coordination of States water resources. These constitute an arsenal of weapons for use by local units of government in their attack on some of the metropolitan area problems. The recently created State legislative committees on urban affairs, and their interest in the proposed strengthening of your laws on municipal incorporation and annexation, are other encouraging developments. But these are only beginnings.

All State governments should establish a special unit to give continuing attention, review, and assistance to the States urban areas.

Most States need to expand their financial and technical assistance to metropolitan jurisdictions in the fields of urban planning, urban renewal, building code modernization, and local government organization and finance.

Most States should establish a special unit to give continuing attention, review, and assistance to the States urban areas.

Most States need to expand their financial and technical assistance to metropolitan jurisdictions in the fields of urban planning, urban renewal, building code modernization, and local government organization and finance.

Most States should take stronger financial and regulatory action to secure and preserve open land in and around urban centers.

And nearly all States should take legislative or administrative action to resolve those disputes among local units of urban government which cannot be settled at the local level.

The Federal Government must also assume its full share of the urban burden. The national character of many metropolitan questions makes this mandatory. More than 50 Federal programs are now operating in our urban areas and most of them have been enacted since 1950. The future is not likely to reverse this trend. The rapid urban growth, new technologies and fragmented responsibilities for local government in urban areas that I have described are making these Federal programs increasingly interdependent, and their impact on other objectives of the urban community is becoming more pronounced. Authority and effort are needed in Washington—as well as in the States and metropolitan areas—to assure that each of these programs contributes not only to its more limited program goal but also to the general goal of orderly urban development. Three current case studies indicate that Washington is responding to this challenge. First, for more than 2 years the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has been examining the questions of Federal-State-local relations, including the vexing problems of our metropolitan areas. Last month we held a week of hearings on a bill introduced this year and which 39 Senators cosponsored. This proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965 is of paramount importance to you here and to all the other metropolitan regions of the country.

Title 4 of the bill merits your special consideration, since it establishes a national urban assistance policy. It prescribes full consideration of all viewpoints—national, regional, State and local—in planning urban development programs and projects. Each Federal administrator, in this framework, would be obliged to coordinate his efforts with those of other Federal agencies. And his plans must be part of—or consistent with—local and regional planning objectives.

Another section of this title stipulates that applications for grants and loans under certain urban programs would be reviewed and commented upon—but not vetoed—by

an areawide planning body composed of elected officials of the general units of local government. This provision is designed to strengthen metropolitan planning and to assist Federal agencies in their evaluation of grant applications. It will not protect the integrity of local and regional planning objectives from subversion by a fragmented and uncoordinated Federal approach to urban development.

A second case study in Federal responses to metropolitan problems is covered in the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965, which I was privileged to introduce in this session. The bill has now passed both Houses of Congress. It increases grants for the construction of municipal sewage treatment works and provides financial assistance to municipalities and other bodies for the separation of combined sewers. Of special concern to metropolitan areas such as yours is the provision that the grants may be increased by 10 percent for projects which are part of a comprehensive regional plan. This incentive approach has already worked well in the "open space program." It will strengthen our attempt to curb water pollution and I am convinced that the device should be extended to other Federal programs.

A third proposal would create a broad instrument for dealing with the urban crisis at both the national and grassroots levels. The Federal Government's reaction to the emergence of a metropolitan America—like that of the States—has generally been disjointed, sporadic, and unplanned. Most of the efforts to date relate to specific programs or to local planning.

For this reason, I supported and worked for President Kennedy's proposal for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in 1961 and subsequent years. I am also cosponsoring President Johnson's proposal to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This legislation is needed to improve the administration and coordination of the principal Federal programs which provide assistance for housing and the development of the Nation's urban communities.

It will help promote interstate, regional, and metropolitan collaboration.

It will provide better technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse service, to these units of State and local government.

I believe this department is a necessary instrument in our struggle to achieve a more measured metropolitan development.

No one of these proposals for Federal action will alone solve the urban crisis. But when combined, they offer a meaningful answer to the task President Johnson set before us in his State of the Union message when he charged us "to break the old patterns, to begin to think, work, and plan for development of entire metropolitan areas."

