

each school day. Schools received more than 972 million pounds of foods, and \$130 million in cash to round out the lunches and add to their substance and variety.

In 1961 the Department initiated the Food Stamp Program, a unique project designed to get more nutritious food into low-income households. By the middle of 1966, the program will reach some 1.3 million needy persons in about 350 areas of 40 states and the District of Columbia. Needy people, judged eligible by local authorities, pay cash equivalent to their normal food budget for food stamps, and get extra bonus stamps to increase their food-buying power.

For example, a West Virginia coal miner was trying to support his family of 11 on \$68 a week. Under the Food Stamp Program, he bought \$57 worth of food stamps every

two weeks and got \$28 worth as a bonus. With this he puts on the table three pounds of meat a week instead of only one.

The Food Stamp Program not only serves needy families, but since the coupons are redeemed in local food stores, it also bolsters the community's economy. Food sales have increased about 8 percent in Food Stamp areas.

The output of one out of every five acres harvested in America is for export. Exports of U.S. farm products in 1965 were estimated at a record \$6.2 billion. In fighting famine, the Food for Peace program has made a significant contribution to the attack on world hunger. Since 1954 the United States has shipped 140 millions tons of food to more than 100 countries populated by over one billion people.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is at this time making every effort to help ease the famine in India, and has stepped up its wheat shipments. Our wheat is providing 13 billion loaves of bread a year for India's people.

The hope of countries threatened with famine is that they develop a capacity to help themselves. Application of our knowledge on their land is one answer to this hope. Last year almost 5,000 agriculturalists from 118 nations got technical help and training in the U.S. The Department also sent experts to 26 countries.

The ability to produce is a weapon for world peace. In the words of President Johnson, "Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys the hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my Redeemer.—Psalm 19: 14.

Our Father, who art in heaven, we come to Thee conscious of our shortcomings and our sins, yet confident that Thou art with us and that with Thee sins are forgiven, discouragement gives way to encouragement, fear changes to faith, and a new glory enters human life.

Give us the courage of our convictions—the confidence to say yes to what is right, the courage to say no to what is wrong, and the wisdom and the insight to know the difference. May this spirit enter the hearts of all our people. So shall we be children of Thine serving Thee faithfully all our days. Let the words of our mouths, and the meditations of our hearts, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. 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 and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 1233. An act for the relief of Lee Chung Woo;
- H.R. 2290. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schulz;
- H.R. 3692. An act for the relief of William F. Kuhlman;
- H.R. 3774. An act for the relief of Wanda Olszowa;
- H.R. 5003. An act for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis;
- H.R. 5533. An act for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer;
- H.R. 8219. An act for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee;
- H.R. 8833. An act for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona;
- H.R. 9643. An act for the relief of Haider Raza and his wife, Irene Raza, and their

children, Afzal Anthony and Haider Raymond Raza;

H.R. 10133. An act for the relief of Fritz A. Frerichs;

H.R. 10838. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Post Office Department at Eau Gallie, Fla.;

H.R. 12396. An act for the relief of Elton P. Johnson; and

H. Con. Res. 597. Concurrent resolution relating to the Centennial Year of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn.

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

H.R. 2270. An act for the relief of Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.;

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157); and

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May 1966 as "Steelmark Month."

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. 777. An act for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado;

S. 1522. An act to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra;

S. 2529. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Hurtado Perez;

S. 2640. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Rodriguez;

S. 2647. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Guillermo Martinez;

S. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Kumar Poddar;

S. 2702. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Montero-Novoa;

S. 2751. An act for the relief of David R. Slemom;

S. 2761. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Sangully, Jr.;

S. 2771. An act for the relief of Hazel Louise Schuman Strunk;

S. 2796. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Anrrich;

S. 2800. An act for the relief of George Joseph Saad;

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri;

S. 2838. An act for the relief of Irene Snyder;

S. 2853. An act for the relief of Abraham Presser;

S. 2854. An act for the relief of Dr. Gottfried R. Kaestner;

S. 2865. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Hernandez;

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Enrique Diaz;

S. 2884. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Zuniga;

S. 2945. An act for the relief of Dr. Jamie E. Condom Valera;

S. 2946. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario V. Machado Espinosa;

S. 2957. An act for the relief of Wing Yuen Wong, also known as Wing Yuen Gee;

S. 3249. An act to consent to the interstate compact defining the boundary between the States of Arizona and California; and

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of April 1967, as "Federal Land Bank Month."

FLAG DAY, 1966

Mr. DOLE, 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE, Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress passed a resolution that established the Stars and Stripes.

This resolution has an interesting history. General Washington, when the Star-Spangled Banner was first flown by the Continental Army, is said to have described its symbolism as follows:

We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty.

The brilliant Henry Ward Beecher said:

A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of Liberty and men rejoiced in it.

The stars upon it were like the bright morning stars of God, and the stripes upon

it were beams of morning light. As at early dawn the stars shine forth even while it grows light, and then as the sun advances that light breaks into banks and streaming lines of color, the glowing red and intense white striving together, and ribbing the horizon with bars effulgent, so, on the American flag, stars and beams of many-colored light shine out together.

The flag today, June 14, 1966, as we struggle for freedom in Vietnam, is, as it was in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, an emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a Nation. Today, as flags fly over our Nation's Capitol, and other places in our country and around the world, we can celebrate the day of its birth. It has witnessed a great history, it was born amid the strife of battle, it became the standard around which a free people struggled to found a great nation. Today to those seeking freedom around the world, it is a "flag of liberation." Yes, the American flag has been and will continue to be a symbol of liberty, and free peoples everywhere should be proud of this symbol of greatness.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on June 13, when rollcall No. 137, for passage of the Foreign Service Buildings Act Amendments of 1966, occurred. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. HAYS. 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. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I notice on page 12954 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the rather curious rules we have, that in a speech by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] immediately preceding the vote on H.R. 14019, Mr. OTTINGER starts his speech by saying:

Mr. Chairman, I was one of only three Members to vote today against the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1966.

As I say, that is before the vote. He goes on to detail his reasons, which seem to be rather obscure. I would just point out to the House that the gentleman did not ask any questions during the debate. He did not make any speech during the debate. There was no opportunity to refute any of the statements he made.

He made some rather queer statements about the Navy.

He said:

We should have learned the great detriment to our oversea endeavor from the Navy.

Then he goes on to say:

Our officers live in fancy Government-furnished quarters—

And so on. He complains about this. The State Department is under the obligation to procure housing for these people. Sometimes they rent them, sometimes they buy them. We try to see that they do it in the most economical fashion.

If the gentleman had asked this question yesterday, I would have pointed out to him that we have cut down the amount they can pay for these houses rather severely and substantially.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GUBSER. 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. 138]

Abernethy	Fino	Ottinger
Annunzio	Flynt	Pool
Ashmore	Foley	Powell
Baring	Gettys	Pucinski
Bingham	Gilbert	Purcell
Bolton	Green, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Bow	Hagan, Ga.	Resnick
Cahill	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Callaway	Hardy	Rivers, Alaska
Cederberg	Harvey, Ind.	Ronan
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Roncallo
Clark	King, Utah	Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen,	Krebs	Rostenkowski
Don H.	McCarthy	Senner
Conyers	McEwen	Sikes
Corbett	McMillan	Stafford
Corman	Madden	Sweeney
Craley	Martin, Ala.	Taylor
Daniels	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Mathias	Toll
Derwinski	Matsunaga	Udall
Diggs	Meeds	Utt
Dingell	Morrison	Waggonner
Dorn	Multer	Walker, Miss.
Dulski	Murray, Ill.	White, Idaho
Dyal	Murray	Williams
Ellsworth	O'Brien	Willis
Erlenborn	O'Hara, Ill.	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	O'Hara, Mich.	Young
Farbstein	O'Neill, Mass.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 859 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 859

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat ve-

hicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, with 4 hours of general debate. Points of order are waived, it is my understanding, because of the inclusion of an amendment which provides for a pay increase for the uniformed services of 3.2 percent, effective July 1, 1966.

Of course, the basic bill is the bill that authorizes procurement for aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and so on, and so on, in the Military Establishment. A total authorization is provided in the bill for \$17,858,059,000.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy over the rule.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that points of order on this bill are waived because of the inclusion of a pay increase for the military in this bill.

Mr. BOLLING. And that is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. I am not necessarily opposed to a pay increase for the military, but does the gentleman think this is a good way to legislate, to include a pay bill in this kind of legislation, when ordinarily a pay increase is dealt with separately, and it is then not necessary that points of order be waived?

Mr. BOLLING. I would have to yield to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for an explanation as to why these points of order are so waived.

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

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we had this provision for military pay in our House bill, H.R. 13456. It was therefore germane to the House bill. But in order to save time, our committee took up and acted on the Senate bill S. 2950. The Senate bill did not

have a provision for a military pay increase and therefore it is technically subject to a point of order. So rather than run into this possible technical objection, we asked that it be waived. Had we brought in our House bill, there would have been no question about it. This is the reason, because we are acting on a Senate bill, that simple prudence dictated that we make certain that this technicality over which we could have no control would not delay House action on this tremendously important bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, by indirection perhaps, I complimented the Rules Committee for bringing out a bill on which points of order were not waived. Apparently I was premature, and I hereby want to amend my commendation that I offered yesterday to the committee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], House Resolution 859 will make in order a 4-hour open rule from the standpoint of amendments for the consideration of S. 2950.

The rule would waive points of order, because of the reasons stated. It would not be germane in a Senate bill, under our rules, to have the salary increase therein. That could be stricken. That part of the bill we believed should be included.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2950 is the annual authorization bill for weapons procurement and for research and development for the Department of Defense. As mentioned, the bill also contains a title which would grant a pay raise to our uniformed services.

The authority granted by this bill is concededly large but so are the military problems which face our country today. The ratio appears to be a reasonable one.

The bill would authorize appropriations in the amount of \$17,858,059,000 which is \$931,100,000 more than the original budget figure. The Rules Committee was assured that these additions were made by the Armed Services Committee only after careful study and deliberation. Their hearings were obviously extensive and such portions of the hearings as I have had the opportunity to read indicate the thoroughness with which all elements of the bill were considered.

In very large part, the bill is the same as those which the House has considered year after year. The committee, however, in its obvious constant effort to exercise its responsibilities and to enhance the position of the Congress in the decisionmaking process in military matters has from time to time used this legislation as a vehicle for effecting these ends.

This year two steps were taken by the committee which I believe warrant the consideration and the thanks of the

House: first, the Armed Services Committee inserted language in connection with the authorization of nuclear-powered guided missile frigates which will render abundantly clear that Congress expects the will of Congress to be observed and followed within the Department of Defense. The language to which I am referring says that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy "shall proceed with the construction" of these two ships.

The other addition by the committee is that which appears as title IV under the heading "Weapons Systems." Here the committee insists that the Congress be informed of "all pertinent details" relating to any proposed action which would result in a substantial reduction or elimination of a major weapon system prior to the time that this action is taken.

I suggest that both of these provisions are designed and will have the effect of increasing the participation of the Congress in important defense decisions.

Mr. Speaker, the report on this bill is perhaps more comprehensive than any that I have seen relating to this kind of legislation. All items other than those of a classified nature are listed and described. And in all instances the rationale of the committee in supporting the particular authorities is given in a clear and unambiguous fashion. A listing of the contents of the report as its last two pages will easily direct any Member to his particular item or area of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay special commendation and tribute today to the staff of this fine committee for the tremendous job they are doing.

I should also like to pay my congratulations and tribute to every member of the committee for the thoroughness with which all have operated—and particularly the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for his tremendous leadership as chairman of this committee.

I say to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], I believe he is a great American and I believe the United States and the Congress are fortunate to have him as the chairman. I, for one, salute him.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. 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. 139]

Abernethy	Bolton	Callaway
Anunzio	Bow	Cederberg
Ashmore	Brown, Calif.	Celler
Baring	Cahill	Clark

Clausen.	Hardy	Resnick
Don H. Harvey, Ind.	Harvey, Mich.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cleveland	Irwin	Rivers, Alaska
Conyers	Jones, Mo.	Ronan
Corbett	King, Calif.	Roncalio
Corman	Krebs	Rooney, N.Y.
Craley	Long, Md.	Rostenkowski
Daniels	McCarthy	Senner
Dawson	McDowell	Sickles
Derwinski	McEwen	Sikes
Dickinson	McMillan	Stafford
Diggs	Madden	Sweeney
Dingell	Martin, Mass.	Taylor
Dorn	Matsunaga	Teague, Calif.
Dulski	Meeds	Teague, Tex.
Ellsworth	Morrison	Thompson, N.J.
Erlenborn	Multer	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Udall
Farbstein	Murray	Utt
Fino	O'Brien	Waggoner
Flynt	O'Hara, Ill.	Walker, Miss.
Gathings	O'Hara, Mich.	White, Idaho
Gettys	O'Neal, Ga.	Williams
Gilbert	O'Neill, Mass.	Willis
Goodell	Pool	Wyatt
Grover	Powell	Young
Halleck	Pucinski	Younger
Hansen, Wash.		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS OF THE HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND MILITARY PAY

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill S. 2950, to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2950, with Mr. DENT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

Mr. Chairman, today happens to be Flag Day. It also happens to be Army Day. Here is what a great American read to his troops, today:

FLAG DAY—ARMY DAY

(Statement by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, and Commanding General, U.S. Army, Vietnam, on the occasion of Army Day, 1966)

June 14, 1966 marks the 191st Anniversary of the United States Army. All of us would be wise to remember the reason for our being.

The United States Army is a force that is respected by our friends and feared by our Nation's enemies. Our existence is essential for freedom.

Some have said that our presence in Vietnam is unwarranted. Their forefathers said that Europe was for Europeans in World War II, and their fathers said Korea was not our concern in 1950. They might well have said that freedom is only for Americans. We know better.

Since 1775, the U.S. Army has been and will continue to be an extension of the arm of freedom. This mighty arm may deliver food to the needy, clothes to the naked, or it can carry—and has carried—a punch that no foe has yet been able to withstand.

We, of all arms and services, will continue the flight, as our forefathers have done in previous years, because we are soldiers and it is our job.

On this, the Army's Birthday, we can all be proud to be members of one of the finest and most dedicated organizations in the Army . . . the United States Army, Vietnam.

That statement was made by a distinguished South Carolinian, my dear friend since his childhood, Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I think this is the appropriate time, before the general debate starts, to make a few remarks that are extremely justified.

The House of Representatives is enriched by the wonderful Committee on Armed Services that we have, and all the members of that Committee on Armed Services, without regard to party. It is a committee that works for the national interest of the United States. It is a committee that has performed its duties in a most outstanding manner.

All of the members of the committee are not only dedicated legislators but also dedicated to the paramount question which should be uppermost in the minds of all of us, the national interest of our beloved country.

As a Member for years, and now as Speaker, I am very proud of the work done by the Committee on Armed Services in connection not only with the present but also the future life and preservation of our country.

The committee is indeed fortunate to have as its chairman the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr.

RIVERS]. Throughout his entire service on the Committee on Armed Services he has been a bulwark of strength in the national interest and in the national defense of the United States of America. He is one of the greatest Americans I have ever met, and one of the outstanding legislators of my long period of service in the Congress of the United States. Under his leadership and in cooperation with the other Members of his committee on both sides, Democrats and Republicans, his committee has rendered service to our country which will go down in history as occupying the outstanding pages of the legislative history of our country.

I am proud to call the gentleman from South Carolina one of my close and dear friends.

If I might, I will give a little secret which I believe is pretty well known to the membership of the House. There is the Republican Party and there is the Democratic Party, but there is also a McCormack-crat party, and that party consists of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. Every once in a while some Member wants to become a member of that party, and I say to him, "I will vote for you, but you have to get MENDEL's vote." But they cannot get it, so it is a very exclusive party. It is one which conveys to me the greatest of sentiment. I value very, very much the state of mind occupied by the gentleman from South Carolina in creating this most unique party in the entire history of our country known as the McCormack-crat party.

I see smiling a few of my colleagues who have tried to be admitted as members of that party, but they have not been able to get in yet, because it requires two votes, it being a two-member party, and they have not been able to get the two votes.

That is a little human interest story which I value very much and which will always be a treasured memory of mine so long as I live.

However, I particularly wish to pay tribute to the entire Committee on Armed Services. Our country and the people of the United States are indebted to this committee for the dedicated manner in which it has performed the duties in the national interest and in the national defense of the United States of America.

Leading that committee, enjoying the respect of Members on both sides, is one of the most able and on the other hand one of the most humble gentlemen I have ever met, whom I am proud to pay tribute to on this occasion, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I am more than humbled by those undeserved words which you heap on my most unworthy shoulders. I pray each night—and I do pray each night—that I shall always be worthy of your friendship. I also pray that I will merit and have a reason and a right to deserve the confidence and respect of you, my colleagues.

You have made me feel wonderful. I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I know that anything anyone might say following the fine tribute of our distinguished Speaker would be an anticlimax, but I think the McCormack-crat party has spoken and that someone should represent the Democratic and Republican Parties in the House. I will undertake to do that, because we have the same high regard for the gentleman as the members of his own exclusive club.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from South Carolina has followed in this House during one of the most critical periods in the history of our Nation a man who left the House of Representatives as probably the most renowned committee chairman in all its history, the distinguished, lovable, and effective former Member, the great gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson.

However, in this period when great demands are made on this committee and on its chairman, my friend from South Carolina has filled the large shoes of Carl Vinson. He has filled this important position with honor, with distinction, with ability, and with courage and dedication. He is a beloved Member of the House and only a few days ago I had the honor of accompanying the gentleman to his own district. It was heartening to me to find out that those who have been the closest to him all of his life have the same high regard and affection for MENDEL RIVERS that we have here.

We are glad to have you back, as you preside over one of the most important measures that will be considered by the 89th Congress.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want also to thank you, my distinguished majority leader. I agree with you. Both of our parties ought to hang closely together, because there is no reason for us to hang separately. I certainly thank you for those very gracious words.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course I will yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that a few years ago the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, before he reached his present high and eminent position as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, was placed upon the American delegation to the NATO parliamentarians, of which I have had the honor to be the chairman. There have been many people on that body over the 11 years I have served. There is no one who has been more faithful in his attendance at the meetings, who has showed up more faithfully when the meetings started and stayed until they ended and no one who served on the committee to which he was assigned and went to all of the committee meetings more regularly than the

gentleman from South Carolina. It has been a privilege to have him on the committee. He has contributed a great deal of his intimate and detailed knowledge of military affairs. I can tell you that he is held in the same high regard amongst the parliamentarians of the 14 other nations who go to this meeting as he is in this body. And, I have always been proud to have had him on that committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, because it has been a great privilege and honor to serve with him and with the NATO parliamentarians.

Mr. Chairman, each year the Armed Services Committee comes before the House to present and defend the annual military procurement and research and development bill. I use the word "defend." I think that this year there is little need for defending the bill. The world situation is the defense for this bill.

I might make note of the fact that the committee has at the one time accepted all of the Department's recommendations while adding a very substantial amount to the bill. This has been the subject of criticism. The theme of the criticism appears to be that in accepting the Department's recommendations the committee rubberstamped them, while in adding to the bill it was playing an old game of inserting pet projects in the program.

Although it probably does not warrant answering, I am going to answer it because it is so easy.

The committee accepted the Department's bill because it was a good bill—as far as it went. The committee made the additions that it did because the Department's program did not go far enough. And that is that.

I am not quite sure what a pet project is but it is reasonable to assume that it is one through which the committee or a member might personally benefit in some fashion, or a project which is favored on some unreasonable or idiosyncratic basis.

Now, I will ask this one question. Which of the committee's additions can be placed in either of these categories?

Who benefits from the addition of medical evacuation aircraft? Our sick and wounded from Vietnam, that is who.

Who benefits from the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates? The people of the United States, that is who.

Who benefits from the addition of \$11.8 million to speed along the progress of our follow-on bomber? You benefit, I benefit, and every man, woman and child in the United States benefits.

I think that takes care of the benefit aspect.

Now, which of the additions is pet from the standpoint of being idiosyncratic?

Shall we say that Nike X falls in that category? If so, then we must put the blame where it belongs—on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Or shall we say that the advanced interceptor, the F-12 airplane, is one of these? Well, we are in good company

again because this, too, is recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of the Air Force.

That kind of criticism tells a great deal about those who make it and absolutely nothing about the bill we are considering today.

So let me just say this: the bill can be considered to be divided into two parts: the bill as it was presented and the additions which the committee made to the bill. The bill as presented was good but not enough. The additions at least helped to approximate enough. It is that simple.

As you know, normally this legislation covers only the procurement of weapons and research and development. But once in a while we use it for other purposes. Last year, for example, we used it to repeal old, unnecessary tonnage remaining from the Vinson-Trammell Act; to require specific authorization of the Department of Defense's emergency fund; and to change the name of the Military Air Transport Service to the Military Airlift Command.

This year we used it as a convenient vehicle for a military pay raise. This could easily have been in a separate bill but since everyone was so unanimous in agreeing that the pay raise was necessary and since extended hearings were not required, this cut down on our work in committee and your work on the floor. We used it also this year to make sure we do not wake up some morning to find we have lost a major weapons system without the Congress knowing about it. I will speak more about both of these matters later on.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course, I yield to my distinguished whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Unfortunately, I was called out of the Chamber when the Speaker of the House and the majority leader made their remarks, but I would like very much to be associated with those remarks. I have served with the distinguished chairman for many years, and I have the greatest respect and admiration for him.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to interpolate at this point in my remarks to make reference to Secretary of Defense McNamara. There is, I am afraid, a somewhat wide belief that Mr. McNamara and I are at sword's points, so to speak. Actually, nothing could be further from the truth. I have the greatest respect for one of the most capable and dedicated Cabinet members in the history of our country. He is an indefatigable worker, with a finely tuned and analytical mind. And I mean every word I say.

There have been, of course, occasions, a number of them, where Mr. McNamara and I—and indeed the Armed Services Committee—have been in disagreement. Some of the additions to this bill, perhaps all of them, are manifestations of our and my disagreement with him. But this is what I will call a professional difference of opinion; there is nothing per-

sonal in it. I think Mr. McNamara is right most of the time. I do not think he is right all of the time and where there is evidence sufficient for the Armed Services Committee to believe that he is in error we have not hesitated to point this out.

As for the committee report on this bill which the press appears to feel is harsh on McNamara, I will say only this: that the statements which have received wide quotation in the press, if read in full context, it will reveal that the committee is engaging in a merely cautionary activity. The committee is expressing concern that Mr. McNamara—only in the sense that is to some extent true of all of us—is perhaps shortsighted in individual instances.