There are many who deem these measures drastic or undesirable. May I simply remind them what we have at stake in the urban crisis.

About 70 percent of our population lives in metropolitan areas. According to the latest figures available, 78.6 percent of all the Nation's bank deposits are in metropolitan area banks; 70 percent of the Nation's assessable property lies within the boundaries of metropolitan areas; 76.3 percent of value added by manufacture originates in metropolitan areas. These regions account for 67.2 percent of the country's manufacturing establishments; 73.8 percent of all industrial employees and 78.5 percent of all manufacturing payrolls.

I suggest that the measures we propose do not exceed the problems we face. Each of the 135 million Americans who lives in a metropolis is entitled to a meaningful life in a healthy environment. The potential is there; we must realize it.

Our concern is for preservation of human dignity in a democratic society. I should like to conclude by reading to you the oath taken by citizens of another and earlier democratic society no less concerned with the fate of human dignity in a metropolis.

"We will never bring disgrace to this our city, by any act of dishonesty or cowardice. Nor ever desert our suffering comrades in the ranks; we will fight for the ideals and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many."

"We will revere and obey the city's laws and do our best to incite a like respect in those above us who are prone to annul or set them at naught; we will strive unceasingly to quicken the public's sense of civic duty, thus in all these ways we will transmit this city not only not less, but greater, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

So vowed the Athenians long ago. We might well renew that vow as a prelude to renewing our cities.

ORDER AND BEAUTY IN MEGALOPOLIS
(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Conference on Urban Regionalism, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, May 21, 1965)

It is really rather exciting to be in on the birth of an idea—in this case, the concept of a special center for the study of regional development. Such centers are still very rare and our technology is still primitive. But there is no doubt whatever about the essential need for such centers, and for such meticulous attention to the problems of metropolitan growth and change.

And I am impressed by the scale of your thinking concerning the role of such a regional center. Not only will the center serve as a clearinghouse for data gathered throughout the region and a junction for the most effective use of available university resources, but it will also become the focus for a badly needed joint effort of Government, business, labor, and education on the complexities of regional growth. And I agree fully with your president, Dr. White, who has said that "Megalopolis carries a challenge. It is a testing ground of the strength and adaptability of American democracy."

This challenge is immense. And there are already real questions as to whether our democratic institutions are rising to meet it with anything like the speed that the situation demands. The President posed the challenge well in his historic message on the cities:

"Between today and the year 2000, more than 80 percent of our population increase will occur in urban areas. During the next 15 years, 30 million people will be added to our cities—equivalent to the combined population of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Baltimore. Each year in the coming generation, we will add the equivalent of 15 cities of 20,000 each."

Furthermore, the President told us, "In the remainder of this century—in less than 40 years—urban population will double, city land will double and we will have to build in our cities as much as all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States."

Urbanization—the growth of urban areas—has been going on in this country for a long time. But for many years it was possible to ignore urban growth, or at least to take a laissez-faire attitude toward it. There was then very little realization that this growth represented the emergence in this country of a new frontier—a frontier of intensive development comparable in its challenges and opportunities to the old frontier of extensive development.

Most of you here are familiar with the long catalog of problems which have

emerged as a result of urbanization: The migration of low-income families to the centers of cities; the migration of moderate- and higher-income families to the suburbs; the movement of business to the suburbs; racial discrimination in housing, schools, and public facilities; unemployment, aggravated by the spread of automation; the skyrocketing cost of replacing and expanding schools and other essential physical facilities; the impossible tangle of traffic and transportation needs.

Every one of these involves a host of immediate needs for those who live and work in urban areas. City and county budgets—even with the help available from the Federal Government—are strained to the utmost in attempting to meet the needs that exist now.

The very thought of the needs that will exist tomorrow sometimes seems overwhelming. Yet it is essential that we do look to the needs of tomorrow if we are to succeed in meeting them better than we have those of today.

This is why the metropolitan and regional planning activities that are going on throughout the Nation are so important to the future of our country. That is why this center will fulfill not only a vital regional need, but also a vital national need.

We believe strongly that planning for urban regions cannot be left exclusively to the technicians—be they city planners, highway engineers, economists, or other specialists. The development of metropolitan areas must be guided by responsible local leaders—elected officials and others. At the same time the technical planning needs to be tied closely to comprehensive planning carried out under local and regional auspices.

In this context, your own region does indeed pose a challenge. As in most fast-growing regions, governmental arrangements are still primitive or nonexistent, for the most part, and there are still great gaps in our knowledge both of the factors of growth and their consequences.

The Federal role is to help local enterprise—private and public—fill these gaps. In your own region, we are helping do this through a special grant for urban planning assistance aimed at developing information on the interrelationships between land use and transportation. Federal funds have been supporting the study-design phase of this program, and soon work will be starting on the planning itself. This is a landmark undertaking, in the context of our usually too slow reactions to the pace of urban growth. The very fact that 7 counties, comprising a region where more than 2 million persons live and 140 municipal and township governments exercise authority, can get together and come up with any plan at all is an achievement.

And it is an achievement that holds out the promise to dozens of similar regions throughout the country that they, too, can surmount their local rivalries and join in planning for their future. In this respect, the work of your Tricounty Regional Planning Commission has also offered a prime example of intergovernmental planning coordination. Tricounty has four 701 urban planning assistance projects completed or underway.

This is exactly the sort of metropolitan—or even megalopolitan—effort that the Federal Government is now attempting to stimulate. President Johnson, in his message on the cities, proposed several new programs which will “* * * require sound, long-range development programs as a condition of Federal assistance. Wherever it can be done without leaving vital needs unmet, existing programs will also be keyed to planning requirements.”

In the new housing and community development legislation now being discussed on Capitol Hill, several new programs have been proposed which have as their foundation conformance with areawide comprehensive planning. The proposed programs for providing sewer and water facilities are a case in point. These badly needed community facilities should be planned for broad metropolitan areas to permit all local governments to realize the economies of scale which accrue through such large-scale development.

Likewise, the program for advance land acquisition would demand conformance with metropolitan planning, to permit the most rational ordering of fast-dwindling urban land resources. This program would encourage communities to plan their public works needs in a more orderly fashion, and thereby maximize the efficiency of local development.

Programs for mass transportation and open space already require conformance with comprehensive areawide planning. And in July of this year, the planning requirements of the Federal Highway Act will take effect. No funds will be approved after that date for highways in any urban area of more than 50,000 population unless there is an established comprehensive transportation planning process for the whole urban area. Such planning must be a cooperative effort of local communities and State highway departments.

Tomorrow Senator MUSKIE will undoubtedly tell you about the so-called Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965 which would refine still further planning requirements regarding Federal aids to local development. This measure would require that projects aided by Federal funds be consistent with local planning objectives and that any applications for Federal aid for urban renewal, hospitals, air pollution, and so forth be reviewed and commented upon by the officially designated metropolitan planning agency for the region. This act would also favor city and county governments over special service districts as recipients of Federal aids.

Some planners, perhaps dismayed by the pace of urbanization, have called for a broader Federal role in planning per se. I am very strongly inclined to resist such proposals. I feel that the physical planning of land uses and determination of the scale and the detail of development should be kept as close as possible to the people most intimately involved. In our Federal system, the State government is the repository of legal authority for municipal powers. The Federal Government should, as it does, offer incentives and aids to State and local governments for the initiation and execution of policies and programs which have clearly discernible national implications. The orderly development of our metropolitan growth is just such a task. The Federal Government will continue to establish national policy objectives and programs to achieve those objectives. It will continue to provide financial and technical assistance to State and local governments which need and desire such help.

But I would much prefer to see many more centers for urban regionalism, such as this one you are launching at Kent State, than a proliferation of Federal planning. A center such as yours offers the opportunity for local, including county, and State governments to coordinate planning with business and leading institutions. The Federal role in this process is to establish broad policies and offer financial aids. Out of such a partnership of the several levels of government, private business and education can come a tremendously useful and historic example of coordinated action for rational regional development.