I talk with Mr. McNamara with great frequency. We counsel with each other and our personal relationship is of the very highest order. I respect Mr. McNamara and I have no reason to believe that he does not return this respect.

We have disagreed in the past. We are in current disagreement, as a matter of fact, as this bill indicates. And we will undoubtedly disagree in the future. But I never intend any more for myself—and I am sure the committee intends no more—than to exercise our responsibilities toward Mr. McNamara as he must exercise his responsibilities toward the Congress. He is a brilliant public servant and I would like once and for all to eliminate from all consideration and discussion the possibility that there is something approximating a personal feud between us. I am not feuding and I know he is not feuding. We will try to do our job here in the Congress and he will continue in the same fashion in the Department of Defense.

It is entirely clear to me that Secretary McNamara is the man appointed by the President of the United States to be Secretary of Defense. I do not forget that and I think that, on the other hand, he is becoming more and more aware of the true function of the Congress. And that is all there is to that.

Mr. Chairman, before going into the procurement, research and development, and pay raise which the bill covers, I want to draw your particular attention to the committee report. Perhaps it is the most comprehensive report ever issued by the Armed Services Committee on this annual bill. You will note that it is 108 pages long and I feel that virtually every question which might arise in your mind is answered in the report. And I will point out that there is at the end of it a table of contents which will lead you to your area of interest with no trouble whatsoever.

Now, to the bill itself.

The bill, not including the pay raise which I will deal with later, totals \$17,858,059,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and for research and development. The procurement portion of the bill is \$10.6 billion and the research and development portion is \$7.3 billion. The overall total of the bill that I just mentioned—\$17.8 billion—is \$931.1 million more than the bill as introduced. Only \$19.9 million of the added amount

represents an additional request by the Department of Defense.

I will deal with these additions briefly. We added:

AIRCRAFT

For F-12 aircraft, \$55 million: This is a version of the A-11 which was unveiled, so to speak, by the President a little over 2 years ago. It travels over 2,000 miles an hour. It was added by the committee because the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of the Air Force have recommended the desirability of producing and deploying a number of these F-12's interceptor aircraft. In essence, the reason for the addition of the funds is to insure that the production line can be kept open. Parenthetically I might mention that the Senate committee added, and the Senate passed, the bill with this same addition.

For CX-2 aircraft, \$51.2 million: The matter of aeromedical evacuation of sick and injured members of the Armed Forces has long been one of special interest to the committee. It was disappointing, therefore, to find that no provision had been made in the budget for this capability. I am aware, Mr. BATES is aware, and other members of the committee know from personal investigations that there is a very real need for the replacement of some of the obsolescent aircraft now being used for our sick and injured members of the Armed Forces.

For additional aircraft and electronic equipment for TV broadcasting facilities in Vietnam, \$20 million: I might mention that this amendment was offered by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, a member of the committee who was in Vietnam and who flew on one of the aircraft which is transmitting TV programs to our troops over there.

As you will recall, one or two of these planes were seriously damaged in an attack on the Saigon airfield and I think the least we can do is to provide this kind of entertainment and relaxation for the troops. Actually there will be both AM and FM broadcast facilities, teletypewriter facilities, and other capabilities of a classified nature in these aircraft.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to second the statement of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], with regard to these aircraft and repeat that a very distinguished member of the subcommittee that made the trip to Vietnam, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has been a very strong spokesman for this program over the years. He is the gentleman that the chairman [Mr. RIVERS] referred to a moment ago as having made this flight just following the attack by the Vietcong on the airstrip at Tan Son Nhut. As a result of his recommendations, subsequently the subcommittee was persuaded that this program is a very vital one and should have much greater support than it does have. I certainly want to endorse what the dis-

tinguished gentleman from South Carolina has said, namely, these planes are a very vital part of this legislation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York very much, and I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan. He took quite a chance; he took quite a chance.

MISSILES

Nike X represents the next addition: We added a total of \$167.9 million of which \$153.5 is for procurement and \$14.4 for research and development. We have long felt that the Department of Defense did not have a proper sense of urgency in the field of the anti-ballistic missile defense system. This added authority could save about 1 year in the time required between a deployment decision and achievement of the first operational capability. I believe in saving this 1 year. Considerable detailed information with respect to Nike X and our rationale in making the addition that we did appear on pages 16 and 17 of the report.

NAVAL VESSELS

We added \$258.3 million to the bill for two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates. Actually one of them is a reauthorization of a ship that was in last year's bill and for which \$20 million was appropriated but not released by the Secretary of Defense.

I could go on for a very long time explaining this particular addition to the bill but I will say little more than it is the unanimous belief of the committee that we must get started on a nuclear Navy. So far the Department—and I refer to the Department of Defense, not the Department of the Navy—has shown a most unimaginative approach to this vital area of our offensive and defensive capability. As a result of this we find ourselves today in the same position with respect to surface vessels that we found ourselves some years ago with respect to the Polaris submarines. If the Congress had not taken a hand in the case of Polaris, we might still not have them in our fleet.

In this general connection, I will draw your attention to pages 17 and 18 of the committee report which contain a relatively brief statement of our reasons for adding these two nuclear-powered frigates. But another section of the report starting on page 24 and extending through page 59 deals with the subject of nuclear propulsion for ships in a fashion that you will not have seen before. That we should have a nuclear Navy is not only persuasively presented on these pages, it is presented in such a fashion as to make one wonder why we do not have one today. This is a serious area of deficiency in our military posture and one which the whole Armed Services Committee is bending every effort to correct.

After nearly 8 years of having one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, and of many attempts by the Congress to have the next two carriers—the *John F. Kennedy* and the *America*—also nuclear powered, the Department of Defense has finally requested funds in this bill for a second nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. It is gratifying to see the Depart-

ment of Defense begin to swing around to the views held so long by our committee and by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that our country should have more nuclear-powered aircraft carriers.

The struggle has now moved to another front—the escorts for the aircraft carriers. The Department of Defense has not allowed the nuclear powered frigate for which the Congress authorized \$150.5 million last year and for which, as I mentioned, it appropriated \$20 million to be built. This ship, together with the *Truxtun*, which the Congress changed in fiscal year 1962 from conventional to nuclear powered, and the *Bainbridge*, which was authorized in 1959, would form three ships out of the four-ship minimum required for a task group to protect the nuclear carrier *Enterprise*. So in order to complete the four-ship escorts for the *Enterprise*, our committee has not only reauthorized the \$130.5 million not appropriated last year, but has also authorized an additional nuclear powered frigate at \$127.8 million. These four would constitute the first nuclear powered task group in our history. The advantages of having this kind of a group which can move around at high speeds without having to worry about the logistics of a fuel oil supply are, of course, tremendous.

Let me say this about the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I want the gentleman from California to hear this—the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has done one of the most effective jobs that this country has ever had done by a committee in trying to get for you surface nuclear ships. We have plenty of submarines. But the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been working day and night begging the country to wake up. And to the eternal credit of that committee, I want to say they have helped us to persuade the DOD to build a new carrier and we are asking the DOD in terms that I think will be rather explicit to build these two frigates. I will get to that a little more in detail later on.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks about the Committee on Atomic Energy in this particular field that is related so closely to the defense of our Nation.

While I am on my feet—and I would like to have some time later so that I can comment in more detail on this particular point—but I would like to say I have served with the gentleman from South Carolina in this House for 24 years. The gentleman from South Carolina represents a different type of district than I represent. This, I think, is one of the strengths of our House of Representatives—that we can represent our districts as we see fit and as we believe they should be represented and we can differ with each other on many, many different questions, and yet we can be personal friends and we can have respect for each other.

I want the gentleman from South Carolina to know that in my 24 years of service with him, I have considered him as my friend. I am proud to say he is my friend. He has always been friendly toward me and I have tried to be and do the same. I do respect the gentleman from South Carolina and commend him for the fine job he has been doing as chairman of this very important, one of the most important, if not the most important committees—the Committee on Armed Services—our defense committee. He has done a magnificent job. He is following in the footsteps of a great man from Georgia, Carl Vinson, and he has had some big shoes to fill. But I want the gentleman to know I believe, and I believe I express the opinion of most of my colleagues from the State of California, that the gentleman from South Carolina has done a magnificent job. He has worked hard. He has been dedicated to the one thing that we are all dedicated to, and that is the defense of our Nation. I want the gentleman to know publicly of my high regard for him.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to this nuclear matter, I want to say we have either built or are building or there have been authorized about 99 nuclear submarines.

We know that the Soviets have put their naval eggs all in the submarine basket, you might say. They have the greatest fleet of submarines. They have announced that they have more than 400 submarines in the weir. While we do not have that many, as the gentleman well knows, we do have, in the numerous submarines which have been developed over the last 10 or 15 years under the able guidance of Admiral Rickover, we feel, the most efficient and most capable submarine fleet that there is in the world.

They are capable of going uninter-ruptedly around the world a number of times, if necessary, without refueling. They have a tremendous capacity to launch Polaris missiles. Nuclear warheads stand as a real bulwark between the free world and the slave world today.

The Defense Committee has funded these nuclear-powered submarines and has funded the *Enterprise*, the *Bainbridge*, and the *Long Beach*. Now you are proposing these two frigates should be nuclear powered. I will not go into the reasons why this is a sound conclusion. I agree perfectly with the gentleman that as we move into the field of the defense of our Nation, we cannot afford to have a second best. We must have first best in all items of defense of our Nation.

I want to pay my particular compliments to the gentleman from South Carolina and the members of his committee, and I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that we have in the ranking men on our committee the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], who are also on the Defense Committee. So we have a very close relationship between those two gentlemen and the balance of the Defense Committee, and we have tried to correlate our information with the Defense Committee

in such a way that we can work together toward achieving the best interests of the Nation.

I wish to express my confidence in the gentleman in this nuclear field that he is proposing for surface transportation, and assure him that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, every member of it—and there is not a member who is in disagreement—will support to the fullest extent that portion and the other portions of this bill that the gentleman is presenting.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I wish to thank the gentleman from California. I want to urge the members of the committee and the House to get the report recently released by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the subject of nuclear surface propulsion and nuclear surface ships. It is a masterpiece, and that committee deserves the great and the everlasting appreciation of the Congress.

I want also to thank the gentleman from California for what he said about me. You know and I know I do not deserve it, but it is wonderful of you to say it and I am very grateful to you.

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

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I thank the gentleman. I should like to join my colleague from California, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and my good friend from South Carolina in their presentation of this particular subject under discussion, which is so important to our country.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to thank the gentleman very much.

As you know, our committee is non-partisan, completely nonpartisan.

Now that we have gone to another area of activity in trying to bring to you nuclear-surface ships, I point out, as I have said previously, that last year we approved and authorized \$150 million for a nuclear frigate. \$20 million was made available for the long leadtime items, and nothing was done about it. This ship, together with the *Truxton*, which is being built—and I ask you to listen to this—the *Truxton* that is being built is a nuclear ship.

It started off as a conventional ship. Who changed it? The Congress of the United States.

Now this ship, along with the *Truxton* and the *Bainbridge*—the building of which was started in 1959—and the *Enterprise* are all we have. We do not have anything else.

Listen to this. How many nuclear ships do we have? We have four. How many are running? Three. Imagine that. We do not like this. The *Truxton* is being built. We have the “*Big E*,” we have the *Long Beach*, we have the *Bainbridge*, and we have the *Truxton*. This is the inventory. This is so ridiculous, it is ridiculous.

Why do we want to have these surface nuclear ships? I will explain why. We want to have a nuclear task force. We do not have one. Our nuclear task force is comprised of five ships; the carrier

and the four escorts. So we have the “*Big E*,” and we have the *Long Beach*—which I would not use for an escort, but if we have nothing else, we have to use it. So we have the “*Big E*” and we have the four escorts. We leave Long Beach, Calif., or San Francisco, Calif., and head west. How would we leave Long Beach or San Francisco? At full speed, wide open. How long will those ships run wide open? For 10 years. That is what a nuclear task force will do.

When the nuclear task force arrives, it will be ready to go, because at every step of the way the airplanes can take off the carrier, and the escorts can perform other duties which cannot be done now. This happened the other day, to a degree, when the “*Big E*” went to the Pacific. When she arrived there, her pilots were ready to go. The minute they got there, they got into the war, they got into the fight.

We want that. We ask the Members to let us give the country these things. We demand that the DOD give us a nuclear task force.

In addition to this, we are willing not only to have a full nuclear task force, but we are willing to have a mixed task force, to have two brandnew frigates and two brandnew conventional frigates, so that we may try it out and see how the mixed force works. We think it wise. Admiral Rickover highly recommends it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina may proceed.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The research and development budget submitted by the Department of Defense totaled \$6.9 billion. Defense witnesses testified that the amount in the budget reflected a reduction of \$1.2 billion by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Of this amount, \$791 million is directly research and development effort, with the remainder being taken from appropriations supporting research and development.

During the current fiscal year—1966—the Congress has been asked to authorize and appropriate over \$12 billion in supplemental funds to support our efforts in southeast Asia. Included in these supplementals was less than \$152 million for research and development.

The Committee on Armed Services feels—and feels strongly—that the budget submitted by the Department of Defense was much too austere in the research and development area. The military departments advised the committee of numerous projects in their current programs which would require additional funds in fiscal year 1967. It was stated that these funds would have to come from available resources, through reprogramming actions or through use of the emergency fund.

And you, Mr. Chairman, and all members of the committee, know what it means to use the reprogramming procedure or the emergency fund for these essential projects. It means that the direct control of the Congress is very substantially lost when these procedures are used.

In addition, the military departments identified numerous projects that were not included in the budget because the requirements had arisen subsequent to the budget submission to the Secretary of Defense and to the Congress. It was said that these projects also would require funds in the coming year.

Incidentally, I think it very important to note that Dr. Foster, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering—and who acts as Secretary McNamara's principal adviser in this field—informed the committee that many of these projects which were excluded from the budget have his support.

Again, the report deals in considerable detail with the additions in the research and development area and you will find this explanatory material on pages 18 to 23.

Here are the major projects:

First. The manned orbiting laboratory for which \$80 million was added.

Second. Nike X, \$14.4 million.

Third. The advanced aerial fire support system—AAFSS—\$8.8 million.

Fourth. Medium-range air-to-surface guided missile Condor, \$26.6 million.

Fifth. Antisubmarine warfare programs, slightly over \$50 million.

Sixth. Deep submergence program, \$8.6 million.

Seventh. The F-117—TFX—\$22.3 million.

Eighth. Rapid response research and development for support of our forces in southeast Asia, \$15 million; and last

Ninth. Eleven million eight hundred thousand dollars for the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA.

All of these programs you have heard something about, but I am sure that you are particularly familiar with the advanced manned strategic aircraft since we had extended subcommittee and full committee hearings on the need for a follow-on bomber. And, like the area of nuclear propulsion for our naval surface ships, we are going to press for an advanced bomber, too. It is an old and homely phrase, but the committee all agrees that we do not want all our eggs in a missile basket, and I have the feeling that this Committee is in agreement with that principle.

I will now deal briefly with the program as submitted by the Department of Defense, and I will draw your attention to the table on page 6 of the report which sets out in immediately understandable fashion the amount of authority being granted for the various categories of procurement for the three departments and the amounts authorized for research and development.

The individual programs begin on page 64 of the report where you will find a detailed description of all of the items in the Army program. Each of the aircraft, missiles and tracked combat vehicles are

listed and described. The Army program extends to page 70.

It totals almost \$1.5 billion.

The Navy program begins on page 71 of the report, and again all of the fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters, the Sidewinder missile, and all the other missiles, both for the Navy and Marine Corps, are listed and described.

It totals about \$3.8 billion which, of course, includes \$2 billion for ships.

The Air Force program begins on page 77 and, again, contains all of the detail which I have referred to.

It totals about \$5.2 billion.

The Department's original research and development program begins on page 82 and extends for 10 pages.

In addition to the money changes that I have dealt with in the bill both in the area of procurement and research and development, I would also like to point out that the committee made a few other changes. For example, on page 5 of the bill you will find that in addition to authorizing the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates which I dealt with earlier, the committee has added the following language:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable.

The purpose of this language is obvious. It says, in effect, Congress wants a nuclear Navy and we intend that the Department of Defense go ahead and get started on it.

Another change made by the committee was the addition of title IV which appears on page 9 of the bill. The language we added here, simply stated, forbids the Secretary of Defense to reduce or eliminate any major weapons system until he had advised the Congress of all of the pertinent details relating to his proposed action.

You will recall the recent report of the committee which told a rather horrendous tale of a proposal to phase out the B-58 bomber, our only supersonic bomber. Not only did we here in the Congress know nothing about this proposal until we saw it in the press, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force never even heard of it until he saw reference made to it in a draft memorandum from the Secretary of Defense to the President. This is bad business. We cannot allow this kind of thing to go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina, may yield himself 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have made reference to the excellence of the committee report. We all here on the floor today are members of committees of the Congress. And we know where committee reports come from: they are written by the staff un-

der, of course, the overall supervision of the committee. We are all proud of the fine work done by our counsels and our staff. I trust you will indulge me when I say that on Capitol Hill there is no more dedicated—no more harder working—and no more imaginative—staff than that of the Armed Services Committee of the House. Every one of them is a professional in the highest sense of that word. I think every member of the committee shares my respect for our staff and I want to take this opportunity to commend them, and each one of them.

The House, on April 6, approved H.R. 14122, a bill recommended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which would, if enacted, authorize an across-the-board Federal civilian salary adjustment of approximately 2.87 percent. Since this recommendation has been acted upon favorably by the House and is in general accord with the views of the President in which he recommended a direct salary increase of 2.85 percent for Federal civilian employees, the Committee on Armed Services believes that a comparable and equitable increase in the basic pay of uniformed services personnel is fully justified.

As Members of this Committee are aware, last year the Congress authorized a substantial increase in military pay which averaged 10.4 percent. Also included in the pay adjustment made in last year's legislation was an effort by the Congress to overcome serious inequities in the compensation provided military personnel with less than 2 years of service. That group of personnel, officer and enlisted alike, received an average increase of 18 percent in basic pay. Thus, with the enactment of the 1965 Military Pay Act, the committee had established a new and more equitable relationship among the various grades in the military pay structure.

The legislation embodied in this bill providing an increase in uniformed services pay does not alter this grade relationship established in the 1965 pay act since it will provide a flat across-the-board increase of 3.2 percent for all officer and enlisted grades alike.

There was also embodied in the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 a new requirement, section 1088 of title 37, United States Code, which provided that the President would submit to the Congress by January 1, 1967, a detailed report concerning recommended adjustments and changes in the principles and concepts of the compensation system established for members of the uniformed services. An intensive review of these principles and concepts is presently underway within the Department of Defense and should, when completed, provide the Congress with essential background information relative to the desirability of effecting changes in the military compensation system. Therefore, the Committee on Armed Services did not attempt to alter or effect any changes in the uniformed services basic pay structure at this time, and recommended a flat across-the-board increase of 3.2 percent.

The Committee on Armed Services has been advised that the executive branch has no objection to the 3.2-percent increase in basic pay recommended by the committee and embodied in this bill.

The annual cost of this increase in military pay is approximately \$356 million.

The effective date of the military pay increase would coincide with that authorized by the House for civilian employees—that is, July 1, 1966.

And that, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, is the bill. It is a necessarily large and comprehensive bill and, again, I will mention that so is the report that accompanies it. I have tried to deal with the outstandingly important details of the bill, and I hope I have done so to your satisfaction. But I will point out that for those who wish additional and more detailed information, the report will, I believe, satisfy even the most exacting.

The vote on this bill in committee was 33 to 0. The House will make no mistake in voting with the the same preponderance.

This is what we are asking you to do. Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and I share the same aspirations for this country, especially as they relate to the defense of the country.

I sat back there, Mr. Chairman, with pride, as I listened to the able chairman present this bill, pride as a Member of this great, august body, but most especially pride as a fellow South Carolinian.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my colleagues here that certainly the State of South Carolina holds MENDEL RIVERS in the highest possible regard.

The evidence of that is the fact that he does not have either Republican or Democratic opposition in the forthcoming election. Further evidence of that is the fact that South Carolina has honored him as probably we have never honored any man and that is by erecting a monument to MENDEL RIVERS while he is still living, as we did just recently in his home county of Charleston.

We are proud of you, MENDEL RIVERS. While perhaps some might try to make derogatory remarks about you, we of South Carolina are proud of your dedication to duty and your knowledge of the facts, that is probably equaled by no other man. We are proud of you for the long hours that you have worked so hard trying to give our men in Vietnam as well as all our servicemen the best possible equipment in order to defend this country of ours.

So as a South Carolinian and as a Member of this body, we are indeed proud of you. I am proud to claim you as my friend regardless of whether you are a Democrat or an Independent. Above all, you, just as I, try to be loyal Americans and I am proud at this time

to commend you in behalf of the people of South Carolina and of this country.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to say this to you, my dear friend, you know the affection I have for you. You will always be my friend and you will never hear me say anything against you because I know of your love for our country, and I know what you mean to your people. Your people think pretty well of you, ALBERT, and so do I and I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has consumed 1 hour and 17 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for his magnificent statement. He has not only said what I had in mind, but has far surpassed it. It has been a real honor and a pleasure for me to serve with him on the House Committee on Armed Services now for some 17 years, but it has been with even greater pride that I have sat by his side during the last 2 years while he has been chairman of the committee.

His work has been unsurpassed. As great as that pleasure has been in the professional sense, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, in the personal sense my affection for him is as great. I consider him to be a very dear friend. I have traveled with him from the sands of Africa to the icy wastes of the North Pole. He is a dedicated American. He is a man who is informed. He is a man who knows the intricacies of airplanes. He can spell out in detail the master plan of our bases in the most remote parts of the world. The hours that he puts in in his office cannot be equaled by any man in this Chamber, and I would advise my colleagues if sometimes you cannot sleep be it 5 o'clock or 6 o'clock in the morning, call the office of MENDEL RIVERS. You will find him answering that call at his desk in his office.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Republican Member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I want to say that our chairman has gone to unprecedented lengths to keep me and the other members of our committee informed so that when a decision is made by our committee, it is not the decision of the gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS, the chairman of the committee, but it is a decision that is responsive to the will and the desires of all the members of the committee.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, it has been a great pleasure for me to serve with the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts from the bottom of my heart. There is nothing else I can say.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes appropriations amounting to \$17.8 billion,

\$10 billion of which is for the procurement of ships and missiles, research development, and track vehicles; \$7 billion of which is for research and development. So on the one hand we have an expenditure of over \$10 billion for all these various items of procurement, and on the other hand almost an equivalent amount for research and development alone.

I think this points out to us the technical world in which we live, where research is almost equivalent to the procurement of the hardware that is contained in this bill. I think it indicates how much time, effort, brains, and money we are putting into research.

In the last generation we have unlocked the secrets of the atom. We have pierced the hidden sanctity of space. We have gone to greater depths in the ocean than man has ever known before, and these developments have cost a great deal of money.

This bill we have before us today is the largest bill of its kind that has ever been presented here on the floor of the House. I should like to address myself to the reasons for it.

First. Whether a person be a housewife or a Member of this body, he or she is aware of the costs of inflation. That has had its impact.

Second. Technological advancements have a high price tag for the development of our weapon systems. During World War II we spent \$4 million for a submarine. Today a Polaris submarine costs \$150 million.

In World War II a destroyer cost \$7 million. Today a destroyer costs \$67 million.

During World War II an aircraft carrier cost \$55 million; today, without the airplanes on it, it costs a half billion dollars.

So the technological advancements have come high in the price of this bill. But even more importantly than these factors in making this bill a large one is its historical development. When I first came on the committee this bill contained but one item, and that was naval vessels. We thought we ought to have control in the Armed Services Committee over other items of procurement, and in subsequent years we added to ship procurement the procurement of missiles and airplanes and research and development programs. This year for the first time we have included tracked vehicles. So we are getting more control in our committee of the military items, which should properly be under our jurisdiction.

The chairman and the members of the committee propose today and in the future, that, when we report a bill out here on the floor, we want you to know, as far as possible, what is contained in the military bill that you and the taxpayers of the United States must pay.

Mr. Chairman, as I read the newspapers and the periodicals, I observe references to controversies that have developed in respect to our committee and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. I have great respect for the ability of Mr. McNamara. He is a prodigious worker. No one in the entire administration works any harder than that man. We are in agreement with

him on 95 percent of the items that are contained in this bill, but we do have some differences. Who can speak with absolute finality on the subjects here involved? There are bound to be differences on such complex issues.

But more than that we have a constitutional responsibility. Every 2 years the Members of this body raise their hand and say that they will live up to the Constitution and execute the duties of their office, so help them God. The Constitution states that the Congress, not the Secretary of Defense, and not even the President of the United States, has the obligation and the responsibility to raise and support arms, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules and regulations for the land and naval forces. But I ask you, how can we in the Congress raise an Army, how can we provide for a Navy, if when we authorize and appropriate the money the Secretary of Defense insists that he will not spend it? How can we support an Army, how can we maintain the level of naval forces when, by the stroke of a pen, he can destroy it all?

So it is in this area, where we have differences. We believe we have certain responsibilities. We do not seek power. We do not seek more authority. We have enough work to do. But as long as this responsibility is reposed in the Congress of the United States, certainly as far as I am concerned and as far as the committee is concerned, we will exercise our duties as we see them.

There are four main things we have done in this bill. First, we have added to the budget \$931 million of equipment. I will comment just quickly on what these items involve.

Aircraft: \$19.9 million for observation helicopters—OH-6A—as requested by the Department of Defense; \$20 million for the television planes that had been damaged by Vietcong raids in Saigon—as reported back by our subcommittee that visited Saigon shortly after the raid; \$55 million to keep open the production lines of the interceptor aircraft—F-12—as recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the Department of Air Force.

It is particularly important at this point to mention that if the Secretary of Defense had followed the mandate of the Congress in 1962 and 1963, when we authorized and appropriated enough money for continuation of the lines of the B-52 and the B-58, we would have a better plane in operation today than the FB-111, on which we are spending so much money now. There would have been no need for the FB-111 if the Secretary of Defense had followed the decisions of the Congress.

Fifty-one point two million dollars to obtain jet transportation—CX-2—for the sick and wounded for their travel within this country. They are returned from southeast Asia by jetplanes, but there are only old propeller planes to distribute them around within this country. Our committee thought this not fair to the men and would authorize the jetplanes for use within this country.

Missiles: \$167.9 million for research and development and for procure-

ment activities for the Nike X anti-missile missile—\$153.5 for procurement and \$14.4 million for research and development. The committee understands that the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously support the preproduction funding of this missile, without making any final decision as to the exact type of missile involved. The committee believes that even a modest anti-missile-missile program can save millions of American lives.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for the leadership he has given on the Nike X program, as well as the other members of the committee, and the chairman of the committee. Apparently this is one of the items to which Mr. McNamara objects.

I believe this program is long overdue. This is something that should have been started years ago. As I understand it, Mr. McNamara opposed it 3 years ago.

I wonder whether or not this small amount included here is really going to get the program off the ground?

Mr. BATES. The amounts we have included in here are in accordance with the best estimates of progress that can be made, according to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is \$167 million.

It might well be that the long run will prove us wrong. We do not know. But this much we do know: The most we can lose is \$167 million. But, if the Secretary of Defense is wrong, we can lose this country.

Mr. LATTI. I quite agree with the gentleman. Has not some money already been expended on this program?

Mr. BATES. Yes, indeed. This is an add-on. Over \$2 billion has been spent on it already.

Mr. LATTI. This is of great concern to the American people, because we have absolutely no defense against these missiles. Unless this program is developed successfully, we are very vulnerable. Can the gentleman comment on what the Russian position is on this?

Mr. BATES. To the best of my knowledge and understanding, the Russians have an advanced system which they are now installing near Moscow and Leningrad. I do not know how effective it will be, but I do know they are spending money for such purposes.

Regardless of what the Russians do, we must do what we believe is right for the defense of this Nation. It is in that sense and that spirit we have added the \$167 million to this bill.

Mr. LATTI. I thank the gentleman. I commend the gentleman and the committee for putting this money in the bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, another item is \$130 million for the DLGN nuclear frigate. This merely represents a repetition of what we put in last year. The money was not spent.

Army: \$14.4 million for Nike X anti-missile-missile research and development has been set forth above; \$8.8 million for aerial fire support; \$2 million for a heavy lift helicopter; and \$37.6 million

for other research and development, including antitank weapons, air defense missiles, satellite communications-ground environment, night vision components, the limited war laboratory for research for the southeast Asia war, and others.

Navy: \$26.6 million for further work on the medium range guided missile Condor; \$8.6 million for deep submergence research—especially to help locate and release men caught in submarines which may have gone down in deep water; and \$107.5 million for antisubmarine warfare research as specifically identified by Admiral Martell as essential during the next year.

Air Force: \$80 million for funding of the Manned Orbiting Laboratory; \$11.8 million to support the contract definition phase of the advanced manned strategic aircraft—supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; \$22.3 million as requested by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering for further research and development on the F-111A; \$3 million for further work on a vertical/short take-off and land aircraft. These funds will allow the United States to participate in a joint program with the Federal Republic of Germany; \$35.6 million for items which the Secretary of the Air Force would otherwise have to fund through reprogramming. Since these items can be seen this far in advance, they should be supported by this legislation, rather than go through the reprogramming actions; and \$15 million for further research and development for southeast Asia.

Second. My feeling and the feeling of the Chairman was that after the substantial increase in pay we provided to the military last year in order to bring them into line with civilian pay, we were hopeful that during this inflationary period, all other persons would exercise restraint in the interest of not throwing gasoline on the fires of inflation. This hope has not come to pass. Therefore, we could not stand by and see the Armed Forces put into a secondary position as it has been so often in the past. Our committee's suggestion of the pay increase has been supported by the Department of Defense speaking through the Honorable Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower.

Third. The committee, after having reviewed at length the unilateral decision of the Secretary of Defense to cut back on our manned bombers, decided that it should be told of any such similar move in advance in the future. Hence, it has suggested that no major weapons system shall be abandoned in the future unless Congress is told all of the facts relating to the decision 90 days before the decision becomes effective. The suggested provision of law would also require the Committees on Armed Services to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the recommendations of the committees on the proposed action within the 90 days.

Fourth—and this is to me a most important part of the bill—the Committee on Armed Services would have the Congress have the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy proceed with the design, engineering and construction

of two nuclear frigates as soon as practicable. Why is this provision vital? Let me give you the background out of which the provision has been found necessary.

Again, I would remind you of the constitutional power of the Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy."

The Congress decided in 1946 that it wanted to insure that the new powers of atomic energy were developed under strictly civilian control by having an Atomic Energy Commission and a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the Congress. It was the Joint Committee that had the Atomic Energy Commission make the first reactors for the first two nuclear submarines—the *Nautilus* and the *Seawolf*. The Department of Defense had nothing to do with the start of the nuclear submarine fleet. Thanks to that congressional leadership, today there are 23 attack nuclear submarines.

Likewise, it was the congressional interest that fostered our nuclear ballistic missile submarine fleet. Today there are 37 Polaris type submarines.

In the authorization bill before you today, there is a provision for five more nuclear attack submarines, as requested by the Department of Defense. This is but a continuation of the program which Congress had to institute in the early 1950's by having the Atomic Energy Commission provide the nuclear reactors for the first two nuclear submarines.

In the authorization bill before you today, there is also a provision for a second nuclear powered aircraft carrier. Our first nuclear powered aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, was authorized in 1958. Since that time, two other aircraft carriers have been built by the Department of Defense and despite the strong protestations of the Congress, they have been conventionally powered. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made a strong plea in 1963 for the *John F. Kennedy* to be nuclear powered, but without any success. The *America* has also been made conventionally powered. I also made several strong statements on those matters. Now at last, the Department of Defense has come to the realization that nuclear powered aircraft carriers have great advantages—especially of freedom from the fuel oil logistics train—and they now ask for this new one. They plan to ask for others in the future. We are very glad that the Department of Defense at last sees the benefits that the Congress has so long seen in nuclear power.

The importance of having aircraft carriers has been clearly increased in recent days. The attack aircraft carrier is a movable platform from which to launch airplanes from wherever they may be needed and is our prime Navy attack weapon. It and its escorts should be free to the greatest extent possible from any logistics train or logistic depots in foreign countries. Its freedom to go anywhere in the world has been accentuated by the British decision not to defend east of Suez; the French decision to pull out of NATO and have all foreign troops pulled from French soil; and with the increasing problems with rights and overflight.

With each aircraft carrier, there have to be at least four escort ships to provide antisubmarine and antiair protection. It is now in this area that the present battle rages. The *Long Beach*, a nuclear-powered cruiser, was authorized in 1957. The *Bainbridge*, a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate, was authorized in 1959. These are the ships which can properly be the escort of the *Enterprise* now—although the *Long Beach*, as a cruiser is really too large for the job, and can be put to better use elsewhere.

What are the escort ships to come? There is only one so far that is actually being built—the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate, *Truxtun*. This ship was authorized in fiscal year 1962, but was changed from conventionally powered to nuclear powered by the action of our committee. In the next year, we authorized another frigate to be used for escort purposes, but it was canceled by the Department of Defense because the weapons system planned for it was not ready. This means that so far there is only one escort ship which is being built which can be a nuclear escort for either of our nuclear carriers.

But that is not the end of the story. Last year, on the suggestion of the Committee on Armed Services, the Congress authorized a new frigate, and then appropriated \$20 million for the long lead time items. In providing only the long lead items, the House Appropriations Committee told the Department of Defense to come back for the balance of the money this year. To this date, not 1 penny of the \$20 million has been released. Nor did the Department of Defense seek the balance of the \$150.5 million authorized.

Even after the passage of the bills, our committee did not let the matter rest there. Our chairman, the Honorable gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], pursued the matter at length with the Secretary of Defense in extended correspondence. Still not 1 cent of the money has been released. The Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations also requested permission to proceed with the frigate, and still not 1 cent was released.

The amazing part of this story is that the Secretary of Defense testified before our committee:

There is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear-powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't, I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for. As I say, I believe we have. If we haven't, I'm quite prepared to change the programs.

Yes, I think that is important, not just one, but I think each carrier that is nuclear-powered ought to be part of a balanced task force. Since we are recommending a nuclear-powered carrier in 1967, we want to have not just the *Enterprise* part of a balanced force, but also this 1967 carrier part of a balanced force.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy came out with another powerful report in April of this year, after the testimony of the Secretary of Defense and recommended again that the major sur-

face ships, especially the escort ships of nuclear-powered carriers be nuclear powered. Not a penny of the money authorized and appropriated by the Congress last year has yet been released.

What has been the position of the Navy? In 1963, the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations decided that it would be Navy policy from then on to have all aircraft carriers nuclear powered and to have all major combatant ships—those over 8,000 tons—nuclear powered. After the Navy found that it was not going to be allowed to get the \$20 million appropriated last year, it reclaimed the decision and lost, and then it requested the Secretary of Defense to allow it to ask for a full frigate in the budget under discussion and was denied that permission.

Now the Navy has shifted its position to ask that only two of the four minimum escort ships be nuclear powered—undoubtedly on the theory that only real ships can protect the carrier, not just paper ships. It has used as the basis of this position, one of the cost-effectiveness studies that said it might be true that there was not as much to be gained from making the last two escorts nuclear as making the first two escorts. Now what is the truth of the matter?

The truth of the matter is that of the fuel consumption as shown in southeast Asia, one-third is used for the carrier's propulsion, one-third is used for the escorts, propulsion, and one-third is used for the airplanes. Hence, it is that making both the carrier and the escorts nuclear cuts off two-thirds of the fuel logistics pipeline. In case you wonder whether this makes any difference, let me tell you that in every study, the Chief of Naval Operations has insisted on the importance of having the ships free from this pipeline. This adds a whole new dimension to surface navies—just as being free from the surface added a whole new dimension to submarines when nuclear propulsion came along. In study after study, the Chief of Naval Operations has pointed out that this important element has been omitted from the cost effectiveness analysis.

As recently as April 14 the Chief of Naval Operations made this statement:

The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequalled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security.

Admiral Miller, who was in charge of the Carrier Division 3 in southeast Asia, has written a memorandum in which he pointed out the many advantages—both general and from specific instances—of having nuclear-powered ships in combat. Not the least of these is the ability of the escorts to take off after a submarine sounding on a moment's notice. With the great increase in nuclear submarines among other powers in the world, our escorts must be able to leave their station on a moment's notice and follow the submarine without having to worry about

running low on fuel. Admiral Miller put the matter in these terse terms when testifying before our committee:

Well, basically, a nuclear-powered task group can do the job easier, better, and faster, than a conventionally powered task group. Taking the job as a whole, as far as the aircraft carrier is concerned, it launches the strikes, gets them off, gets them back faster and easier than the conventional. The cleaning bill aboard is not as much. We save thousands of hours a year in not having to clean the soot and the residue off the airplanes and the ship internally and externally. It is an easier maintenance job aboard the nuclear carrier. And with the planes that you have aboard a nuclear carrier, the acceleration and the deceleration of your nuclear ships is much more responsive than the conventional ships. You can take every facet of operation, you might say it is easier in a nuclear-powered ship.

Admiral Rickover, who has had the courage to try for nuclear-powered ships over the objections of the Department of Defense for many years, spoke at length about the advantages of nuclear power. His outspoken stand has earned him many enemies within the Department, but he has continued to devote his efforts to get the kind of a Navy he thinks is best for this country. His statements are not only in the hearings, but set forth at length in our report.

Now the objection to having nuclear-powered surface ships has always been that they cost too much. Yet, this does not appear to be true. Remember that the initial cost of a nuclear ship also includes the first nuclear fuel which will last at least 10 years. The initial cost of a conventionally powered ship does not include the cost of the fuel. The memorandum of the Chief of Naval Operations shows that when the cost of the fuel and fuel delivery is included in the cost of operating any conventionally powered ship, the lifetime cost of that ship in a task group is only 1 percent more if it is nuclear than if it is conventionally powered. Therefore, since the Navy is already accepting at least two nuclear-powered escorts, what we are really talking about is only 2 percent of the lifetime cost of the entire nuclear task group. And this is the sum to be spent for full protection of a \$1 billion initial investment in a nuclear carrier and its planes. In view of the far greater battle effectiveness of the nuclear-powered ships, this 2 percent is hardly worth mentioning at all.

Remember that it is not until the last of the escort ships is made nuclear that the real importance of the nuclear power of the entire task group can be shown. It is then that the chain is cut, and the task group is freed for far more flexibility and battle effectiveness.

This, then, is the background against which the committee voted to reauthorize the frigate of last year and to include a frigate for this year—the long-standing efforts of Congress to get a nuclear task group for the Navy—the far greater battle effectiveness of the nuclear task group—the almost minimal increase in cost over the lifetime of the task group when it is nuclear.

Despite the constitutional power of the Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy" the Department of Defense has

refused to consider the positions which the Congress has set into law. In our opinion, this is a serious matter. As the Chief of Naval Operations has said with respect to nuclear propulsion:

To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security.

After the deliberate failure of the Department of Defense in not following the program for the Navy as set forth in the statutes, the only answer is to provide that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the construction of the two frigates as soon as practicable.

This is the real civilian control of the military as envisioned by our forefathers. This is the real exercise of the Congress and its constitutional power to provide and maintain a Navy.

Section 101 of S. 2950, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, contains, in the section on naval vessels, the sentence:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable.

In my opinion, this provision is constitutional. The Constitution starts out, article I, section I:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Article II, section I, on the other hand, provides:

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

What do these words mean? Legislative? Executive? What did they mean when the Constitution was written? The Dictionary of American English, 1940, University of Chicago Press provides some help:

Legislative: Of or pertaining to a legislature. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)

Legislature:

1. The body of assembly of constituted representatives of a colony, state, or territory, vested with authority to make laws for the governance of the body politic. (Citing instances from 1729 on.)

2. The federal Congress. (Citing instances from 1787 on.) Executive department: The, or a, department of government concerned with the proper carrying out of the laws:

1. Of a State government. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)

2. Of the U.S. government. (Citing instances from 1787 on.)

Thus it is that by the very terms of the first sections of both article I and article II of the Constitution, it is the function of the Congress to enact the laws of the United States, and for the President to see that those laws are carried into effect. Lest there be any doubt of this, article II, section 3 provides "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

Under the Articles of Confederation of 1778, there was no executive to carry out the will of Congress—there was only a Congress. This was felt to be a very real drawback. Hence it was that when the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 to try to eliminate some of the shortcomings

of the Articles of Confederation, the first proposal put before the Convention, that of Edmund Randolph, included the provision:

7. Resolved, that a National Executive be instituted; to be chosen by the National Legislature for a term of —; to receive punctually, at stated times, a fixed compensation for the services rendered, in which no increase nor diminution shall be made, so as to affect the magistracy existing at the time of increase or diminution; and to be ineligible a second time; and that, besides a general authority to execute the national laws, it ought to enjoy the executive rights vested in Congress by the Confederation. ("The Papers of James Madison, and his Reports of Debates in the Federal Convention, 1840," p. 732.)

The next proposal came from Charles Pinckney, including an article VIII which would provide:

The executive power of the United States shall be vested in a President of the United States of America, which shall be his style; and his title shall be His Excellency. He shall be elected for — years; and shall be re-eligible.

He shall from time to time give information to the Legislature, of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration the measures he may think necessary. He shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed. ("Madison Papers," p. 742)

Beyond the introduction and reference to the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style, there was little further that happened to the provisions that the President "shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed" during the Convention.

There were several powers given to the Congress with respect to military affairs:

- To declare War . . .
- To raise and support Armies . . .
- To provide and maintain a Navy . . .
- To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces . . .
- To provide for calling forth the Militia . . .
- To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia . . .
- To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever . . . and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings.

The extent to which the Congress was intended to have the control over the military is best shown by the special provision in the power to raise Armies:

But no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two years.

The Founding Fathers were so fearful of having a military imposed on the country that they even wanted to keep the moneys limited so that each Congress would be able to decide how the military would be run.

The reasons for this special provision were given in the debates:

To the second clause Mr. Gerry objected, that it admitted of appropriations to an army for two years, instead of one; for which he could not conceive a reason; that it implied there was to be a standing army, which he inveighed against, as dangerous to liberty—as unnecessary even for so great an extent of country as this—and if necessary, some restriction on the number and duration ought to be provided. Nor was this a proper

time for such an innovation. The people would not bear it.

Mr. Sherman remarked, that the appropriations were permitted only, not required to be for two years. As the Legislature is to be biennially elected, it would be inconvenient to require appropriations to be for one year, as there might be no session within the time necessary to renew them. He should himself, he said, like a reasonable restriction on the number and continuance of an army in time of peace.

The second clause was then agreed to, *nem. con.* ("Madison Papers," p. 1495.)

In the *Federalist*, No. 24, there was discussion of the exact relation between the Executive and the Congress:

A stranger to our politics, who was to read our newspapers at the present juncture, without having previously inspected the plan reported by the convention, would be naturally led to one of two conclusions: either that it contained a positive injunction, that standing armies should be kept up in time of peace; or that it vested in the Executive the whole power of levying troops, without subjecting his discretion, in any shape, to the control of the legislature.

If he came afterwards to peruse the plan itself, he would be surprised to discover, that neither the one nor the other was the case; that the whole power of raising armies was lodged in the Legislature, not in the Executive; that this legislature was to be a popular body, consisting of the representatives of the people periodically elected; and that instead of the provision he had supposed in favor of standing armies, there was to be found, in respect to this object, an important qualification even of the legislative discretion, in that clause which forbids the appropriation of money for the support of an army for any longer period than two years—a precaution which, upon a nearer view of it will appear to be a great and real security against the keeping up of troops without evident necessity."

From this discussion, it is obvious that the Founding Fathers were most fearful of a standing army and that they wanted the controls over that Army to be in the Congress, not in the Executive.

It is claimed that the President has full power over the military from his position, given him by article II, section 2:

The President shall be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States.

This position was first suggested by Mr. Charles Pinckney as part of article VIII of his proposed draft. It was incorporated in all later drafts without discussion.

The relation between the powers of the Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy and the position of the President as Commander in Chief were clearly spelled out in the report of this Committee on the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958:

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESS

While the Constitution designates the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, it places upon Congress the responsibility to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Analysis of these constitutional provisions in comparison with the powers of the British Crown, from which the Colonies wrested their independence, clarifies the origin of the responsibilities placed upon Congress by the Constitution. The King—like the President today—had the

power of command over the armed forces of Britain, but he also had the power to raise and regulate armies and navies and to govern them.