As the President has said: “Whatever the scale of its programs, the Federal Government will only be able to do a small part of

what is required. The vast bulk of resources and energy, of talent and toil, will have to come from State and local governments, private interests, and individual citizens.”

Earlier today you have heard speakers discussing economic planning and techniques for regional development. You also heard Mr. Wittenberg talk about space for living in Megalopolis. I have already spoken to the point of a more rational economic order and governmental pattern in our regional development, and now I would like to direct your attention more to Mr. Wittenberg's point.

You notice that I have titled this talk “Order and Beauty in Megalopolis,” and perhaps that strikes a rather discordant note for some of you. We are not very used to talking about beauty as a corollary of urbanization. Our experience has been, in fact, quite the contrary—urbanization has meant, usually, a despoliation rather than an enhancing of nature. But something unique is happening in our urban history—for the first time, a President of the United States has sent to Congress a special message on, of all things, “Natural Beauty.”

In that message, the President outlined the several ways in which urbanization and regional growth were “depriving many Americans of the right to live in decent surroundings.” The waste and inefficiency of sprawl, the proliferation of junkyards and roadside clutter and the fouling of our air and water were all cited as the symptoms of our carelessness growth.

The President's answer to this problem is “a new conservation.” And he said:

“We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must not be just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare, but the dignity of man's spirit.”

As an early step to mustering a national effort to foster this “new conservation,” the President has called a White House Conference on Natural Beauty. This conference will summon over 800 of the top experts in landscape design, architecture, citizen action, government, business, education and city and regional planning to Washington next Monday for 2 days of discussion. The conference is aimed directly at the development of action programs and means for implementing the broad objectives laid out in the President's message. In his own words, the conference “will look for ways to help and encourage State and local governments, institutions, and private citizens in their own efforts.”

I could think of no better forum than this to bring this message to your notice. You are now embarking on a major effort to develop a higher order of development throughout this great megalopolis. I urge you to keep constantly in the forefront of your thinking the necessity to grow with beauty, as well as with efficiency and economy. There is an even greater need for more research into the form of great regions than there is for study of a region's viable functions. And the two, as our greatest architects have long since demonstrated, are really inseparable.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency will be putting even greater stress on the need for more natural beauty, better building design, and a higher caliber of sound planning in the future. In this fast-growing northeastern Ohio region, you can certainly see the ravages of uncontrolled development, and should therefore be able better to appreciate our renewed emphasis on these programs. Your lake is strangling to death on

pollution and misuse. Your streams and rivers, like those in most of the rest of the Nation, are becoming increasingly fouled. And you need only look at your major cities—Cleveland, Youngstown, Akron, or Canton—and their environs, replete with junkyards, road clutter and the accumulations of industrial neglect, to see what the nature of the need is for "a new conservation" in your own region. You will also see in these great cities examples of beauty which afford prototypes of future growth.

In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, the Administration has made several recommendations for expanding the usefulness of existing programs affecting natural beauty and for new programs as well. For instance, the open space program, which has already made over 360 grants to State and local governments for acquisition of over 135,000 acres, would be extended to built-up city areas.

This will enable States or localities to acquire land in cities, and then develop such land into neighborhood parks, play areas, pedestrian malls, or where possible, redevelop waterfronts with the aid of a proposed program of matching grants for urban beautification. Tied closely to this new program would be an improvement program, providing Federal funds for tree plantings, park improvements, and renovations or the landscaping of small urban spaces.

Another proposed program would permit localities to receive grants for special demonstration projects aimed at furthering natural beauty in the city. Such demonstrations could be paid for entirely by Federal grants. A maximum of innovation and experimentation would be encouraged.

All these proposed programs are designed to bring a higher order of amenity into city neighborhoods and downtown areas, including waterfronts.

The President has said that the urban problem is really "people and the quality of lives they lead." We have for too long ignored or simply not worked hard enough at, the critical problems of ugliness in our cities, towns, and landscape. Our lives can have no quality without beauty, the opportunity for repose, and to enjoy nature not only in the great national parks but in the most congested city neighborhoods as well. Our urban waterfronts must be rehabilitated and brought to life. Cities must be forced to turn toward the water and not away from it. It is a resource that is irreplaceable, and no premium is too high to place on its ultimate value.

To implement the President's broad objectives for greater natural beauty, we need not only a stronger national effort and awareness of the problems, but we also need a great deal more knowledge on which to base our programs. The President, in his natural beauty message, called for a community extension program to bring university resources to bear on problems of the community. And he also called for funds to implement the program, passed in 1964, for training of local government employees under State educational facilities.

The latter program is particularly essential if we are to relieve the critical shortage of skilled persons needed to serve local government in planning and related work. The training which would be available under title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 would train technical and professional employees of local government in community development responsibilities. And matching grants would also be made to assist State and local research in connection with community development problems, such as housing programs and needs, public improvement programming, code problems, efficient land use, and urban transportation.

Hopefully the Congress will see fit to follow the President's recommendation and

fund this program as soon as possible. I know that many of you here today have been very interested in title VII, and realize full well how valuable a tool it can be in generating the manpower and technology which we need so desperately if we are ever to develop megalopolis with order and with beauty.

The role of great universities in regional development cannot be underestimated. We have already seen, in Berkeley and Cambridge, how university complexes can generate economic development. And now we have a veritable nationwide competition, with Pittsburgh, Dallas, Denver, Cleveland, and other cities all jockeying for position. Most of these new university-oriented complexes are aimed at further developing our scientific and technological skills. Too few have been directed, as is your Center for Urban Regionalism, at the very real difficulties, physical, social, and esthetic, besetting metropolitan areas themselves.

In closing, I would return to the words of Dr. White, who said recently that "Megalopolis presents a challenge not only for socioeconomic reasons, but also for cultural reasons; both need exploration and discussion."

I fully agree, and that is why I have chosen to speak on esthetics and beauty as well as economics and political organization. Recently, the London Economist commented on the creation of a new Greater London Council, which will plan the development—on a much more comprehensive and sophisticated scale than anything we have seen yet in this country—for an area seven times larger than that under the jurisdiction of the old and now extinct London County Council. The Economist was shedding no tears for the old council, which it obviously regarded as inadequate to the task, although it handled a much broader area with much stronger powers than anything in the United States. But it did pass out some bouquets to the old planning body, and it is rather interesting to see what they said:

"The true distinction of the London County Council has been to lead the nation in municipal patronage of the arts."

The council, the writer went on, will be best remembered for the Royal Festival Hall, Kenwood concerts, and the "true architectural distinction of the Alton housing estate at Roehampton."

Hopefully, as we in this country develop a more sophisticated and effective means of shaping our metropolitan growth, with the aid of centers such as this one, we will not lose sight of such an achievement. There can no longer be any argument that if our objective is "the quality of lives" our people lead, then we must pay stricter attention to the arts, to architecture and to the joys of natural beauty. With these elements built directly into our thinking, we can see that growth becomes a vehicle to move us nearer a truly Great Society, rather than a juggernaut which can crush not only our own chances for decent living but those of our children as well.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. POOL, for May 25 through 28, 1965, on account of hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities held in Chicago.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business attending hearings in Chicago, Ill., as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. HULL, for Thursday, May 27, and Friday, May 28, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS), on account of official business.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business attending hearings in Chicago, Ill., as member of Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. RANDALL, for Wednesday, May 26, and Thursday, May 27, 1965, on account of official business in district.

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. VANIK (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matters.

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN), for 1 hour, on June 3, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 30 minutes, on May 27, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida to include with his remarks made in Committee today certain miscellaneous material and tables.

Mr. PHILBIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. MORSE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUOT.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. HECHLER.