In contrast, under the Constitution, the President's powers over military affairs were not allowed to pass to him by implication, rising from his position as the Chief Executive. His military authority was specifically designated as command only. The responsibility to provide for the common defense, to create the forces necessary for such defense, and to make necessary rules for the government of the forces thus created was placed and remains with Congress.

This separation of powers over the military affairs of the Nation was the product of conscious and careful design. It was completely consistent with a fundamental concept upon which our Government was, and is, established; that is, that freedom can thrive only when the basic powers of government are not vested in one man or a small group of men. A firm and distinct separation of power over our military forces was to be expected from men who had experienced the tyranny of a government in which all power over military affairs was vested in one man. Indeed, the abusive employment of military force was a major complaint lodged by the Declaration of Independence against the Crown.

It is apparent that, under the Constitution, the power of Congress over the Military Establishment is, and was intended to be, complete, save for the power to command the forces they create.

Congress has never considered this responsibility to consist merely in providing funds as requested by the executive branch to be used or withheld at its discretion. Under this view, Congress would be unable to discharge its constitutional responsibilities or to insure that the views of the American people, as expressed by their elected representatives, are observed by the executive branch of the Government.

The committee recognizes military power as an instrument of national policy and the necessity for close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches in shaping that policy. If, however, Congress is to perform its constitutional responsibilities and give vitality to the fundamental doctrine of separation of powers, it must retain a meaningful measure of control over the combatant functions of the Armed Forces it creates. Otherwise, the flexibility or rigidity of our military policies will come to rest entirely upon the executive branch of the Government. The legislative branch would thus abdicate its historic responsibility over the design and capabilities of our major instruments of military policy and would renounce its responsibility to provide for the common defense. The Committee on Armed Services is confident, from the testimony of representatives of the executive branch, that this is neither contemplated nor desired by the present incumbents; but it is the responsibility of Congress to insure that the law does not permit such a result.

The committee has made no provision to give the Secretary of Defense increased control over the funds appropriated to his Department. This area of the President's recommendations are set forth in his message of April 3, 1958, was not developed in specific terms by witnesses from the executive branch. It is also an area that will require meticulous examination by Congress.

The executive department has from time to time contended, as early as 1795, that appropriations for military purposes ought to be general or even lump-sum grants to be expended at discretion by the executive rather than specific appropriations. Congress has never accepted this view as being consistent with its re-

sponsibility to insure that money is not withdrawn from the Treasury except for a specific object, to an extent, and out of a fund which has been established by law. The relationship of this control over appropriations to the constitutional responsibilities of Congress relating to the Armed Forces, which are enumerated above, is too apparent to necessitate discussion—House Report No. 1765, 85th Congress, 2d session, May 22, 1958.

That this analysis is probably correct is shown by the study made by the Library of Congress, "The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States"—House Document No. 443, 84th Congress, 2d session, June 14, 1956. Of the 117 instances of the use by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief cited therein, none relates to the composition of the fighting force and its equipment. Rather the instances are directed toward the tactical use of the forces and equipment available in specific instances.

That the President is bound by the legislation, in his capacity as Commander in Chief even in wartime, is shown by the message to Congress of September 2, 1942, in which President Roosevelt demanded repeal of a provision of the Emergency Price Control Act, which he felt to be a hindrance to the war effort, although he threatened to use his powers to achieve the same end if the Congress did not act.

The power of the Congress to provide a Navy was first suggested by Charles Pinckney in his proposal:

Article VI. The Legislature of the United States shall have the power . . . To build and equip fleets. ("Madison Papers," p. 739.)

In the debates this phrase was changed to—

To provide and maintain a Navy ("Madison Papers," p. 1360) without discussion and without dissent, as a more convenient definition of the power.

After that, the phrase was accepted by the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style.

While it was not until 1798 that the Congress found it desirable to establish a Department of the Navy—1 Stat. 553, chap. XXXV, April 30, 1798—the Congress in 1794 authorized the President "to provide, by purchase, or otherwise, equip and employ four ships to carry 44 guns each, and two ships to carry 36 guns each."

Not only does the 1794 law provide for the number of guns; it also provides:

That there shall be employed on board each of the said ships of forty-four guns, one captain, four lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one chaplain, one surgeon, and two surgeon's mates; and in each of the ships of thirty-six guns, one captain, three lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one surgeon and one surgeon's mate, who shall be appointed and commissioned in like manner as other officers of the United States are. (1 Stat. 350, Chap. XII, March 27, 1794.)

The statute then goes on to provide for the number of warrant officers for each ship, and the number of men in the crews. The pay of all is set forth—"That the pay and subsistence of the respective commissioned and warrant officers be as follows."

Thus, while the Congress authorized the President to obtain the ships, it specified the armament, the manning, the pay for the officers and even the ration.

There was similar legislation in 1797:

That the President of the United States be and he is hereby empowered, should he deem it expedient, to cause the frigates *United States*, *Constitution* and *Constellation*, to be manned and employed. (1 Stat. 523, Chap. VII, July 1, 1797)

However, the balance of the law sets forth what the strength in officers and enlisted shall be, what their pay shall be and what shall be the ration.

The provisions of the law of 1799 are even more direct:

That under the orders of the President of the United States, and in addition to the naval armament already authorized by law, there shall be built within the United States six ships of war, of a size to carry, and which shall be armed with not less than seventy-four guns each. (1 Stat. 621, Chap. XIII, February 25, 1799)

An examination of the membership of Congress in 1794, 1797, and 1799 shows that, along with the President and Vice President, there were eight Members of Congress in 1794 who attended the Constitutional Convention and five Members of Congress in 1797 and 1799 who attended the Constitutional Convention. Although the laws directed the size of the ships, their manning, pay and rations, there was no recorded discussion on the floor of either the House or the Senate that these requirements were an infringement of the President's prerogatives. On the contrary, the bills always passed on voice votes and were signed immediately by the President.

Again, in 1809, Thomas Jefferson signed into law a bill—

That, in addition to the frigates now employed in actual service, there be fitted out, officered and manned, as soon as may be, the four following frigates, to wit: the *United States*, *Essex*, *John Adams*, and *President* (2 Stat. 514, chap. XI, January 31, 1809).

From the historical background, it is clear not only that the drafters of the Constitution intended the Congress to direct the President in the operation of the Navy, but that the Congress immediately after the adoption of the Constitution did direct the President as to the kinds of ships and armament he should have in the Navy. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson signed one such mandate into law.

There are several instances in recent periods where the Department of Defense has been directed by the Congress with respect to its operations.

In 1952, the Congress directed the Department of Defense to maintain the Marine Corps at a certain level. The precise language of the law—Public Law 416, 82d Congress, chapter 479, 2d session, 61 Stat. 502, June 28, 1952—includes:

The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and three air wings.

On August 10, 1956, the Congress thoroughly reexamined title 10 of the United States Code, Armed Forces, and enacted the title into law. According to House

Report No. 970, 84th Congress, 2d session, the real task of preparing the new codification was carried on by the Department of Defense.

Section 101 of title 10 is "Definitions" and contains:

(28) "Shall" is used in an imperative sense.
(29) "May" is used in a permissive sense. The words "no person may" mean that no person is required, authorized, or permitted to do the act prescribed.

While the first section after the "Definitions" is permissive—

SEC. 121. REGULATIONS.—The President may prescribe regulations to carry out his functions, powers, and duties under this title—

The third section is mandatory:

SEC. 124. COMBATANT COMMANDS.—Establishment; composition; functions; administration and support—

(a) With the advice and assistance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, shall—

(1) establish unified combatant commands or specified combatant commands to perform military missions; and
(2) shall prescribe the force structure of those commands.

(b) The military departments shall assign forces to combatant commands established under this section to perform the missions of those commands.

Attention should also be drawn to the mandatory language of the fourth section following the definitions:

SEC. 125. Functions, powers, and duties; transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition—

(a) Subject to section 401 of title 50, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate action (including the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition of any function, power or duty) to provide more effective, efficient and economical administration and operation, and to eliminate duplication, in the Department of Defense.

Note that the Secretary is directed to provide more effective efficient administration before he is directed to provide more economical administration.

It is exactly the lack of effectiveness and efficiency that has caused the Committee on Armed Services to recommend to the House that it direct the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

From that point on, the title on armed services is replete with mandates in the operation of the Department of Defense and of the military departments.

There are also other mandates in the United States Code directed to the Department of Defense. For example, the matter of pay is directed by the Congress. Thus in section 2211 of title 5, the pay of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and some of their subordinates are set forth. Title 37 of the United States Code is devoted to the pay and allowances of the uniformed services. Congress sets the pay levels mandatorily. That is why it is necessary to have title III to S. 2950 as reported by the committee, when the committee believes that pay actions in other parts of the Federal Government make it equitable to increase the pay of the members of our armed services.

The mandatory language we have been discussing was taken from another statute, passed by the Congress and ap-

proved by the President. In 1957, the Congress, on the proposal of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, directed the Atomic Energy Commission to undertake various studies and research leading to the construction of some new kinds of reactors. Included in the reactors which the Congress wanted to have built, and which the Atomic Energy Commission was opposed to building, was a plutonium recycle experimental reactor. In order to be sure that this reactor was constructed, the Congress fiscal year 1958 the following language wrote into the authorization act for of section 110(a):

The Commission shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of the prototype power reactor facility authorized by section 101 for project 58-e-15 (plutonium recycle experimental reactor) at an installation operated by or on behalf of the Commission and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such installation. (Public Law 85-162, 71 Stat. 403, August 21, 1957.)

Similar mandatory language was included in sections 110 and 111 of the authorization act for fiscal year 1959—Public Law 85-590, 72 Stat. 490, August 4, 1958.

The mandatory language in our bill is necessary. Following the construction of the nuclear cruiser *Long Beach*, authorized in fiscal year 1957, and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge*, authorized in fiscal year 1959, there have been no proposals from the Department of Defense to have any more nuclear escorts. In fiscal year 1962, the Congress changed one frigate, the *Truxtun*, to nuclear power and in 1963 it authorized another nuclear frigate which was later canceled by the Department of Defense.

Last year, the Congress authorized \$150.5 million for another nuclear frigate and appropriated \$20 million toward it. Despite the appeals of the Department of the Navy, these funds have never been released by the Department of Defense.

This year, the Secretary of Defense testified before our committee:

There is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't, I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for.

Despite this testimony, the Secretary of Defense still has not released the \$20 million appropriated last year.

Under the words and history of the Constitution, under the first statutes putting into practice the ideas of our Constitution, and under recent legislative practices drafted in part by and accepted by the executive branch, there is no doubt that the Congress has the power to prescribe the kind of ships that will be built for the Navy. In view of the history of Department of Defense defiance to the will of Congress, the power can well be exercised. The language—"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and

the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable—is constitutional. The Congress has the power to direct the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

It seems to me the time has long since passed when we should have nuclear power for our surface ships. Let us not take two-thirds of a century again, as we did 100 years ago, in making a necessary transition. Let us cut the chains that bind our fighting ships to a pipeline.

Let us cut the umbilical cord from the mother ship so that these nuclear ships can do the kind of a job that our country and the times demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts consumed 17 minutes.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the national defense bill now before us—both that part pertaining to the procurement of military weapons and research and development, and that part which provides a moderate pay raise for our people in uniform.

There is little I can add, or in fact need be added, to what our very able Armed Services Committee chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], have presented with respect to the contents of the measure. They have more than adequately explained what our committee decided as to our defense needs, looking to the future in the light of present-day realities and contingencies. Our committee report, supplemented by the statements of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], details not only what is proposed but why, item by item.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Armed Services Committee since its inception. I have always been proud to be a member of this great committee. But never have I been as proud as I am at this very moment when our committee presents this bill to you.

This measure is but one of the many things that our committee has accomplished during this session under the able leadership of our chairman. In fact, during my many years' service on the committee I do not recall giving as detailed and as thorough examination into our defense posture and plans and needs as has been undertaken these past few months.

Aside from this and other measures we have brought before the House, our committee has made special inquiries into the closing of military installations, into the deferment of military construction previously authorized, into the phasing out of our manned bombers, and into our overall defense posture. We have filed special reports on our findings and recommendations, and they have resulted in appropriate legislative action.

All this we owe to the quality leadership provided our committee by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIV-

ERS]. Without the slightest partisanship, solely with a desire to do that which is best for the country and its security, our committee has worked together as a unit. And, at long last, thanks to our chairman, our Armed Services Committee has become an arm of the Congress and not simply an adjunct of the Defense Department. At long last, thanks to our chairman, our committee and the Congress are having an affirmative voice in the kind of defense we shall have. I might add that at long last, thanks to the leadership being provided by our committee and its chairman, our Joint Chiefs of Staff will have the voice they are intended to have as military experts in our military planning and strategy.

This is a committee bill in the fullest sense. It represents our collective judgment, based on our independent evaluation of the recommendations of the Defense Department as a civilian and military organization and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a military planning and strategy unit. Our committee decisions embodied in this bill were not based solely on some nebulous cost-effectiveness formula but upon what we now have in our defense arsenal and what we should have to insure that we are at all times fully prepared for any emergency, whenever, however and wherever it may arise as a threat to our national security.

We have not been unmindful of dollar costs but we have not allowed ourselves to be slaves to any predetermined dollar budget ceiling. We have sought to authorize no more and no less than what we must have to maintain a national defense second to none.

It must be borne in mind that the authorizations in this bill are not for next year's Air Force or for next year's Navy. An operational aircraft or ship cannot be produced in a year or even 2 years. Military planning and military procurement is not only for next year but for several years, with due allowance for technological developments, and with due allowance for all the international potentials for the foreseeable future.

From what is set forth in the first part of our committee report there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that we are determined that our Armed Services Committee and the Congress shall have an affirmative voice in the decisions made as to the size and nature of a national defense we shall have. For all too long, all too frequently and all too great an extent the Secretary of Defense has ignored, subverted, and circumvented the expressed will of Congress in the performance of our constitutional duties and responsibilities.

We have great respect for our Secretary of Defense and well recognize the burdensome duties and responsibilities that are his. We always have, and always will respectfully receive his recommendations. But whatever his managerial talents, and they are many; and whatever his intellectual capabilities, and they are great; he is not infallible. He is one man.

We likewise have great respect for our Joint Chiefs of Staff and well recognize the duties and responsibilities that are theirs. And we likewise respectfully receive their recommendations. But what-

ever their professional military skills, and they are exceptional, they are not without their limitation in matters other than weaponry and strategy.

We who serve in Congress are not without our limitations. Neither individually nor collectively does our Armed Services Committee claim to be defense experts. Nonetheless, we have the duty and responsibility to make the overall decision as to the kind of a defense we shall have, taking into account many more factors than either the Secretary of Defense or the Joint Chiefs of Staff are called upon to consider.

Unfortunately, Secretary of Defense McNamara has been disposed to substitute his individual judgment for the collective judgment of the Congress. He has seen fit to substitute his nonprofessional civilian judgment for the professional military judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The bill before us again brings in issue a long standing difference of opinion between the Secretary of Defense and the Congress. I refer to the question whether we should have an advanced manned strategic bomber as a part of our national defense.

Five years ago our committee authorized and funds were appropriated for the development of the B-70. The Defense Secretary refused to use the funds. The following year—1962—our committee reported a bill which directed him to use not less than \$491 million for this purpose. There was a question whether the Congress had the constitutional authority to mandate or order the Defense Secretary in that respect. But it never came to a test.

Our committee chairman, Mr. Vinson, of Georgia, made his now famous visit to the rose garden at the White House, something in the nature of a compromise was reached, and the language directing the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the bomber program was withdrawn.

The so-called compromise has proven to be little more than a save-face gesture. The issue over the manned bomber is still with us. Without prior consultation with our committee the Secretary of Defense decided to phase out the B-58, our only supersonic bomber.

Secretary McNamara to the contrary notwithstanding, our Committee is determined that we have a manned bomber replacement for the B-52 and B-58, and for this purpose have added \$11,800,000 to this bill. This is merely a step toward the objective. I sincerely hope the Secretary does not have the effrontery again to ignore our repeatedly expressed will. He already has gone so far as to try to leave the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff concur in the position he takes. The contrary is true. For alleged security reasons testimony from the Air Force member of the Joint Chiefs was deleted from the hearings by the Defense Department that showed the Joint Chiefs not in agreement with the position taken by the Secretary of Defense.

In this connection I might point out that a few years ago it became evident that our Joint Chiefs of Staff were losing their independent professional status as our military planners and strategists. They were placed under restraint in the

expression of their independent judgments on military matters. If they did not conform in all respect to the views of the Secretary of Defense they risked not being reappointed.

On several occasions I, and other members of our Armed Services Committee, have expressed our strenuous objection to manipulating the tenure of office of a Joint Chief of Staff to compel conformity to civilian decisions in our military planning. As a matter of fact, both the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and I sponsored a bill in the last Congress to fix the term of each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at 4 years, subject only to removal by the President. Our committee reported the bill but no action was taken on it. As to be expected, Secretary McNamara was opposed.

All this may not seem pertinent to the bill before us. But it is. The measure we have presented does not conform in its entirety with the views of the Secretary of Defense. We have added the advanced manned bomber, which I mentioned, and we have also added nuclear-powered frigates. We all too well know, I regret to say, what to expect when we, the Congress, or they, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, do not meekly accept what the Secretary in his benign judgment decides.

The time has long since arrived when the Congress must assert its constitutional prerogatives with respect to our defense plans and posture. That we are endeavoring to do, under the able leadership of Chairman RIVERS.

We recognize that the President is Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces. We recognize that the Secretary of Defense has his grave responsibilities and arduous duties. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff also have their independent, but coordinate, duties and responsibilities, and we in Congress have ours. This is what Secretary of Defense McNamara refuses to recognize.

It is for this reason that our committee has found it necessary to insert in this multibillion military procurement bill a provision that the Defense Secretary cannot eliminate or substantially reduce any weapons system without first advising the Congress and giving us opportunity to make a recommendation. We wrote a provision of the same general nature in the military construction bill passed last session.

All that the Congress is really asking is that both the executive and the legislative branches share in the constitutional responsibilities for both the establishment and maintenance of an adequate system of national defense. Is that asking too much? As a matter of fact this sharing of responsibilities is something that should be done without the asking by statutory law.

There are many features of the bill I should like to discuss, but to do so would be largely repetitious. In all this the important point to bear in mind is that what we are authorizing today is not simply for tomorrow, for next year, for the year after year or the year following. We must plan as well as humanly possi-

ble for the distant future, and yet not too distant.

We must, for example, plan now for the day when our entire Navy task force will be nuclear-powered. That is why our committee has added two nuclear-powered frigates not requested by the Secretary of Defense. It is also why we made other additions, such as for an advanced manned strategic bomber and for research and development. Not the least of the authorizations, looking to the future, is that for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory.

This bill represents almost \$18 billion. It is a tremendous amount of money. But, I ask, what is the alternative? We are engaged in a major conflict in southeast Asia. We can be faced at any time with other conflicts in other parts of the world. Secretary of State Rusk has said that we have about 40 unilateral commitments worldwide and southeast Asia is but part of that commitment.

The decision as to what to do with respect to a bill of this character is not easy. No one of us likes to see so much of our national resources being devoted to instruments of warfare. None of us can take any satisfaction in having to spend \$18 billion in this manner. But all of us can take satisfaction in knowing that such an experience will best insure our country's security, our people's freedom and, in the long run, best advance the cause of peace as we stand strong against those who would make war.

This measure has my wholehearted support, and I hope the House will uphold the decision made by our Armed Services Committee. It represents our best judgment, based on all the information available, the best advice obtainable and our own many years of collective experience, in peace and in war, in evaluating all aspects of our national defense.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for his very excellent statement.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill before the House today. I would like to specifically comment on the portion of the bill authorizing nuclear propelled naval warships.

The Joint Committee of which I am a member has throughout the years supported a strong research and development program on nuclear propulsion plants for naval warships. This program, which is being carried out by Admiral Rickover, has been outstandingly successful. Because of our successes, the United States is without peer in the field of nuclear propulsion for warships. The only problem that we have encountered concerns the utilization of our position of leadership. By this I mean the failure of the administration to build nuclear propelled warships—particularly surface warships.

Our first three surface warships—the carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge* have proved their superiority as men of war. Since these ships were authorized, the

Department of Defense has obtained authorization for two new conventional aircraft carriers and 10 new conventional frigates all of which should have been nuclear powered. If the correct decision had been made and these 12 ships had been provided with nuclear power, we would now have in these perilous times three nuclear powered carrier task forces for our Navy instead of the one we have.

It appears that finally the administration is starting to recognize the demonstrated superiority of nuclear propelled warships since this bill includes a nuclear propelled aircraft carrier, requested by the Secretary of Defense. I am very pleased to note that a deficiency in the bill, as submitted by the administration, has been corrected by the Armed Services Committee. I am referring to the addition of two nuclear propelled frigates to the bill, reported out by the Armed Services Committee. With the addition of the two nuclear propelled frigates, the bill before the House contains a total of eight nuclear warships. It is indeed encouraging to see the United States take advantage of its position of technical leadership in this field vital to our defense—nuclear propulsion for naval warships.

The United States now has 59 nuclear submarines in operation including 37 Polaris missile launching types. By the end of this year we expect to have 9 more nuclear submarines in the fleet for a total of 68. In addition, including the 5 in this bill, we will have 36 more nuclear submarines authorized. As I mentioned before, we also have three nuclear propelled surface warships. Our fourth nuclear surface warship, the *Truxton*, is expected to be completed this year.

I strongly recommend support of the bill before us today. I sincerely believe this bill reflects the right direction to take concerning the Navy of the future. We must continue our efforts to convert the Navy to nuclear propulsion. The record set by the nuclear carrier *Enterprise* off Vietnam is proof that nuclear propulsion is the correct choice. We must make certain that, as in the case of the *Enterprise*, the carrier in this authorization bill is provided with nuclear propelled escorts.

The action the Congress is taking in this bill by adding nuclear propelled warships to the authorization runs parallel to action taken by the Congress in the early days of nuclear propulsion of submarines. In the early 1950's the Navy was opposed to building nuclear submarines because of a failure to recognize the increased military effectiveness that nuclear propulsion provides. The initiative taken by Congress overrode that attitude, and now we have, as a first line of defense, nuclear attack submarines and Polaris missile launching submarines. Today we face a similar problem concerning nuclear surface warships. The Congress must again correct misconceptions conveyed by cost effectiveness analysts which are based on false assumptions and do not place proper emphasis on military effectiveness. The Joint Committee's review of the various studies disclosed these facts.