Mr. DENTON.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 125. An act for the relief of Armando S. Arguilles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 133. An act for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 313. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 402. An act for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 409. An act for the relief of Betty Tin-Sang Chan Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 442. An act for the relief of Carleen Coen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 449. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialogowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 469. An act for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadracentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 579. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 582. An act for the relief of Aleksandr Kaznacheev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 584. An act for the relief of Ming Chup Chau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 585. An act for the relief of Santiago Woo and Morjin Chee de Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 586. An act for the relief of Maria Tsilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 616. An act for the relief of Miss Choun Seem Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 826. An act for the relief of Har Gobind Khorana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Andreina Viselli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Gluseppa Rafala Monarca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1103. An act for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1138. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1196. An act for the relief of Wright G. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Angelina Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Sp. Manuel D. Racelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1388. An act for the relief of David Lee Bogue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1390. An act for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1405. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1468. An act for the relief of Dorothy Eyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1498. An act for the relief of Nikolai Artamonov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; and

H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 339. An act to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1152. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 16, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Santa Rosa Wash, Ariz., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 189); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1153. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) transmitting a proposal to transfer two motor whale boats (hull Nos. 22417 and 23671) to the U.S.S. Alabama Battleship Commission, Mobile, Ala., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1154. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1155. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of excessive interest costs incurred on certain income tax refunds, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1156. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary procurement of air passenger service on scheduled commercial airliners from Japan and Korea to the United States, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1157. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of loose management in budgeting and financial reporting for certain educational

exchange activities, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1158. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the Federal water resources research program for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1159. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Maj. Derrill deS. Trenholm, Jr., U.S. Air Force; 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. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 354. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled "Overseas Programs of Private Nonprofit American Organizations"; without amendment (Rept. No. 367). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on overseas programs of private nonprofit American organizations. (Rept. No. 368.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 431. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CORMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7707. A bill to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 398. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 237, a bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 399. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 485, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 400. Resolution waiving points of order against conference report on S. 800, an act 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. S. 800. An act 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 (Rept. No. 374). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 2452. A bill to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and the Classification Act

of 1949 with respect to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 8419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct from gross income the expenses, not exceeding \$300 a year, paid for transportation to and from his place of abode and his place of business or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8420. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8421. A bill to expand and improve existing law and to provide for the establishment of regulations for the purpose of controlling pollution from vessels and certain other sources in the Great Lakes and other navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8422. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLOREY:

H.R. 8423. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to provide for extension of terms of patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8424. A bill to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8425. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 8426. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8427. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 8428. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8429. A bill to nullify certain rules of the Federal Communications Commission relating to the Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 8430. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 8431. A bill to cover into the competitive civil service of the United States the positions of employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the

Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8432. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Conservation Act with respect to the disposal of land and interests in land acquired pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 8433. A bill to provide for the rights of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8434. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to give to Peace Corps volunteers returning from duty assignments abroad the same favorable customs treatment given other persons in the service of the United States returning from such assignments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 8435. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8436. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possession of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 8437. A bill to provide feed grain program benefits to cooperating farmers affected by flood or other natural disaster; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 8438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the excise taxes on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8439. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8440. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to remove the prohibitions against importing, transporting, and mailing in the U.S. mails articles for preventing conception and advertisements with respect to such articles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 8441. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 8442. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the maximum amount of the lump-sum death payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 8443. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8444. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the

Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 8447. A bill to amend section 2678 of title 28, United States Code, relating to attorney fees under the Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 8448. A bill to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 8449. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 8450. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which supplemental agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8451. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the prohibition against the importation of drugs, medicine, and other articles for the prevention of conception; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 482. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the President to make treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 483. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution relative to population growth and requesting the creation of a Presidential Commission on Population; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to bringing the Baltic States question before the United Nations and the conduct of free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 422. Concurrent resolution calling for free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8452. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Argumedo-Ortiz and Margarita Ortiz de Argumedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 8453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret G. Bremner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8454. A bill for the relief of Dr. Riccardo Ricciardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8455. A bill for the relief of Erdem Ahmet Tuncsipser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:
 H.R. 8456. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Malliris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H.R. 8457. A bill for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 By Mr. KREBS:
 H.R. 8458. A bill for the relief of Mr. Cvetko Grdovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 By Mr. PELLY:
 H.R. 8459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleuteria A. Lactaocn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ayako Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H.R. 8461. A bill for the relief of Nadir Spahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
 H.R. 8462. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bela Szwimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:
 H.R. 8463. A bill for the relief of Alden Jo Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