As was stated in the foreword to the Joint Committee's 1966 hearings entitled "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program":

The assumption that tankers and oilers needed to supply propulsion fuel for oil-fired warships will operate unhampered by the enemy and suffer no losses;

The assumption that the fuel oil needed to run our conventional surface warships will be readily available wherever and whenever needed; and

The assumption that no cost factor need be included in their studies for losses—or protection of our propulsion fuel oil supply lines.

These are dangerous assumptions to use in evaluating weapons of war. The factors of military effectiveness in the protection of our Nation's security must always be dominant over the factors of cost. In southeast Asia today the United States is once again faced with the bitter reality that what counts in war is "military effectiveness"—not "cost effectiveness."

I can assure you that the members of the Joint Committee intend to continue to support an aggressive research and development program in the field of nuclear propulsion for nuclear warships. This will assure that the United States continues to maintain an overwhelming leadership in the naval nuclear propulsion field, which is so vital to our defense.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum of the Committee is not present to hear about this \$18 billion bill.

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

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

[Roll No. 140]

Abernethy	Flynt	Powell
Annunzio	Gettys	Pucinski
Ashmore	Halleck	Reid, N.Y.
Ayres	Hanna	Resnick
Baring	Hardy	Rhodes, Ariz.
Blatnik	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Jones, Ala.	Ronan
Buchanan	Jones, Mo.	Roncallo
Cahill	Krebs	Rooney, N.Y.
Callaway	McCarthy	Rostenkowski
Cederberg	McEwen	Senner
Celler	McMillan	Sickles
Clark	MacGregor	Sikes
Clausen,	Madden	Sisk
Don H.	Martin, Ala.	Stafford
Congers	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Corbett	Matsunaga	Taylor
Daniels	Meeds	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Morrison	Thompson, Tex.
Derwinski	Moss	Toll
Devine	Multer	Utt
Diggs	Murphy, Ill.	Waggoner
Dorn	Murray	Walker, Miss.
Dulski	O'Brien	White, Idaho
Ellsworth	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams
Erlenborn	O'Hara, Mich.	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	O'Neill, Mass.	Young
Farbstein	Patman	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, S. 2950, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 350 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, today is a very historic day in the history of this country. It is historic because we have come to grips with the answer to the question of whether the Congress shall discharge its responsibility under the Constitution to raise and maintain armies and navies and to provide the rules and regulations thereof, or whether it shall abrogate that power to the executive department. The issue is very simple.

The problem is not simple. We are here today to determine whether or not the best judgment of the military brains of this country, in whose education and experience we have invested millions and millions of dollars, shall prevail with their expertise on their chosen subject.

In these few minutes I shall attempt to bring into sharp focus the issues that are involved. I shall attempt to document the statements which I make. But over and above these considerations we must face one fact of life, and that fact of life is the reason why this House is today given the opportunity to accept the decision of its own chosen members of the Committee on Armed Services or to reject their decision in favor of a member of the executive department. We should ask ourselves this question: How has it been made possible to bring this issue straightforward and forefrontly to the House for decision? The answer to that question comes to you today who have been on this floor since 12 o'clock. You have seen here today a demonstration the like of which I have not seen in my 26 years in this Congress. You have seen this body stand up and give prolonged applause and salutation to the one individual who stood his guns and fought for the principles in which he believes and the discharge of the responsibility which he assumed when, on 13 different occasions, he stood in this body and raised his hand to support the Constitution of the United States.

You have heard applause given to him here by his conferees, his colleagues. You have heard each Member stand here and tell of the job that the gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS, the chairman of the committee, has done. I repeat and reemphasize it now because, without the dogged determination and the tenacity—yes, the guts and the courage in the face of every adversity that an individual could possibly face—the chairman refused to be sidetracked, and he comes to you today with a bill which he has fathered and which he has sponsored in order that you can make your decision as to whether the Congress shall discharge its constitutional responsibilities.

I could not add to what has been said about the bill or what has been said about our chairman from South Carolina. My statement would be gilding the lily. But I must say to you that no one in this

House has been closer to the gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS, than I have.

We came here together 26 years ago, and we have served side by side. I believe I know him better than anybody here. It is a proud moment when I can stand in the well of this House and salute him for his courage and for his determination to discharge his responsibilities, and, above all, to recognize him and pay tribute to him for being a human being.

He is just as much a human being as anybody in this House, with all the faults and frailties and all the sterling qualities, whatever you want to call them which we all, at some degree, may possess. This is what makes him the real man that he is and the real leader that he has demonstrated himself to be.

I share with each Member who has spoken the remarks made about him. I am sure he deeply appreciates them, as he has told you. But this is the important thing: If the gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS, had not determined upon his course when he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee, we today would not have the opportunity of making history in this body, in this very Chamber. He has overcome every obstacle. He has defied every assailant. The record that is being made here today will last longer—yes, more eternally—as an eloquent monument to him, than anything else that could be written or said. So this is why it is a historic day.

It is a day of testimony for him, who has led us to this point. It is going to be his finest hour when the roll is called and there is not a dissenting vote against this proposition that we offer you today. Our solid front of solidarity, of respect to this man that will be reflected in the vote on this bill, will say to the world that the Congress of the United States shall have the power to discharge its constitutional responsibility.

I will not attempt here to talk about the bill except in generalities which reflect the basic question at issue. On this side we have the Secretary of Defense. Let me say that I join with my colleagues who have insisted that we have no personal argument with the Secretary. I certainly have none. I am a great admirer of his. I admire his ability and I respect him as a person.

I sincerely believe that he is doing the job that he believes in his conscience is the job to do. I likewise expect him to believe that I am doing the job that I in my conscience am expected to do and I am trying to do.

We have the situation of military man after military man coming to our committee and testifying before us that they are in need of certain implements of war. Their testimony is subject to questioning by the committee of 37, whose combined membership represents hundreds of years of experience.

We place this expert testimony against the position taken by the young man, a civilian, who just came here some 6 years ago, and who has just celebrated his 50th birthday. We have to balance this man's expertise against the expertise of these

military people. Is there any doubt in your mind which one we will accept?

It is therefore our responsibility, when the Secretary comes before the American public and suggests or persuades the public that he is supported in his position by the military, when, as my distinguished colleague here has said, is not quite accurate—then whom do we believe? When this individual comes to us and says, "We do not see a clear need for an advanced bomber."

"We."

One would assume, and naturally so, that "we" means the military. "We" means the experts. "We" means the generals and the admirals.

So we would say to the generals and admirals, "Are you part of 'we'?" And everyone of whom we asked the question said "No, I am no part of 'we'."

Then the Secretary of Defense staged a very dramatic and theatrical television show, which would have done Cecil B. DeMille proud.

He surrounded himself with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations and the Secretary for Air, and he told the audience, "I will tell you who 'we' is. 'We' is my Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary for Air, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the President of the United States."

I say to the Secretary, "Mr. Secretary, you have not accurately stated your case, because I know of my own knowledge that there is a hole in that list you named."

Having one hole, they could have two. So whom do I offer as a witness? I offer the testimony of these military people in connection with the advanced bomber.

The advanced bomber is a very simple thing. Either we are going to have an advanced bomber to follow on in the defense of this country or we are not going to have one. We are going to place all our eggs in the basket of missiles, or we are going to have a balanced mix. The only way we can have the advanced bomber is to build the bomber. This is the only way to do it.

The Armed Services Committee has time and again, and repeatedly, said that it is in favor of an advanced bomber.

General LeMay and the generals who served with him without exception have testified to the need for the manned bomber. General LeMay quite interestingly had this to say before our committee; that the first day he talked with the Secretary of Defense he got the message; he just was not going to build a bomber.

Every year there have been delays and delays and excuses and excuses.

Now we come down to this proposition. We ask now to have put into the bill \$11.3 million for what is known as contract definition or the definition phase of the advanced bomber, the so-called AMSA.

The Secretary says that the committee in its report shockingly distorted the facts. Well, we wanted to find out how we shockingly distorted the facts, so we looked at the record. The record shows a very enlightening thing.

I hold here a page from the hearings, printed in the report, wherein the Joint Chiefs say they see a clear need. They do not use the word "clear" but they see a need for the bomber in the future. The Joint Chiefs say this.

This is our testimony. So what happened? When the hearings came back from the Office of the Secretary of Defense everything favorable to the advanced bomber had been "inadvertently" deleted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, so that no one could know what the actual position of the Joint Chiefs is on this vital subject.

Acting in the face of this, I asked the Secretary was there anything in this which would work against the defense of the country. The Secretary did not reply, but General Wheeler did, and he said there was no security involved. On my own initiative this was done, with the approval of the chairman. I must emphasize again that I could do nothing in this field, nor could any other member of the committee do anything, without the stalwart and absolute unrelenting backing of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

So the Secretary himself then called a press conference. Now, is this not an amazing thing? He changed the wording from a shocking distortion to a misunderstanding by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. They had misunderstood a memorandum. Are any of you ladies and gentlemen so naive as to believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are going to take a piece of paper, a memorandum, on its face value and, if they have any idea of a misunderstanding, do you believe that these people will not go directly to the source to discuss the matter?

Now, I am a naive and simple man, but I cannot go that far. So, instead of our report being shockingly distorted, it now becomes a matter of misunderstanding.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to place in the RECORD the entire exchange of correspondence on this subject, for which I have previously obtained permission. I ask the Members here to read the transcript of the Secretary's press conference. It would be amusing if it were not so tragic to see the light in which he attempts to place this matter.

The material referred to is as follows:

PRESS RELEASE, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1966

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT (D-La.), Chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee which had conducted an inquiry into the Department of Defense decision to reduce the number of our strategic manned bombers, today issued the following statement:

"Secretary McNamara, on Monday, April 25, 1966, held a special press conference in which he attacked the credibility of a report issued by my Subcommittee on the future of our strategic bomber force. The Secretary alleged that the report gave 'a shockingly distorted picture of the true situation.' He carefully attempted to leave the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the

Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were part of the 'we' who, as he said, today 'still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber.'

"Since the Secretary of Defense challenged the credibility of my Subcommittee's report and attempted to utilize the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a follow-on bomber as illustrative of the 'distortions' in our report, I challenged the Secretary to resolve this issue by releasing to the American public the present position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need for a follow-on bomber.

"That challenge was issued by me on April 26th—the day after Secretary McNamara's press conference. Today, more than two weeks later, the Secretary of Defense has failed to accept this challenge and has not released the present recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which unequivocally reflect 'a clear need for a new strategic bomber,' and thereby flatly agree with the Subcommittee and its report.

"The refusal of the Secretary of Defense to release this information to the American people speaks for itself. However, I had assumed that this information would nevertheless be available to the American people at the time the printed hearings were released by the Committee on Armed Services on the Fiscal Year 1967 weapons procurement bill. This information was officially received in testimony on April 5, 1966.

"I was, therefore, amazed to discover that this testimony, relative to the present position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need for a follow-on bomber, was deleted from the Committee transcript for 'security reasons' by the Department of Defense. Since nothing in this testimony appeared to be in any way secret or in violation of our national security interests, I addressed a letter, on May 6, 1966, to the Secretary of Defense challenging this security action.

"Late on May 9th, 1966, I received a reply signed by General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Unfortunately, the letter from General Wheeler is also classified 'confidential' and, therefore, I am precluded from making it available to the public in its entirety. However, I do not think it a violation of security to quote the following passage from that letter:

"I can not say that release of this advice (of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) pertaining to next year's budget, or release of selected extracts of that testimony you propose to release in its entirety, would be in violation of the national security interests of the United States. I do think such release would establish an unfortunate precedent."

"Since the national security interests of the United States will not be affected by the release of this information, its release is in the public interest, and in view of the importance of this issue as it affects not only a possible follow-on strategic bomber but the very credibility of the Congress, I am today releasing an extract of this April 5, 1966 testimony as received by the full Committee on Armed Services.

"I direct your attention to a statement made by the Secretary of Defense on a nationally televised press conference on April 25th at which time he said: 'The Report of the House Armed Services Committee on this subject of manned bombers gives, I think, a shockingly distorted picture of the true situation. The suggestion that major decisions on the manned bomber program were made against the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is without any foundation, whatsoever.'

"And now I direct your attention to the statement made by General John P. McConnell, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, to the full Committee on Armed Services on April 5, 1966, and which was part of the deletion made by the Department of Defense in an

obvious attempt to keep from the American people information they were entitled to have in the interest of national defense: 'the JCS are agreed that a missile/manned bomber mix is required for the foreseeable future. The operational life of the B-52 Gs and Hs cannot be assured beyond fiscal year 1975. The FB-111 as presently conceived, is not capable of covering the more distant targets in the USSR and communist China. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that concept formulation for a follow-on manned bomber should be completed at the earliest possible time.'

"The 'clear need for a new strategic bomber' is further emphasized by the willingness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to recommend, as testified to the Committee on April 5, 1966—which I point out was a full three weeks before the Secretary's press conference: 'full scale follow-on bomber development in order to protect the offensive striking power of the United States by preserving an option for an initial operating capability in fiscal year 1974.'

"The Joint Chiefs did indicate they would prefer to review the results of a contract definition phase before actually committing themselves on full scale development of any one particular strategic aircraft. But they feel so strongly about the clear need for some kind of follow-on manned bomber that they have recommended full scale development of the AMSA to assure both initiation of contract definition and ultimate availability of a new strategic manned bomber. They have been forced into this position by the inflexibility of the Secretary of Defense and his opposition to entering the contract definition phase of the AMSA.

"In summary, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree completely with the position of the subcommittee. They support the concept of a follow-on manned bomber and they recommend at this time that the initiation of the contract definition phase of the AMSA go forward.

"The whole picture here presented is indeed shocking, but clearly not because of any distortion of the facts by the Subcommittee."

Attached hereto is the actual colloquy during the Committee hearing as documentary evidence of the accuracy of the foregoing. That language which appears in brackets was physically cut out of the Committee transcript by the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE PRINT

Mr. BATES. I will not take very long, because Mr. HÉBERT touched on one of the questions I wanted to get into, and that was the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Air Force with respect to AMSA.

Now, as far as the Air Force is concerned they wanted full funding for the program to move ahead. What was the recommendation of the Air Force, per se?

The CHAIRMAN. Contract definition?
General McCONNELL. Contract definition phase.

Mr. BATES. Is that as far as they wanted to go?

General McCONNELL. That is as far as the Air Force asked to go when this budget was made up; yes, sir.

Mr. BATES. So the Air Force wanted just the contract or project definition; is that correct? The reason I asked, somebody gave—

General McCONNELL. Since this budget was made up, Mr. Bates, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have made another statement with respect to the AMSA. [It was not the same statement that General Wheeler gave before the subcommittee, because we had not completed the 1968 to 1975 JSOP.]

[The position that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken in the new JSOP, which has just been published and submitted to the Secre-

tary of Defense is that they support full-scale development.]

Mr. BATES. Mr. HÉBERT wants you to repeat that, General, if you please.

Mr. HÉBERT. The point about [development,] General, that last sentence.

Mr. BATES. [Full-scale development.]

General McCONNELL. Let me read to you what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said in the 1968-75 Joint Strategic Objectives Plan. [which is not what they said before the fiscal year 1967 budget was made up.] General Wheeler quoted what the position of the JCS was at the time that the budget was made up, and when he testified before your subcommittee.

Since then there has been the publication of the new JSOP, Joint Strategic Objectives Plan.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that date?
Mr. HÉBERT. What was that date, General?
General McCONNELL. That was just about the middle of last month.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this what you are reading?

General McCONNELL. I would like to put it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. This is what you are reading?

General McCONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and read it.

General McCONNELL. [It says the JCS are agreed that a missile/manned bomber mix is required for the foreseeable future. The operational life of the B-52 G's and H's cannot be assured beyond fiscal year 1975. The FB-111, as presently conceived, is not capable of covering the more distant targets in the U.S.S.R. and Communist China. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that concept formulation for a follow-on manned bomber should be completed at the earliest possible time.] And parenthetically, that is what the Secretary was talking about when he said we would hope by July to come up with the concept formulation.

I will go ahead and finish this, if I may.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is what I want to get.

General McCONNELL. [Subject to satisfactory completion thereof; that is completion of concept formulation, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that succeeding stages be conducted on timing consistent with an I.O.C. of fiscal 1974. Although the JCS recognize uncertainties associated with a commitment now, to full-scale follow-on bomber development, the prohibition contained in Secretary of Defense memorandum of the 3d of September 1965, subject: Program Change Proposal of 5-038. Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft, forecloses the conduct of a contract definition phase without a decision to proceed with full-scale development.]

That is because of the Secretary of Defense's interpretation of contract definition. The Secretary of Defense says that if you go to contract definition phase, then he is conditionally committed to full-scale development.

[As a consequence, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have no alternative to recommending full-scale follow-on bomber development in order to protect the offensive striking power of the United States by preserving an option for an I.O.C. in fiscal year 1974. However, they would prefer to review the results of a contract definition phase before recommending full-scale weapons system development.]

Mr. HÉBERT. I couldn't have testified better for the subcommittee's report, General; I will let it rest there.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1966.

HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
The Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Committee on Armed Services received testimony on April 5,

1966, from departmental witnesses relative to the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need for a follow-on bomber. Regrettably, the Department of Defense, in sanitizing this testimony for public release, has seen fit to delete from the transcript such pertinent testimony as actually reflects the current position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft. Copies of the specific testimony to which I refer, both in unclassified and classified form, are attached for your information.

As you know, my Subcommittee recommended initiation of the contract definition phase of AMSA in FY 1967. The full Committee on Armed Services concurred in this recommendation and, therefore, added to the FY 1967 departmental procurement bill additional authorization for this purpose.

Since the current views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on this important subject constitute essential background information upon which the members of the House of Representatives must make a decision in reference to this Committee action, and since there appears to be no genuine security consideration which precludes the publication of this testimony, it is my intention to recommend that this deleted testimony be made available for publication.

In the event you believe such action would violate the national security interests of the United States, I would appreciate your specific views on this question not later than the close of business Monday, the 9th of May, 1966.

Sincerely,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 2.

NEWS RELEASE, OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (PUBLIC AFFAIRS), WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 12, 1966

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara today issued the following statement:

"I understand that Mr. HÉBERT has held a news conference today and that confusion continues to exist as to the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff concerning the provisions for an advanced bomber in the FY 1967 budget now before the Congress.

"As I told you in open press conference April 25th, the suggestion by Mr. HÉBERT and his Committee that major decisions on the manned bomber program in the 1967 budget were made against the advice of the majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is without foundation. The testimony the Air Force Chief of Staff, General J. P. McConnell, before the Committee April 5, released by Mr. HÉBERT today, makes this clear. This is further attested by the letter of May 9 from General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to Mr. HÉBERT, parts of which Mr. HÉBERT made public today. General Wheeler wrote Mr. HÉBERT: 'I do think it would be inappropriate if the impression were generated, either by implication or otherwise, that in connection with the budget now before the Congress the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended full scale follow-on bomber development. This is not the case. The extracts of testimony you propose to release do not make this point sufficiently clear.'

"On December 3, 1965, General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, transmitted to Mr. Vance and me the final recommendations of the Chiefs on the FY 1967 budget. In his memorandum, General Wheeler said: 'The Joint Chiefs of Staff, less the Chief of Staff, Air Force, agree with the Secretary of Defense that commitment to full-scale development of the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft should not be made at this time. The Secretary of Defense has approved \$11 million in FY 1967 for continuation of development of avionics and propulsion subsystems. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that these subsys-

tems be developed and that systems studies be performed, to permit an AMSA IOC of FY 1974 but without commitment at this time to develop it as a weapon system.

"This was the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the final stages of our formulation of the FY 1967 Defense Budget, this was the position they presented to the President prior to the time he made his final decision on the budget, and this was the position I expressed in my statement to the House Armed Services Committee on March 8, 1966 when I said that: 'Although we still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber to replace the B-52G-Hs and FB-111s, we plan, as a hedge against some unforeseen improvement in Soviet anti-bomber defenses, to continue development work on the components and sub-systems which would be required if it should ultimately become desirable to deploy such an aircraft.'

"Now let me address the development of the FY 1968 budget, a matter which has not yet been considered by Mr. Vance or me and which will not be presented to the Congress by the President until January 1967.

"One of the initial steps in this process of preparing the 1968 budget is the preparation of the so-called JSOP (the Joint Strategic Objectives Plan). The JSOP is but one of several documents in which the Joint Chiefs of Staff will make recommendations on the advanced manned bomber program (AMSA) for FY 1968. Their final recommendations on the advanced bomber program for FY 1968 are not due to be submitted to the Deputy Secretary and the Secretary for incorporation in their recommendations to the President until August or September of this year.

"In the JSOP for 1968 the JCS stated that they would prefer to review the results of a contract definition phase before recommending full-scale weapon system development of bombers, but they understood that expenditures for contract definition for FY 1968 would not be approved unless they were prepared to recommend full development. Therefore, they felt compelled to recommend it. Their belief that proceeding with contract definition required a decision on full development arose out of a misunderstanding of the relationship between these two phases of an engineering program. This misunderstanding has been clarified and as a result the Joint Chiefs are reconsidering the matter and are free to adopt the position they initially preferred."

PRESS CONFERENCE, MAY 12, 1966

Secretary McNAMARA. Now, let's go to this question of the advance. Let's pass these out and then—

PRESS. Mr. Secretary, I have another question on Background while these are being passed out.

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, let's—let's just hold it for a second and pass these out and those of you who get them before I start reading, can read it in advance.

This is a rather complex matter and it's highly technical in terms of dates and statements and so on, and I want to be absolutely sure that you completely understand the facts.

So I want to—I want to read this slowly and then I want to take your questions on it with the hope that we can clarify the—the issue.

(The Secretary reads the statement:)

I understand that Mr. HÉBERT held a news conference today and the confusion continues to exist as to the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff concerning the provisions for an advanced manned bomber in the fiscal '67 budget now before the Congress.

As I told you in open press conference April 25th, the suggestions by Mr. HÉBERT and his Committee that major decisions on the manned bomber program in the '67

budget, were made against the advice of a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is without foundation.

The testimony by the Air Force Chief of Staff, General McConnell, before the Committee April 5th, released by Mr. HÉBERT today, makes this clear. It's further attested to by the letter of May 9 from General Wheeler to Mr. HÉBERT, parts of which Mr. HÉBERT made public today.

General Wheeler wrote Mr. HÉBERT in that letter of May 9, and this is an exact quote from the letter: "I do think it would be inappropriate that the impression was generated, either by implication or otherwise, that, in connection with the budget now before the Congress, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended full-scale follow-on bomber development. This is not the case. The extracts of testimony you propose to release do not make this point sufficiently clear."

And that ends the quote.

On December 3rd, 1965, General Wheeler, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, transmitted to Mr. Vance and me the final recommendations of the Chiefs on the '67 budget and in memorandum, General Wheeler had this to say, and this is an exact quote: "The Joint Chiefs of Staff, less the Chief of Staff Air Force, agree with the Secretary of Defense that commitment to full-scale development of the advanced manned strategic aircraft, should not be made at this time."

Now, let me read that again. This is the heart of the controversy: "The Joint Chiefs of Staff, less the Chief of Staff Air Force, agree with the Secretary of Defense that commitment to full-scale development of the advanced manned strategic aircraft, should not be made at this time."

That's an exact extract from their paper. It is the exact language that is in my final paper to the President on the basis of which he made the decision that led to the budget that's now before the Congress for fiscal '67.

Continuing with the quote from the Joint Chiefs paper of December 3rd: "The Secretary of Defense has approved \$11 million in fiscal '67 for continuation of development of avionics and propulsion sub-systems. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that these sub-systems be developed and that system studies be performed to permit an in-operation date of FY-74, but without commitment at this time to develop it as a weapons system."

The underlining of "at this time" connotes that perhaps at some future time they would wish to commit to development as a weapons system. But—

PRESS. Is that their choice to do it?

Secretary McNAMARA. It's theirs.

This was the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the final stages of our formulation of the FY-67 Defense budget. This was the position they presented to the President in Texas, prior to the time he made his final decision on the budget.

And this was the position I expressed in my statement to the House Armed Services Committee on March 8th when I said that—and this is an exact quote from that statement, which was released to the press: "Although we still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber to replace the B-52G's and H's and FB-111's, we plan as a hedge against some unforeseen improvement in Soviet anti-bomber defenses, to continue development work on the components and subsystems which would be required if it should ultimately become desirable to deploy such an aircraft."

And this, by the way, in that quote, is the source of the famous "we". I've been charged many times since then with using we when there wasn't any "we" except me. Well, the "we" here is four Chiefs, plus the Deputy Secretary, plus the President. So I thought I was in good company and fully justified in using the term "we".

Many of the witnesses, by the way, who were interrogated on this point before the Committee, were not participants in the final decision and didn't know who "we" was. And that's why—

(Laughter)

Secretary McNAMARA. —some of the controversy arose. Had the question been addressed to me or anyone who knew who "we" was, there would have been no confusion. In any event, as I say, the "we" is me and the President and Cy and four Chiefs.

Now let me consider the development of the FY 68 budget, a matter which has not yet been considered by Mr. Vance and me, and which will not be presented to the Congress by the President until January 1967.

One of the initial steps in this process of preparing the '68 budget, is the preparation of the so-called JSOP—the Joint Strategic Objectives Plan. The JSOP is but one of several documents in which the Joint Chiefs of Staff will make recommendations on the advanced manned bomber program for fiscal '68.

The final document in which they will make their recommendations will be similar to the one I referred to above, and will finally come in around early December, 1966, just as their final recommendations for '67 came in in that document dated December 3rd above.

In any event, the JSOP is one of the initial steps.

Their final recommendations on the advanced manned bomber for '68 are not due to be submitted to the Deputy Secretary and the Secretary for incorporation in their recommendations to the President until August or September of this year, and once we incorporate them in ours we then send it back to the Chiefs and they come out with their final recommendations to the President about December.

In the JSOP for '68, the Joint Chiefs stated they would prefer to review the results of a contract definition phase before recommending full-scale weapons system development of bombers. They understood that expenditures for contract definition for fiscal '68 would not be approved unless they were prepared to recommend full development. Therefore they felt compelled to recommend it.

Their belief that proceeding with contract definition required a decision on full development, arose out of a misunderstanding of the relationship between these two phases of an engineering program. This misunderstanding has been clarified, and, as a result, the Joint Chiefs are reconsidering the matter and are free to adopt the position they initially preferred.

Let me say, before taking your questions, that it's important to understand the difference between the contract definition phase of engineering and what succeeds it. Contract definition is a—phase during which something on the order of 5 per cent or less of the total engineering funds are spent in an attempt to lay out and formulate the characteristics of the program and advance with sufficient preliminary information to determine whether the specifications can be accomplished during the succeeding development.

And there's a tremendous difference between recommending therefore proceeding with 5 per cent or less of the program on the one hand, and recommending proceedings with full development on the other.

Yes?

PRESS. Mr. Secretary, this will be in a sort of semantic (unintelligible), but doesn't— isn't it a fact that there remains a difference on this phrase "we still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber"? It seems to me that the JCS does feel that there must be a bomber going into service by 1974, whereas you don't feel there is.

Now admittedly, the JCS doesn't seem to agree on timing or phasing or even what this aircraft should be.

Secretary McNAMARA. No.

PRESS. Is that the difference?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, I don't believe—I don't believe it is. I think that the Chiefs feel that as far ahead as they can see, we need a mixed force. And I'm inclined to agree with that, but the question is: what should be the composition of the mixed force and when should that composition change?

Now the—this issue's been confused by mingling discussion of two fiscal year budgets, '67 and '68. It's quite inappropriate, I think, at this time, to be discussing the '68 budget. Mr. Vance and I haven't considered it at all. The President isn't even aware hardly we're working on it. And the Chiefs haven't even begun to formulate their final recommendations with respect to it.

I think I'm correct in saying—and, Cy, correct me if I'm wrong—that JSOP doesn't even have dollar figures in it.

Mr. VANCE. I don't believe it does—

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't think—

Mr. VANCE. I haven't looked at it, so I can't say.

Secretary McNAMARA. It isn't even a budget. It is just a preliminary force plan. But I think I'm correct—Henry Glass is here.

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Secretary McNAMARA. Henry, does the JSOP have dollar figures in it?

Mr. GLASS. No. No.

Secretary McNAMARA. No—

Mr. GLASS. The Secretary recommends it—

Secretary McNAMARA. It's their preliminary recommendations on force plan, so that—

PRESS. It still isn't very clear what you're saying here.

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, what I'm saying, Lloyd, is that the allegation that (A) the majority of the Chiefs favored inclusion in the fiscal '67 budget of funds to provide or to start a full development—

PRESS. You mean contract definitions?

Secretary McNAMARA. No—I mean just exactly what I said. The allegation that the Chiefs favored inclusion in the '67 budget of funds to start full development of the bomber is without foundation. These words indicate it.

(B) The allegation that I misstated the position of myself vis-a-vis the Chiefs in relation to their action and attitude on the '67 budget is without foundation.

PRESS. Mr. Secretary—

Secretary McNAMARA. (C) These allegations resulted from a confusion of thought with respect to '67 and '68.

(D) No one's position on '68 has been fully formulated yet.

And it's just not appropriate at this time to be talking about it * * *

It came up in passing in connection with these hearings and there was some reference to it today in the statement put out by—by Mr. HÉBERT.

PRESS. (Unintelligible) straighten this up. You say that the confusion has been clarified—

(Laughter.)

PRESS. Or misunderstanding has been clarified, not for me, maybe you did do it for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Are you saying that the Joint Chiefs of Staff thought that contract definition and the commitment (unintelligible) were interdependent and could not be separated and therefore in order to get a contract definition they had to go ahead with full development?

Secretary McNAMARA. I'm saying that they acted separately on two years, '67 and '68.

PRESS. But then—

Secretary McNAMARA. Wait, just a second now. Let me answer Lloyd's question.

They acted separately on '67 from their actions on '68. On '67, they stated clearly and unequivocally that regardless of what pre-

ises they were operating on, they did not recommend full development.

Now that's extremely important to get across. That's the budget that went to the President, that's the budget before the Congress. That's the only budget that anybody's acting on.

Now, the second point is that when they began their consideration of '68, then a semantical confusion developed, and they understood in their earlier discussion on '68, that if they were to get any funds at all for contract definition i.e., the first 5 per cent program, they had to recommend going ahead with 100 per cent of the program, and requesting whatever was appropriate for that.

That is not the case. That is not the way we run engineering in this Department. It was the way it was run at one time. It's what led to the Sky Bolt and the Dynasoar and whatever you call that big dish at Sugar Grove—

(Laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. People proceeding on programs that weren't clearly visualized, that weren't well-formulated, that hadn't been addressed to the end result, and getting so far along before they found out that they weren't really what they wanted, that they had to continue it anyhow.

Now, we're trying to stop that, avoid it, and the way to avoid it is to think before you act. And I'm willing to spend 5 per cent of the total cost on thinking time before we spend the other 95 per cent and we made a mistake. So we definitely want to separate contract definitions from decisions relating to full development.

The Chiefs didn't understand that, and in some of their initial thinking on '68, were confused by it. That's all been clarified and that's being taken account of.

That confusion did not affect their action on '67. It's because the consideration of '68 and '7 has been confused and brought together that this misunderstanding has developed.

Yes?

PRESS. The kindly congressman from Louisiana also had more than a statement. He had Q and A, and we went into this. And he makes two points: (A) that the Chiefs were unanimous on FY 67 in wanting money for project definition which you refused; and, (B), that, according to Congressman HÉBERT, that you had told the Joint Chiefs that project definition would commit you to development of this project. Would you comment on those two?

Secretary McNAMARA. First, I didn't tell them that. There was a piece of paper that they say—that related to '68—but, it was the foundation for the confusion of '68 that told them that. That's why the misunderstanding developed. Mr. Vance and I have clarified that.

Now, as to the first point that they wanted more money for '67 than I proposed and the President recommended, that's absolutely correct. I've said it a hundred times.

PRESS. For project definition?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes. The words they used were for project definition, but—

PRESS. (Unintelligible) we're talking about the same thing?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, we're talking about money, but we're not talking about the same thing in concept here.

They didn't know what kind of a bomber they wanted to develop, and there's a tremendous difference of opinion on this at the present time.

Now, you—you really have three stages in the development of a complex weapons system. One I would call concept formulation. This is when you can see what it is you're trying to do. And after you've conceived of what you try to do, you then add what I'm going to call concept—contract definition, which is, you take that concept and you try

to develop specifications for it and you—you proceed far enough in examining design problems to determine whether you think with full development you can accomplish in performance, those specifications.

And then you have after contract definition the remaining 95 per cent, the engineering. Now, the concept formulation hasn't been completed here. You can't find three senior people in this building, or at least I haven't found them, who will give you the same concept of this bomber.

You heard Dr. Brown, on April 25th, say that he—I think his words were, he thought there were—what did he say—a spectrum of designs. I've forgotten exactly what it is—spectrum was the word he used. The reason he used the word "spectrum" was that he has one concept and he, that is, Secretary Brown. There is I think a spectrum of views as to what the purpose of a manned bomber to replace the 52's would be, whether it's to be used in a nuclear strategic role as a complement to ballistic missiles, or whether it's to be used for conventional bombing, or whether it's to be used for both.

Now just stop there just a second. Now this is what we're talking about. Concept formulation. What's the concept of the bomber? Is it a nuclear bomber, a conventional bomber, or a dual-purpose bomber? That's one point.

Secondly, once you decide on the general role of it, what's the concept of how you can best achieve it? High altitude, fast penetration? Low altitude, subsonic; low altitude, supersonic; standoff, launch of missiles; launch over the target; short-range standoff, long-range standoff?

None of this has been decided. Until you decide that, you can't even move into contract definition. And Brown went on to say, therefore, someplace, well, here it is: He said: "But the characteristic's for one purpose, i.e., nuclear-strategic, conventional, dual-purpose, low-level, high-level, subsonic, supersonic, standoff, drop-over-the-target" et cetera.

The concepts, the characteristics for one of those purposes versus another purpose are quite different from the ideal characteristics of the other purpose and that's why, in my opinion, further examination of the concept of use will here precede full-scale development. I'm hopeful that sometime by the end of this summer, we'll be in a position to explore all of these things in sufficient detail.

So, going back to the Chiefs' recommendations for '67, what the Chiefs really recommended was—forgetting words now—they wanted \$22 million of work done, and we recommended \$11 million.

Now, Dr. Brown also recommended \$22, but he recommended the money be spent in a different way than the Chiefs recommended. Check me on this, Cy, and see—Brown wanted it the extra 11 million spent on engines, as I remember.

Mr. VANCE. That's correct.

Secretary McNAMARA. The Chiefs wanted it spent on studies of airplanes.

Now, I don't—don't want to extend this discussion much longer, other than to say to you that I think the record shows complete confusion—

(Laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. And I'm a taxpayer as you are, and until I can see with more clarity than I can presently see what the citizens of our country are going to receive in benefits from the expenditure of more money, I'm not going to recommend it. And, as it happens, the President agreed with my recommendations, so that's exactly where we stand.

PRESS. How long would it take you, sir, to get this after you start? How long do you figure it would take—

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, the Chiefs—the Chiefs say that they believe that we should

be prepared—they don't say we should have—but we should be prepared, if we choose, or have the option of having if you want to phrase it that way, new manned bomber in 1974. And we've got time for that because we've been working on components. We have big engines, small engines, supersonic engines, subsonic engines, sweep-wing airplanes, delta-wing airplanes. You've got all kinds of components we can use here and that, you see, is exactly what the money is for.

I've forgotten how much has been appropriated and stamped or committed in sixty—let's see now—'64-5 and 6, but it's on the order of \$60 million, to which will be added this \$11 million, making \$70 million, which is money spent for component development, avionics, air frame studies, engine studies, et cetera.

Yes.

Press. Mr. Secretary—

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, this gentleman (pointing).

Press. Mr. Secretary, project definition and contract definition policy that's been around for several years now. Who gave the Chiefs the mistaken impression about full development—

Secretary McNAMARA. There's never been a—there's never been a clear break between these and frankly I'm afraid the concepts aren't clear in the Department today.

Press. Sounds like you better get some new Chiefs.

(Laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. This was Senator MORSE's remark on the Secretary-General yesterday when he said the UN has nothing—well, that's—

Press. I have no intention to be in such a situation.

(Laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, let me give a ringing endorsement to the—

(Laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. Effectiveness of our present Chiefs. I—I mean—digress to say. And I—I mean this very sincerely. You don't—you don't often find men who are spending 6 and 7 days a week on their job year in and year out—many of us in this room certainly are—they're here temporarily—we'll have a few years, five years or six years, whatever it may be—but the Chiefs spend their lives at this and they spend literally seven days a week at it and hardly a Sunday goes by that I don't have a call from General Wheeler or some conversation with him.

So, and it isn't just effort either that they're putting in; they're putting in effective work. So I don't want anybody left with the impression that the Chiefs aren't doing an effective job; they are.

They most certainly have my full confidence and the full confidence of the President.

Press. Sir—

Secretary McNAMARA. Yeah, Charlie.

Press. I still get out of this statement the announcement that the Chiefs recommended full development of an airplane because they did not know that they did not have to.

Secretary McNAMARA. Yeah, I think that's fair.

Press. And I must say that that is incredible.

Secretary McNAMARA. But—but, Charlie, look—look. No, it isn't. But, you're—you're—well, look, you're getting mixed up now '68 and '67.

Press. I'm talking about '68 now.

Secretary McNAMARA. Yeah, the Chiefs haven't recommended a budget for '68. Not a single damn dollar.

Press. That's what Mr. HEBERT said too. Secretary McNAMARA. That they haven't recommended a budget?

Press. That he agrees with your men.

Secretary McNAMARA. All right, they arrived at—they made no recommendation for '68, in terms of budget.

Press. What is it that he referred to that confused the Chiefs?

Secretary McNAMARA. They have—they have a JSOP, which is a force structure, but it does—it doesn't include dollars.

So let's—let's not get '68 mixed up with '67. '68 never should have been discussed. It just crept into the discussion one day in an off-handed fashion and it was seized upon and not fully developed by anybody, so let's keep '68 out of this and talk about '67. We've got a budget for '67 lying before the Congress; it's perfectly clear what the Chiefs recommended are.

And that's what I've tried to clarify today and it's that testimony which has been confused and misunderstood.

Yes?

Press. Mr. Secretary, if the Chiefs do not get contract definition in fiscal '68 budgets, will they get their airplane in fiscal '74?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, I—let me rephrase your question and then answer the rephrased question.

(Laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, these terms—these terms are confusing. It depends on what contract definition is. I think it would be fair to say that—that if no money was spent on further development in '68, a '74 introduction date probably couldn't be met. And what therefore is—is critical in answering your question is, how much money would be spent in '68 and for what?

Now, if—if engine development, for example, didn't continue at a particular pace, probably the '74 date could not be met. If airplane development didn't continue and there were no money for it, probably the '74 date could be met because I think in this particular instance, the engine will prove to be the long lead-time item.

Press. Mr. Secretary?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes.

Press. Mr. Secretary, I've always understood that entering into contract definition is at least a tentative commitment to development.

Secretary McNAMARA. No, it isn't.

Press. Apparently the Chiefs (noises).

Secretary McNAMARA. Yeah. Yeah. Yes, you—you may have had a correct understanding of what had been the case in the past, but it isn't the case now, and that's exactly why we have contract definition. It's exactly why we have it. That—if we didn't—if that weren't the purpose of it, to separate it from the decision to develop, they'd be no need for having a separate phase. That's the way you distinguish contract definition from the remaining portion.

But what I want to emphasize here is—we're doing a lot of talking about contract definition, but we haven't really discussed what the concept is. Why do we have to have it? What's it going to do? What kind of bomber is it going to be?

How—how can you talk about spending much money to—to probe design to see whether you can achieve a given set of specs, specifications, when you aren't clear on what you want? And that—that's where we stand now. We're not clear what we want.

Yes?

Press. Could we ask this. I—I'm not clear in my own mind, how it is that these men, with their professional standing, working there under your thumb here, can be confused on an issue of this significance?

Mr. VANCE. It was a badly-drafted memorandum.

Secretary McNAMARA. It was a badly-drafted memorandum that they were working on and it's so early in the budget process that technical problems like this haven't really been considered early in the '68 budget processes.

MANY VOICES. (Unintelligible.)

Mr. VANCE. That's by ASD and OSD.

Press. These are ground rules about contract definition?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, it means that—it means that, as I tried to point out to you, that for years this Department has proceeded on engineering development without adequate thought as to the purpose of the project, and the—the performance to be achieved, and the specifications necessary to accomplish it all. I've said this now for 4 or 5 years, it'll take ten to turn the Department around on a problem like this. It's a very complex thing to do, but we're making a lot of progress. And what we're trying to insure is, that before we start on a Dyna-Soar product, before we start on a Sky Bolt project, before we start on a B-70 project, before we start on a Sugar Grove Big Dish project, we have a clearly-conceived idea of the purpose, of the performance required to achieve that purpose, of the specifications necessary to accomplish that performance and of the probability of accomplishing those specifications with a given design approach.

Now that's what we're trying to accomplish. That's what these two initial phases are for. (A) concept formulation. (B) contract definition.

Press. Mr. Secretary—

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes?

Press. Have you set or suggested a date when the contract formulation will be due?

Secretary McNAMARA. I've asked Secretary Brown to do it as soon as possible. The Air Force is working on it now. I think that—that sometime this summer or fall these studies will be completed. They're very complex. They have to take account of the defenses this aircraft would have to penetrate. The alternative ways of penetrating them. The targets to be struck. The weapons to be used. The possible supplementary use to be made of the system—that is, conventional bombing versus nuclear and so on.

Yes?

Press. Did I understand you to say, sir, that Sky Bolt was a victim to similar confusion—

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes—

Press. Of concept?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, no, not—

Press. Could you explain that?

Secretary McNAMARA. I think that Sky Bolt if you dug into the history of it, was started without a clear concept of its purpose. Just as simple a point as this was never clear and I—I went back into the documents to try to determine the answer to this question. Was it intended to destroy primary targets? Or was it intended to destroy the defenses the bombers would be required to penetrate to get to the primary targets? The bombers were carrying gravity bombs—that's clear. Now were those Sky Bolt missiles intended to be launched against primary targets such as a military depot or a nuclear weapons site, or something of that kind? Or were the Sky Bolt missiles intended to be launched from the distance of a thousand miles away, against the defenses on the perimeter of the enemy territory—defenses that the bombers would be required to penetrate in order to get to their primary targets.

Now if any of you have the answer to that I'd be happy to have it if you can show me the document that made that answer available before we started a program on which we spent \$4 million on the latest development that would have cost \$2 billion. And I submit to you unless you can answer that question, you never should have been allowed to spend more than a few millions of dollars.

Now it's that kind of an approach we're trying to take through engineering development.

One more question, fellows, and I think we better call it off.

Yes?

PRESS. When did contract formuliza—
Secretary McNAMARA. Formulation.

PRESS. Formulation determine the accepted part of the doctrine and under what date—

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, I'd say about 6 or 9 months ago. I think we better end on this note.

I'm sorry we didn't get into some of the more interesting subjects I've been questioned on recently, but—

(Loud laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. We'll look forward to that—look forward to that the next time.

(Mixed questions audible only in part.)

Secretary McNAMARA. I was going to say some people thought I behaved differently than the newspapers—

(Laughter.)

Secretary McNAMARA. I thought surely I consider that a (inaudible—laughter) to me or you.

(Laughter.)

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN F. EDWARD
HÉBERT

I am gratified that the Secretary of Defense, at his press conference on May 12th, conceded that the confusion in the public's mind over the Joint Chiefs of Staff's position on a future manned bomber was caused by misleading documents emanating from his office.

It is clear now that there was no "shockingly distorted" picture given to the public by my subcommittee's report. I take the Secretary's statement on May 12th as a willingness to admit he was wrong. I excuse his earlier excess of language.

But let's not let past weaknesses of syntax further cloud the facts. What is unmistakably clear is that:

(1) The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended for inclusion in the fiscal year 1967 budget precisely what the subcommittee recommended—that is, a total of \$22.8 million for the AMSA program; and

(2) The Joint Chiefs of Staff strongly believe that we require a follow-on manned bomber to replace the B-52 G to H series aircraft and it is not the FB-111.

I am sure the Congress will approve the full \$22.8 million required for AMSA contract definition.