218. Mr. SHRIVER presented a resolution of the Outdoor Writers of Kansas, Thayne Smith, president, adopted May 14, 1965, at Wichita, Kans., stating opposition to S. 1592 since its obvious intent can only be considered as but a prelude to complete elimination of article II, the constitutional right to keep and bear arms, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tabulation of Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed an experiment in the First Congressional District of Alabama in order to learn more about the opinions of the district's citizens regarding important national and international issues of the day.

We have been overwhelmed by the tremendous number of persons who took the time to respond to a written questionnaire which we mailed to every home in the district. More than 16,000 persons responded.

This is a great tribute to the First District because it shows that our people want to make their ideas on important issues known to their elected representative in Congress.

In order that representative government can be effective it is important that elected officials know the views of the voters. This is one way that I can be informed as I proceed to serve the First District.

I want to call particular attention to 2 of the 10 issues raised in the questionnaire. Of those responding to the questionnaire fully 86.2 percent oppose President Johnson's proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and thus they favor continuing the State authority to enact right-to-work laws.

On the other hand, 73.5 percent of those responding believe that our national security is at stake in the conflict in Vietnam, giving support to the administration in its determination to help South Vietnam resist outside aggression from the north.

Following is the complete tabulation of results of the questionnaire:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor "medicare" for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?.....	20.5	79.5
2. Would you approve of a Federal law repealing State "right to work" laws?.....	13.8	86.2
3. Should the Federal Government undertake a program for controlling pollution in lakes, rivers, and streams?.....	75.9	24.1
4. Do you believe that our own national security is at stake in the Vietnam conflict?.....	73.5	26.5
5. Would you favor a change in our immigration laws to base a person's admittance to the United States on skills rather than on country of birth?.....	51.2	48.8
6. Do you feel any State should have the right to apportion 1 house of its State legislature on factors other than population if a majority of the State's voters agree?.....	74.0	26.0
7. Do you support Federal aid to education?.....	45.6	54.4
8. Would you support a constitutional amendment to provide for a 4-year term for the U.S. House of Representatives with 1/2 of the House Members elected every 2 years?.....	74.4	25.6
9. Do you favor the proposal to give a tax credit to individuals for the costs of higher education?.....	74.1	25.9
10. Would you support a program of Federal rent subsidies to low- and middle-income families?.....	18.2	81.8

United Nations Should Conduct Free Elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviet Union to withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, columnists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and also to return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia prisons and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union and that free elections be held in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Twenty-five years ago on the coming 15th of June, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were overrun

by the Red army and I am looking forward to the enactment of this resolution to return their freedom to these democratic and peace-loving nations.

Christian Endeavor Annual Citizenship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, there is much publicity today given to youths who are called wayward and delinquent and others who find themselves in serious trouble with the law. However, a refreshing bit of news came across my desk this week and I feel that I should share the essence of it here with my colleagues.

The International Society of Christian Endeavor recently announced the award

recipients in its annual citizenship awards program. This contest received hundreds of entries, showing that there is indeed a large number of our young people who are interested in practicing good citizenship.

One of the individual award winners is a young lad from my hometown of Evansville, Ind. The boy, Gary W. Haire, is only 17. His interest and his activities, however, show that he is indeed, a mature citizen of this country. He is active in both church and school affairs.

His winning entry, published first in his high school paper, was a cartoon showing a drunken driver saying "Pardon me, I didn't know I was loaded."

For his efforts Mr. Haire will receive a cash award and a grant which will enable him to attend the Society of Christian Endeavor's international convention in Dallas, Tex., this year.

I am very pleased that such a young man comes from my district. But I am even more pleased to learn that such young people are being recognized for their efforts in good citizenship, helping to allay the belief that our young people are not being trained to become good citizens.