I am pleased that, instead of saying he sees no clear need, the Secretary now indicates he has an open mind on the manned bomber. I trust he will now let the contract definition phase go forward and not let the masters of confusion in the Pentagon further confuse the basic and simple facts.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, one other matter and I will be through, because I do not want to trespass on your time any longer. There is only one thing that this committee is interested in and that is discharging its duty. There is only one thing this committee is interested in and that is the defense of this country, and giving our men in uniform the best available weapons. We are not interested in engaging in controversies or in challenging people, but I do think that we discharge our responsibility and we must discharge our responsibility by following this admonition of a great American who is still admired throughout the world. He said this:

* * * We therefore can pay honor to the deepest source of our national strength.

That strength takes many forms, and the most obvious are not always the most significant.

The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the Nation's greatness, but the men who question power make

a contribution just as indispensable, especially when that questioning is disinterested, for they determine whether we use power or power uses us.

Those are the words, even though he is fresh in his grave, of John F. Kennedy. I say that we not only follow that admonition in the procedures that we take here, but it is my fervent hope when the roll is called—and the roll will be called—that there will not be one dissenting vote against substantiating our judgment and backing up our committee and recognizing the power that this Congress has and which it must discharge. I hope that you bring to this body today the crowning jewel of my chairman's finest hour.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, our chairman of the committee, Mr. RIVERS, and the ranking minority member, Mr. BATES, have given a comprehensive picture of the purpose and scope of the bill before us. However, there are specific items in the bill which I would like to emphasize. Before doing so, I want to pay tribute to our chairman, under whose dedicated leadership long and intensive hearings were conducted. His hard work and vast knowledge of the military have contributed much. His devotion to his task has resulted in many measures vital to our Nation's security and the welfare of our fighting men being enacted after virtually unanimous approval within our committee and the entire House. For this the Nation is indebted.

In certain respects, the measure today is at variance with attitudes of the Defense Department. We regret this is true but it is understandable. One cannot properly serve on this committee without developing individual judgments and personal convictions. Failure to reflect them in our legislation would be a betrayal of our obligations. Our differences should not be identified as a feud but rather honest diversity of opinion. We truly believe that certain weapons and systems must be included in our defense posture and are taking steps to assure that such will be the case.

The additions that the committee made, while substantial, have, I think, been explained in sufficient detail to establish their validity. Simply stated, the Department of Defense, while presenting a good bill, did not take into consideration a number of important areas. We, in the committee, have attempted to supply these omissions and it is my hope that the whole House will see its way clear to join in passing the bill as the committee has amended it.

Last year the Armed Services Committee amended its authorizing legislation so as to include within the requirement for authorization tracked combat vehicles. Since this is the first year—and the first bill—which contains specific authorization for this new item, I would like to deal briefly with these vehicles as they are reflected in the Army portion of the bill.

While from a money standpoint the tracked combat vehicle program in the bill is relatively minor; namely, about

\$360 million, it does represent a major advance in our land warfare capabilities. We know the part that tanks played in World War II. We knew, too, that the Soviet Union and its satellites have something in the order of 90,000 tanks. Accordingly, our own capability in this area—both to employ our own tanks and to defeat the enemy's tanks—must be deemed of great importance.

No one can foretell what the future may bring in the way of warfare. Quite naturally we tend to think in the context of intercontinental ballistic missiles, airplanes traveling at three times the speed of sound, and other dramatic weapons of this kind. History has shown, and may well show again, that in the last analysis, it is the ground troops who must take and hold territory. Therefore, though lacking in glamour, the tank and other tracked vehicles play a fundamental and extremely important role in our military capability.

I think, therefore, that both because it is the first time that this program is being presented in any detail to the House and because of their importance, these vehicles warrant some description. Parenthetically, I could suggest that the Army follow the lead of the Air Force in giving popular designations to these vehicles. Who is not presented with a dramatic picture when he hears of an airplane called the Delta Dagger, the Voodoo, and the Super-Saber and so on? Unhappily the Army in all too many instances has a mere numerical designation for its vehicles and in giving this brief description of them, I will, therefore, necessarily use these designations.

First, in the vehicles affording entirely new combat capabilities to our ground forces is the armored reconnaissance assault vehicle, the General Sheridan, and the M-60 main battle tank. Both of these vehicles have as their principal armament the new Shillelagh. This is a very unusual weapon in that we have departed from the normal cannon round and progressed to a guided missile designed to be fired from a gun tube that is also capable of firing conventional ammunition. Probably in the whole world today there is no weapon which has the accuracy of the Shillelagh both against moving and stationary targets. There is no known armored vehicle in the arsenal of any potential enemy, or indeed in the arsenal of any of our allies, that cannot be defeated by this spectacular new weapon. It can be used with equal effectiveness against armor and against field fortifications and troop concentrations.

Other new or improved capabilities are represented by the M-548 cargo carrier. This can perform a variety of functions but it is most important as an ammunition resupply vehicle for self-propelled artillery units. The modern Army is fast moving, faster than anything we have seen before. Its mobility will be greatly enhanced by this new carrier. It can travel almost 40 miles an hour on land and at about 3½ miles an hour on water. Virtually no terrain is too rough for it. It is air droppable and represents a real advance in ground warfare.

Next is the XM-571 utility carrier. This is actually two vehicles in one, al-

though both of the units are driven by the same engine through an extremely interesting power transmission by universal joint. We speak of all-weather airplanes, and this is the Army's version of an all-weather vehicle. It will travel through swamp, deep snow, and virtually every terrain condition that might be encountered.

Perhaps the most impressive among the tracked vehicles authorized by this bill is the bridge launcher. Its basic vehicle has the same general characteristics as the M-60 tank. It carries, launches, and retrieves a 7-foot scissor-type aluminum bridge. The effectiveness of this vehicle is immediately evident.

Other vehicles being presented for specific authorization for the first time are mentioned on pages 68, 69, and 70 of the committee report.

As this portion of the defense program was being discussed in committee, it became apparent how far we have progressed in land warfare in the relatively few years since World War II. I have personally examined many of these vehicles and have seen them in operation. Our Army has, indeed, made real strides with its mobility.

Subsequent to the presentation of this bill to the committee, a request came from the Department of Defense to increase one item by about \$20 million. The committee accepted this recommendation and its wisdom in so doing has been indicated by the performance of the craft it procures.

I am referring to the light observation helicopter known as the OH-6A.

It was recently announced that this helicopter has set 21 unofficial world records for rotary-wing aircraft. Twelve of them are for speed and three each for distance, climbing, and sustained altitude. Indeed, three of these records are for helicopters of all sizes and weights.

Incidentally, these flights were conducted under the supervision of the National Aeronautic Association and have been submitted for approval as official world records. If these are approved, and they undoubtedly will be, the OH-6A will hold more world records than any other helicopter. It has traveled at over 172 miles an hour and exceeded the existing official world record by almost 50 miles an hour.

We all know that the bumblebee from an aeronautical standpoint theoretically cannot fly. The OH-6A, in lifting three times its own weight, seems to be similarly anomalous.

And now I would like to take a few moments to speak of something that is not directly associated with the bill but which is of great moment in all of our lives today, namely the activities of our Air Force in southeast Asia.

As the war in southeast Asia has changed its character from an insurgency to open aggression, the scope and tempo of all military operations increased far beyond that envisioned for counter-insurgency alone.

Today, air operations in southeast Asia include two major programs: air strikes in North Vietnam and tactical air support operations in South Vietnam.

In South Vietnam the Air Force is concerned primarily with delivering effective

and timely close air support to both United States and South Vietnamese ground forces. When an Army unit commander needs immediate air support, the request is forwarded by radio to the Direct Air Support Center—DASC—for Army validation. The mission is then assigned to one of the fighter units—either on ground alert or airborne—which is allocated to the direct air support center for that day's operation. The fighter aircrews contact the radar installations designated to control them to the target area, and then report to the ground or airborne forward air controller—FAC. This entire procedure is completed in a matter of minutes.

Once the fighters are in the immediate target area, the airborne forward air controller marks the target by smoke from a rocket grenade. The ground forward air controller uses mortars or artillery. The same procedure applies at night, except that special flare aircraft precede the fighters to the target area, where the forward air controller directs them to illuminate the target for the attacking aircraft.

A specific number of Air Force attack sorties are allocated to the support of ground operations in South Vietnam each month. This is only a planned allocation, however, and airpower has such flexibility that the entire force can be directed immediately to any threatened area if required, since support of the ground forces in South Vietnam receives first priority in our air effort.

The system I have just described is providing excellent control of tactical air operations in an extremely harsh environment, and an even better system is now evolving with the extension of radar control for positioning and precision bombing in southeast Asia. Only minutes elapse between the request for a strike by an Army commander and its delivery, and there have been numerous comments by Army commanders attesting to the effectiveness of this close air support. In my opinion, the proper application of airpower has been a key factor in enabling us to hold our own in numerous specific encounters and, in our basic conduct of the conflict, to turn from the defensive to the offensive.

The air strike program against North Vietnam which began in March 1965 has included targets such as ammunition depots, military barracks, supply depots, POL storage areas, power plants, railroad yards, port facilities, roads, bridges, airfields, radar sites, and ground defense positions, including SAM sites. This air campaign is a determined effort to restrict the flow of men and supplies to South Vietnam and to convince the North Vietnamese that the price for their continued support of aggression is too high. Within the limits imposed by national policy and despite a hostile ground environment of surface-to-air missiles and conventional fire equal to any found in Europe in World War II, our operations in North Vietnam have been highly successful. Our program of air strikes has virtually denied the enemy the use of main roads during daylight, and we have stepped up night attack operations to further obstruct enemy movement to the south. Also in the

north we have witnessed increased Mig activity during the past month. During this period our pilots have destroyed seven Mig aircraft without the loss of a single airplane to enemy aircraft. Such results from the recent attempts at aerial engagements by enemy fighter planes have proven the superiority of the combination of our pilots and aircraft against the best they have to offer. It is also significant to note that in regard to the newest version of the ground-to-air threat, the SAM's, our airpower has again prevailed and successfully countered a modern weapon system.

Although our tactical fighters have flown most of the strike missions, they have been ably augmented and supported by our SAC B-52's and our Special Air Warfare, reconnaissance and airlift forces. As an example, the Guam-based B-52's have flown approximately 300 missions and delivered close to 64,000 tons of bombs on Vietcong strongholds. This aircraft has also shown its versatility by flying interdiction missions and closing the Mu Gia Pass in direct support of ground operations. Other strike missions are flown by the Special Air Warfare Forces which perform an important role in South Vietnam. Close air support missions are flown by their A-1 and F-5 fighter aircraft, C-123 and C-47 transport aircraft perform flare missions, defoliation operations and airlift. Loudspeaker equipped aircraft conduct operations over friendly or enemy targets and are used extensively to drop leaflets. The fire support squadron using C-47 aircraft, the old "Gooney Bird," equipped with side-firing Miniguns, is used in defense of forts and hamlets at night.

In the reconnaissance area, the Air Force maintains tactical reconnaissance forces in southeast Asia to provide the intelligence necessary for planning and conducting the ground campaign as well as for tactical air operations. The southeast Asia reconnaissance force consists of aircraft that can perform both day and night operations in support of U.S. Army and ARVN requirements for infrared and night photo reconnaissance, but are also employed for day reconnaissance both in and out of country. The entire reconnaissance force furnishes the vital intelligence base for updating target information and provides any other intelligence which can be collected by aircraft.

As for tactical airlift, the forces assigned to support southeast Asia combat operations have effectively met all RVN requirements to this date and have been one of our most valuable assets in conducting operations in southeast Asia. In an area where surface transportation is greatly limited by both terrain and Vietcong activity, air transportation has become a veritable lifeblood factor by maintaining a steady flow of food, ammunition, and equipment to our deployed combat forces. The effectiveness of airlift is exemplified by the very diversity of the missions flown—not only military deployment, resupply, and aeromedical evacuation missions, but also such functions as airlifting livestock and food to resupply Vietnamese villages.

The recent introduction of the faster and longer range HH-3E helicopter in southeast Asia has improved the Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Service capability to recover downed aircrew members from hostile areas. During the first 4 months of 1966 this particular aircraft rescued 29 of our downed aircrew members.

In summary, I would like to say that the Air Force has done a truly outstanding job. Although operating thousands of miles away from the base of supplies, using highly sophisticated weapons in a primitive environment, and facing heavy ground fire, the Air Force has successfully met the requirements placed upon it. It has shown great flexibility and versatility in measuring up to the challenges it has faced. We may all be justly proud.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is obviously a necessary one. It has received close study by the committee and represents the committee's best thinking as to our requirements in the area of procurement and research and development for fiscal year 1967.

I remind the House that it was reported from the Armed Services Committee unanimously, and it is my sincere hope that this unanimity will be reflected in the vote of the House here today.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the tributes that have been accorded to our able chairman today, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. I want to particularly thank the gentleman for the kind remarks that he had to say with respect to my efforts on the amendment that is now incorporated in this bill to provide additional airborne television capabilities for South Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2950, the 1967 defense procurement authorization as amended by the House Armed Services Committee.

While I wish to address myself primarily to a specific committee amendment, I want first to underscore the importance for our national security of the actions taken unanimously by the committee under the leadership of its able chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. For at a time when there is so much justified concern over the decline in the influence of the legislative branch of our Government I believe the American people should take encouragement and satisfaction from the committee's conscientious exercise of independent judgment with respect to the proposals and policies of the executive branch relating to our defense posture.

Although the committee in its consideration of this bill, and in the language of the report accompanying it, is critical of certain attitudes and views currently dominating the Department of Defense, it should be carefully noted that these differences arise out of a continuing debate over many areas of defense policy in which there is constructive concern on both sides for the welfare of the country.

In certain areas the so-called "cost effectiveness" approach has been found inappropriate and in something less than the national interest. The successful handling of challenges throughout the world unfortunately do not necessarily lend themselves to the neat criteria of "cost effectiveness."

What the committee rejects in the current handling of defense policy is a one-eyed "efficiency" based too exclusively upon only quantifiable data. What is needed is a balanced flexibility approach which permits the highest degree of adaptability toward the changing demands of world events which defy computer explanation and prediction. The committee believes we must always strive to be ready for the unexpected as well as the expected, the incalculable as well as the calculable. It is apparent today for instance that 2 years ago the great build-up in South Vietnam was not really anticipated, and when events presented themselves, our military people in South Vietnam found that they, in order to meet the challenge at all, had to go into the business of distributing shortages of supplies and skills.

The committee is concerned that an unrealistically restricted view of our future military requirements might result in a much more drastic situation. For example, this one-eyed cost approach asserts that because a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier costs more money a conventionally powered one is more in the national interest. Such an argument, however, in no way establishes which type of vessel will perform its mission most adequately under changing political and military requirements. I fully share the committee's conviction that nuclear power offers advantages that far outweigh the cost factors; and that these advantages may well prove to be of crucial importance to our defense posture in the years ahead.

In the past, the committee, insisting upon its constitutional mandate to be a full participant in the debate and control of our defenses, has sought to require that future aircraft carriers be nuclear powered, but the Pentagon has resisted. Today in fact there is being built an aircraft carrier, the *John F. Kennedy*, with conventional propulsion—which means this carrier is obsolete before it is christened.

Last year Congress authorized a nuclear powered guided missile frigate but again nothing was done about it. Today's bill includes authorization for two such vessels, the committee report contains conclusive evidence that such ships are of vital importance. Similarly the committee has found that it is essential to authorize funds for the production of F-12 interceptor aircraft, for the CX-2 aircraft needed to modernize our aeromedical evacuation fleet, for continued work on the Poseidon program, for the manned orbiting laboratory, and for the advanced manned strategic aircraft, the followon bomber designed to replace the aging B-52's. Likewise the committee deems it prudent to provide the funds which would reduce the time required to deploy the Nike X antiballistic missile system once the go ahead has been given.

These actions, as well as the recommendation for a 3.2 percent military pay increase, I believe, deserve the support of Congress and the quick action by the executive branch for they deal with problems we cannot ignore or postpone indefinitely.

As I said at the outset, my remarks today relate primarily to one of the committee amendments to this bill which I am gratified to report was adopted unanimously. This has to do with the authorizing of additional airborne telecasting and broadcasting capabilities. For this purpose this bill would authorize \$20 million for the procurement of aircraft which will provide greater flexibility in operation, permit an extension of transmission coverage and broadcast time and also guarantee a higher degree of security. I believe this added capability will be of great assistance in insuring that the Vietnamese television network recently inaugurated will approach its highest potential as a means of providing reliable information throughout South Vietnam to combat years of Vietcong propaganda and to help create a stable and unified national community.

Let me summarize briefly some of the basic reasons which support this increased capability.

Many of my colleagues know that regular television broadcasts were begun in South Vietnam on February 7 entirely through the means of airborne facilities which simultaneously transmit on two channels; one for the Vietnamese—with program assistance furnished by the USIA—and the other for U.S. military personnel—operated by Armed Forces Radio-Television Service.

The urgent nature of the origination of an airborne broadcasting facility necessitated the utilization of available resources. A vehicle was needed large enough to house television transmitting and programming devices for two channels, AM and FM broadcast facilities, equipment for single or multichannel teletypewriter operations and other capabilities of a classified nature. The aircraft which was available and selected was the C-121 Super Constellation.

However, although the two C-121 aircraft, which bear the designation "Blue Eagle," now on station have performed satisfactorily, due in part to some ingenious makeshift modifications, other restrictions imposed by this airframe tend to downgrade the ability to exploit fully the potential of television in South Vietnam. What is required for optimum performance is an airframe that is not severely weight limited, that possesses the speed and altitude capabilities for flexibility in operation, and sufficient range to allow, should the need arise, for basing in an area of known security.

In order to provide adequate telecasting daily to substantially all of South Vietnam as well as having the capability to operate from a remote area—for example in the Philippines—I am advised that four aircraft of a type comparable to that of the P-3A Orion would be required. Furthermore, turbojet engines would greatly reduce the vibration and noise which are concomitant with the C-121 reciprocating type, and which

have necessitated special modifications to secure acceptable broadcast quality. An aircraft that can operate at altitudes in the neighborhood of 30,000 feet, as opposed to the C-121 maximum of 16,000 feet, would, I am told, increase the effective area of broadcast by a factor of three or four.

The C-121 aircraft now on station were originally expected to provide the television signal for only a few months until ground facilities could be constructed. The airborne concept was essentially a stopgap measure and the number of these flying TV stations were kept to the absolute minimum that would still permit daily broadcast. This absolute minimum, however, did not allow for proper maintenance procedures. Delay in the construction of ground transmitters has in part required the fabrication of a third C-121 facility which is scheduled to be on station in August when it will permit one of the other Blue Eagles to undergo a long overdue overhaul.

Official estimates now call for an operational ground facility in Saigon, with a standard transmission coverage of a maximum of 40 to 50 miles, not before October 15 of this year. However, there are already reports that it may not be ready until December. In addition 3 substations are to be erected in other areas of the country but which will not be operational before June of 1967 at least and then to only an estimated 60 percent of the population.

It should also be noted that these 3 substations will not be "relay" stations but will be for the most part rebroadcasting material first shown by the Saigon facility. Airborne transmitters, on the other hand, are fully capable of providing instantaneous "live" coverage throughout the whole country, since two Blue Eagles of the type recommended in this bill, flying simultaneously 300 miles apart and at altitudes in the neighborhood of 30,000 feet can beam signals throughout virtually all of South Vietnam. The advantages of broader coverage and the capacity for live transmissions are ones which I believe should be exploited.

Mr. Chairman, because the Blue Eagles have to be based in South Vietnam due to restrictions imposed by the C-121 airframe there exists the very real problem of protecting these transmitters from destruction.

It need only be recalled that the Vietcong mortar attack in April of this year on Tan Son Nhut Air Base, resulted in damage to both and the near total destruction of 1 Blue Eagle aircraft causing a curtailment in broadcasting from a 7- to 5-day-week schedule for several weeks.

Ground stations whenever they are ready will always be vulnerable to destruction by the Vietcong or "capture" by dissident elements. The capability of being based outside South Vietnam and the fact that the aircraft are at all times under the control of U.S. personnel will insure that control over communications will not be lost to unfriendly hands. It is imperative that there should be no disruption in broadcasting schedules and that coverage and programing time be greatly extended. The psycho-

logical implications of a failure to maintain broadcasting schedules might well contribute to a demoralization of efforts to defeat the Vietcong.

Mr. Chairman, while the language of the bill before us does not designate a specific type of aircraft for this purpose the P-3A Orion has been recommended for this purpose. In order to provide the optimum coverage and transmission time it is estimated that such airborne facilities would be required. These can be purchased and outfitted for \$20 million.

I have, of course, no assurance that the funds authorized by this bill for additional airborne telecasting facilities will in fact be utilized by the Department of Defense. Perhaps, when they put this proposal on a punchcard it will not pass the cost-effectiveness test. If so, that would be but another example of the failure of the computer to have the vision that is vitally needed in our efforts throughout the world.

In view of the great potential of television in Vietnam, I cannot see how the cost of these additional airborne facilities can be thought excessive or prohibitive. Last February we passed a supplemental appropriation for Vietnam of around \$13 billion just to facilitate this war until the end of this month. The price tag on the bill before us is \$17.9 billion. Certainly any piece of equipment which promises to shorten this war by as much as 1 day will have very effectively paid for itself many times over in the lives and dollars saved. We can really afford nothing less.

The struggle in Vietnam is first and last a struggle for the minds of men. Military victories will not alone bring a stable, unified country. There can be no political stability where there is no reliable means of communication and where there is a constant stream of misinformation and falsehood being disseminated by the enemy. A program which attempts to meet this need deserves our very best effort. At present, this program is working remarkably well, but it is based too much on a gamble—the gamble that these airborne transmitters will not be attacked again, the gamble that the ground transmitters when in place will always be secure and loyal.

A few weeks ago, I flew a mission with one of the Blue Eagles as it circled Saigon for some 5 hours transmitting its signals. I monitored the Vietnamese channel and I am satisfied that we are making a good effort, but the stakes are high and time may be fleeting. If the job is worth doing, it is worth doing well. We should have first-class equipment.

As we all know, South Vietnam is presently experiencing another grave political crisis. Nothing, I think, could emphasize more the need for greater efforts to resolve these internal differences and to encourage the forces of union rather than dissension among the South Vietnamese people.

A television network reaching out through all of South Vietnam offers a remarkable opportunity to provide these people, for perhaps the first time, with reliable information about the policies of their government and the truth about our efforts to help them. They will be able to see with their own eyes the mili-

tary, economic, and social progress being made in other parts of the country. Just as a picture is said to be worth a thousand words, so one picture can give the lie to many thousands of words of Vietcong propaganda. The Communists have been working in this field for years. We have really just begun to answer them. We have made a good start, but we must do more and soon. Ways must be found to greatly expand the daily telecasts which are now only 1 hour in length. There is very little, I think, that is more urgent in the Vietnam situation than this program. The funds authorized in this bill would greatly increase the possibility of reaching the potential that this program promises. Let us in the Congress give this program every bit of help we can. I urge the approval of this legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, as unanimously reported from our committee, the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I speak as a member of the Select Committee of the House and Senate on the Organization of the Congress, and its relations to other Government agencies. Then, I speak by appointment of the chairman, as well as the nomination of the ranking minority member and at the election of the committee; as a member of the Research and Development Subcommittee, the Military Aircraft Subcommittee, regular Subcommittee No. 3; and the Military Hospital Construction Special Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to deviate for a minute to stress and lend what I can, to the eloquence of the Speaker and other Members of the House who have spoken in behalf of the chairman of this full committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, today.

As a surgeon, I view mankind objectively and they usually all look alike to me, both from without and from within. I cannot but admire with what deft precision and clean cleavage the Speaker purloined a page from the Gross-Hall party in setting up his beautiful ode and his outgiving remarks about Republicans, to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, is my chairman and personal friend, is a man upon whom the sun shines and who stands tall in the esteem and the affection of those who know him, because that alone is sufficient to culminate in his humaneness, his greatness, his decisiveness, his determination, mixed with that proper milieu of humility which makes a great man steadfast in his ideals, a man who stands tall in his thoughts and who moves humbly in his relations among his fellow man.

This reminds me of the bit of doggerel paraphrased from "Like the Pine" by Emmabell Woodworth Davis.

Like the pine, let him stand tall,
Twice blest by sun and rain.
Let him be strong
Against buffeting storms,
Nor bend with pain.

Like the pine, let him be gentle,
With arms outstretched—
Giving solace there,
And when the nights
Are calm and clear,
Let him wear stardust in his hair.

Mr. Chairman, I like a man who has the guts to stand for principles which remain eternal, and who in good days and bad supports the Constitution which has given us the highest standard of living on earth and who can ride against the stream when necessary to do that which is best for the veteran, and for the enlisted men and officers who stand but for us, around the world.

The Lord and Soldier we adore in time of danger—not before. Danger past, All things righted—God forgotten, Soldier Slighted!—American Commentator

I happen to have in my hand extracts from the Federalist papers, and what James Madison said or wrote at the time our Constitution was being framed. It is a great piece which I will not repeat, it explicitly places the whole power of raising armies in the legislature and not in the executive. So this legislature was to be a popular body consisting of the Representatives of the people periodically elected and instead of a provision that was supposed to favor the standing armies, there was to be found in respect to this object an important qualification even of legislative discretion.

I shall not go further.

But how remarkable it is in this day of the grab of executive and judicial powers, if you please, from those of the people's personally elected Representatives we have a leader who will stand and include such things as light observation helicopters, pay raise, atom nuclear propelled surface ships, F-12 interceptors, sprint modification of the anti-missile missile, depth submergence studies, antisubmarine warfare research and development, and yet think of the wounded GI and his proper but often delayed aeromedical evacuation in the Conus.

How wonderful it is to follow the leadership with the top secret posture briefings, the hearings, at the side of this white-maned man from South Carolina who stands so tall among his colleagues today.

He reminds us all of Josiah Gilbert Holland's poem entitled "God Give Us Men!"

God, give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and
ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without
winking.

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the
fog

In public duty and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-
worn creeds,

Their large professions, and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting justice
sleeps.

Mr. Chairman, I personally am and have been vitally interested in maintain-

ing our fight against aggression at all costs. No man has yet explained to me where we would defend freedom if not in South Vietnam, the keystone in the arch of southeast Asia. I have always stood four-square for our representative Republic under the Constitution, and I believe thoroughly in the powers vested in our Congress by that masterpiece insofar as raising, supporting, and developing policies of the armed services are concerned.

It is for this reason that months ago I took the floor of this House and documented many areas in which our extinct Secretary of Defense has been lacking, if not deceptive and in error. It is for this reason I have castigated the Assistant Secretary of Defense for public information who has widened the credibility gap, defended the right to lie, and knows not the meaning of "no comment." It is for this reason that I caused last year's military construction bill to be voted on by this Congress over a Presidential veto based on executive powers versus legislative authority, and it is for this reason that I support this bill which will undo many of the faults of the misinterpreted Curtis-McCormack amendment wherein the Secretary of Defense and his clever attorneys state they derive unseemly powers over the Congress.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is for this reason that I offer deference and respect to the gentleman from South Carolina, our chairman, in the form of Thomas Wolfe's selection from "Burning in the Night" which is so applicable to this defender of freedom, the Nation, and the promise of America.

BURNING IN THE NIGHT

(By Thomas Wolfe)

So, then, to every man his chance—
To every man, regardless of his birth,
His shining, golden opportunity—
To every man the right to live.
To work, to be himself,
And to become
Whatever thing his manhood and his vision
Can combine to make him—
This, seeker,
Is the promise of America.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri how humbly grateful I am for his most gracious statement about me.

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2950, which authorizes \$17.9 billion for military procurement and research and development and urge the adoption of this legislation as reported by the committee.

As always, the number and type of weapons authorized in this annual bill are governed chiefly by the level of military preparedness the current world situation demands. The adversaries of freedom have made tremendous progress in the technology of mass destruction. More than ever in this Nation's history, it is incumbent upon us that we maintain a military inventory of sufficient weapons and force to survive a massive nuclear attack and to deliver a decisive counterblow.

We cannot risk letting down our guard for even a moment. This is clearly demonstrated by the unwavering determination of those who direct the Communist conspiracy to attain their announced goals. We must remain powerful enough to insure that no other nation would ever consider challenging our full military potential.

The Department of Defense planners have placed a great deal of reliance on missiles, but we must remember that new antimissile developments may affect the reliability of missiles in the future. Therefore, our national defense effort must be based on a balanced and flexible military force in order to achieve maximum effectiveness and protection. The need for versatility has been amply and decisively illustrated by the military demands placed on our forces in southeast Asia.

Our commitment in Vietnam, 6,500 miles from our shores, and other worldwide commitments demonstrate more than ever the need for a follow-on manned bomber. Long-range bombers carrying conventional bombs have been singularly successful in denying the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese reinforcements sanctuary throughout the jungles of South Vietnam.

It is imperative that the Secretary of Defense proceed to full-scale development of follow-on manned bombers other than the modification of the F-111, and it is hoped that he will reach a decision quickly on an advanced strategic aircraft. Undue delay in reaching this decision could possibly result in increased cost of this program. In the case of the F-111 it was brought out in testimony before our Committee that the development of this aircraft will cost us nearly twice as much as we were originally told it was going to cost in the beginning of this program. The engine cost increase alone has been approximately \$218 million. We are willing to authorize the expenditure of whatever sums are necessary to maintain a strong defense posture, but we should not tolerate increased costs that we need not have incurred.

I join with my colleagues on the committee in strongly urging that in the interest of our national security the Department of Defense pursue with full measure of speed and dedication steps which will permit the Air Force to begin contract definition of the AMSA in fiscal year 1967.

We have added \$11.8 million in this bill to the \$11 million requested for AMSA. The judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff supports the wisdom of this action by the committee. The reluctance of the Secretary of Defense notwithstanding, we must move forward more rapidly in development and deployment of an advanced manned strategic aircraft that can meet the optimum performance characteristics that the Air Force requires today.

I am fully in agreement with the authorization for an additional number of F-4 aircraft. This is a wise decision in view of the excellent performance of this aircraft in Vietnam. And I might take this opportunity to point with pride

to the work done by the GE Evendale plant in Cincinnati in making the engine to power this aircraft.

The decision to include an amount in excess of \$250 million for the C-5A cargo plane is also a wise one. This will be the largest aircraft ever built in the world and unquestionably represents one of the most dramatic and significant developments in our airlift capability. The action taken by the committee demonstrates our cognizance of the importance of our airlift capability.

The high-bypass turbofan engines to power this enormous aircraft are manufactured by the General Electric Co. in Cincinnati. I would again like to commend GE for the impressive progress they have made in developing a wide variety of jet engine configurations. The engine for the C-5A will be produced in the same Evendale facilities and use the same highly skilled personnel that are currently producing the J-79 engine that powers such famous aircraft as the B-58, F-104, F-4 and A-5.

I heartily endorse the action taken by the committee with respect to nuclear-powered frigates. The advantages of nuclear power over conventionally powered vessels, particularly under combat conditions, are obvious when all the facts are considered. Nuclear power affords significant military advantages not outweighed by their added cost. The value of their increased flexibility under attack cannot be measured in dollars. I would strongly hope that no more time is lost in moving forward with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered frigates authorized by this bill.

The committee has added \$167,900,000 in authorization of appropriations for preproduction activities directed toward the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system. The Nike X can afford significant protection against many types of ballistic missile attack and would thereby strengthen our defenses against a very real and increasing threat to this Nation's security.

Of course, there is no simple answer as deterrence can never be completely assured. We have an obligation, however, to do everything in our power to see that American lives are protected, and that obligation requires no less action than is proposed by the committee. Better that the cost to us be in dollars than in human life.

We believe the legislation before us today is consistent with maintenance of a military posture sufficient to deter aggression on the part of those who strive for world domination. The authorizations provided in this bill and the purposes for which they will be spent will enable us to remain the strongest nation in the world militarily.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled and concerned about the very strange procedure under which the HS-820 20-millimeter machinegun was cleared for procurement and given a standard A rating despite the fact that on at least four different points the per-

formance standards normally required of guns of this type were either dropped or waived.

Mr. Chairman, why were Army standards lowered to clear the HS-820 gun for standard A rating and procurement?

A report dated April 19, 1966, by the U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, showed that:

First, accuracy requirement of 1.5 miles dropped to 2 miles.

Second, burst accuracy requirement at 1,000 meters dropped completely.

Third, reliability requirement which for years had been a maximum of only 1 per 1,000 rounds was changed to 2 or 3.

Fourth, no dust test was required.

Hearings show this weapon was classified standard A but that classification means considerably less than a year ago.

Why were the standards lowered?

The Germans rejected this gun as unsatisfactory 5 years ago.

The German Army is not now using this gun for field use and has no intention of doing so. Indeed Germany is getting a superior 20-millimeter gun from the same Rheinmetall firm and will be getting deliveries about the same time the United States will get deliveries of the inferior HS-820.

The new German weapon, nearly ready for production is known as the RH-202. It uses the same type ammunition but is not the lubricated-type mechanism. It is a new gun, not a re-do of the HS-820.

Why?

Why was the Army ordered to lower its standards, to let this gun get standard A classification? Why is our negotiating team this week completing the contract deal for an inferior weapon when the same German firm has a superior gun nearly ready?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may require to the distinguished gentleman from California, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Defense Department's bill reported out by the House Armed Services Committee.

I should like to comment on the provisions in the bill for the construction of nuclear-powered naval warships. This bill includes a nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier and five nuclear-propelled attack submarines requested by the administration. In addition, this bill includes the authorization of two nuclear-propelled frigates. This latter item is particularly heartening to me.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am chairman, has throughout the years supported a strong research and development program on nuclear propulsion plants for warships. This research and development effort, under the competent guidance of Admiral Rickover, has been outstandingly successful. It is because of this effort and leadership that we have a clear-cut lead in this technology over all other nations. The addition of the two nuclear-propelled frigates is in accordance with this research and development program

and is a logical utilization of the major developments which have occurred in the field of nuclear propulsion.

The Joint Committee published hearings entitled "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program" in January of this year. I would like to quote a section from the foreword of these hearings which I was pleased to note was also quoted in the Armed Services Committee report on the authorization bill before us today:

The Joint Committee recommends that the Congress change the fiscal year 1967 Department of Defense authorization to require the two new destroyers to be nuclear-powered ships. This change will be in consonance with the constitutional responsibility of Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy * * *" and with the continuing role of leadership taken by Congress in the development and application of nuclear propulsion to the U.S. Navy—first for submarines, then for aircraft carriers, and now for major fleet escorts.

The bill before the House today is in complete agreement with the views expressed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have, with other members of the Joint Committee, spent many hours studying the particular problem of nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels. A comprehensive study was made of this matter in the latter part of 1963. It was at this time that nuclear propulsion was being considered for the aircraft carrier, *John F. Kennedy*, which is now under construction. The study resulted in a report by the Joint Committee entitled "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," dated December 1963.

Based upon our study, we concluded that the *John F. Kennedy* and all first-line naval surface warships should be provided with nuclear power. It is most unfortunate that our recommendation concerning the *John F. Kennedy* was not followed, and that it is now being built as a conventionally powered warship. We have had to wait nearly 5 years since our first nuclear propelled aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, was authorized.

I would like to quote a short excerpt from our 1963 study which I think is still very pertinent to the matter of nuclear propulsion.

It is an indisputable, demonstrated fact that nuclear propulsion increases the combat effectiveness of our surface warships.

Nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load, and to return; all without logistic support. Nuclear propulsion in the combatant ships will free the striking forces of our Navy from the obvious restrictions of reliance on a worldwide propulsion fuel distribution system. As our potential enemies continue to improve their capabilities over, under, and on the sea, the importance of reducing our dependence on logistic support becomes increasingly critical.

Certain cost effectiveness comparisons were made within the Defense Department and cited to support the contention that the advantages of nuclear propulsion in surface warships are not particularly significant. These studies, however, contain a fundamental weakness that, in the opinion of the Joint Committee, negates their validity. The comparisons cited were based on the assumption that in wartime, logistic support forces will be able to operate unhampered and without losses as they do in peacetime. The defect in this analysis is immediately apparent.

We must plan for time of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. It is fundamentally illogical and wasteful to fit our new first line warships with powerplants that are, perhaps, already obsolete.

In concluding my remarks, I want to assure all Members that I, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, intend to provide every support possible to the naval reactor development program. My objective is to assure that our Nation continues to maintain an overwhelming lead in this vital field of technology, which is so important to our national security.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri such time as he may require.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the military procurement bill. I am proud to be a member of the House Armed Services Committee, today. Awhile ago your chairman was given such a great ovation.

It is most appropriate that through pure coincidence this bill is being considered on June 14, which is Flag Day. Equally appropriate is the fact that today has been designated as Army Day. It so happens today is the 191st anniversary of the U.S. Army. The bill before us today is without any question one of the most important that will be considered by this 2d session of the 89th Congress. This bill not only affects our present existence but our future life and security of this country in the years ahead.

Before proceeding onward I wish to pause to pay tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina. The entire country is indebted to this able man who would be the first, because of his humility, to say that he does not deserve such praise by his colleagues. The efforts which he has made to return to the control of the Congress powers that have been lifted away by the Department of Defense and others in the executive branch, mark him not only as a man of ability and dedication but as a man of great courage. Our great chairman enjoys the greatest respect from everyone of his fellow members of the House.

This bill has not been hurriedly considered. Even the report has taken a matter of at least 2 weeks to prepare. Preceding that there were many weeks of committee hearings.

The requests submitted by the Department of Defense were acceptable. They were good requests. Your committee felt several additions were needed and in some instances the amounts requested by DOD were inadequate or insufficient.

Before discussing in detail what was added by the committee, it should be pointed out that there are some innovations in this procurement bill which make it rather unusual. For the first time, a procurement bill has been used as a vehicle for a military pay raise. Then again, provisions have been inserted in this bill to prevent the abandonment of a major weapons system without your Congress knowing about such changes or

the reasons proposed for canceling such weapons systems.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the best way to place into perspective the \$931 million which was added by the House Armed Services Committee over and above the request by the DOD is to consider the three major additions which some editorial writers and columnists seem to think are the most controversial.

First is the continuation or follow-on of the B-58 bombers to include such items at \$55 million in procurement funds for the F-12. This plane is simply a version of the A-11 which was heralded by the President a few years ago as one of the greatest planes that had ever been developed. Then there is \$51 million for the CX-2 aircraft which is for aeromedical evacuation missions for our sick and injured members of the armed forces. In the field of research and development for aircraft \$11 million has been added for further research and development of the AMSA—advanced manned strategic aircraft—\$22 million for further tests and evaluation of the F-111A or the TFX which received so much publicity 2 or 3 years ago.

The second largest component among the additions is \$167 million for the Nike-X, of which \$153 million was for procurement and about \$14 million for research and development. All of this sum is directed toward an early deployment of an antiballistic defense system. Your committee has long been of the belief that DOD has not exhibited a proper sense of urgency about ABM—antiballistic missile. This authorization today could mean the saving of more than 1 year to get ready to go. In other words, this authorization means a chance to make an earlier deployment of this most important weapons system. Your committee believes that after 9 years of research and development there has been sufficient progress upon this system to afford us significant protection against many types of ballistic attacks. Your committee knows that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are unanimous in supporting this funding for preproduction activities of this antiballistic missile system.

The third major addition by the committee is in the field of naval vessels. We propose the addition of two nuclear-powered guided-missile frigates—DLGN—in the amount of \$258 million. The word "frigate" is a revival from old Navy terminology meaning the ship somewhat larger than a destroyer and carrying more firepower than an ordinary warship. Actually, while the present authorization is for two of these frigates, one is simply a reauthorization from last year. It should be recalled that something in excess of \$20 million was previously authorized as a start but the Secretary of Defense decided, in his wisdom, not to proceed. In this connection attention should be directed to the language in the authorization. The bill clearly points out the Secretary of Defense "shall" proceed with the design and construction of these frigates as soon as practicable. It is the feeling of the committee that this language contains a potential test as to whether Congress has

the power to raise armies and maintain navies. Certainly there is no better place for a test to be made than for this important weapons system to be the subject of the trial, if it must happen.

Remember, the Soviets have put all their reliance upon submarines. They have 1,400. We believe our submarine fleet, while smaller, is more efficient and more effective. We do have the *Big E*, the *Bainbridge*, the *Long Beach*, and the *Truxtun* is now being built. The decision to add these nuclear vessels was a unanimous decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They thought we need a nuclear task force of at least one carrier and four escorts. The report which accompanies this bill so ably points out the advantages of nuclear-powered ships over conventional power. To put it very briefly, a nuclear-powered ship can proceed at full speed not for a matter of days or weeks or a matter of months without refueling but nuclear-powered escort or carriers can continue for as much as 10 years without refueling.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for a few moments I hope I may direct my thoughts to the question whether the additions to this bill by the committee, being mainly the three programs which the press says Secretary McNamara does not want, are really necessary or important. Some editorial writers have referred to these as pet projects of the committee. Others said these additions were purely provincial or political. Some columnists have put into issue the good judgment of the committee. For such reasons, I think we should consider these in the following order:

First. As to the phaseout of the greater part of our manned strategic bomber force, Secretary McNamara denied repeatedly that the Joint Chiefs of Staff disagreed with his recommendation for such phaseout. Then the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HÉBERT], produced two pages of testimony by General McConnell, Chief of Staff of the Air Force who stated positively and affirmatively that the Joint Chiefs were in agreement that a missile-manned bomber mix is needed and required for the foreseeable future. He emphasized that the operational life of our B-52-G cannot go beyond 1975. General McConnell also pointed out that the FB-111, as presently conceived, is not capable of covering the distant targets in the U.S.S.R. and Communist China. Again, General McConnell did not mince words when he said the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider the follow-on manned bomber should be completed at the earliest possible time. The House should take careful note that if there is a question of credibility concerning Mr. McNamara in his dispute with the committee, it would seem the committee should have a right to believe the statement of General McConnell.

The issue today is one that can be stated simply but one which is most important. It is whether the Congress will come to grips with the urgent need to discharge its responsibility under the Constitution, that is, to raise and maintain armies and navies or whether we

will abrogate such power to the executive branch. Stated differently, the issue is whether the House will follow its own members on the Armed Services Committee or reject their judgment in favor of a member of the executive branch, who may happen to be the Secretary of Defense.

Second. Turning now to the matter of credibility between the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs, we find that the Chief of Naval Operations has taken issue with Secretary McNamara by warning him the continued construction of conventionally powered warships poses "grave implications for the national security." The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Navy seem to have objected to the cost of construction of nuclear powered frigates and destroyers. The Chief of Naval Operations countered or rebutted by the submission of a warning that our Navy overseas supply lines are now more vulnerable than at any time in our history. Nuclear power offers advantages that could be decisive in many situations. Admiral McDonald went on to point out in a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense that we should not raise objections to the cost of construction of nuclear powered frigates when this cost must be set off against the potential vulnerability of logistical support ships, particularly tankers powered conventionally. The Admiral went on to emphasize that there is such a thing as cost-effectiveness and that construction of nuclear powered task forces can lead to a greatly superior Navy because it will not depend upon tankers.

The third major increase in the authorization bill is the question of the need for an antiballistic missile system or the Nike-X. There should be little doubt now that the U.S.S.R. can inflict damage to the United States by employing long-range missiles. This situation is likely to continue. True, Nike-X is costly but it is worth its cost in the potential saving of American lives. Once again, there seems to be a reluctance upon the part of the Department of Defense to proceed. Military man after military man has come before our committee to testify that leadtime is important if we are to achieve an effective defense posture. They point out that any delay in the production base will result in an equal delay in operational hardware to be deployed at some future date.

One of the most interesting facts about the missile defense system is the result of a survey conducted by ARPA—Advanced Research Projects Agency. There was an exploratory survey made which found out quite a lot about the knowledge of the American public about an antiballistic system. Two-thirds of the persons sampled in the United States thought our country now has a ABM system ready for deployment or operation. It seems to me the result of this opinion poll should provide some real food for thought among the membership of this House. If the public believes they now have protection from enemy missiles when in truth and fact they do not it is time for action by the Congress.

If the Nike-X system can be carried forward immediately it will be capable of defending us against intercontinental missiles and also missiles that might be launched from Polaris type submarines. Whether it can be brought to complete perfection or in even a reasonably effective ballistic missile defense system nevertheless it would save millions of American lives in the event of an enemy attack. Is it any wonder the Joint Chiefs of Staff were unanimous in supporting funding this year? The real wonder is why there was no request from the Secretary of Defense for funds for this purpose?

Mr. Chairman, in the field of research and development the United States lead time is not as long as it appears. It is narrowing and the Vietnam situation is pushing us closer to the danger point. True, we have two advantages over our competitors. We can take laboratory findings to the production line faster. We have a much larger backlog of patents and other technical exclusives. But these are today's assets and they cannot be lived upon forever. Our rivals are learning to shorten the time between "R"—research—and "D"—development. Their big investment in R. & D. people today should be a warning bell. Let us hope it does not take a new shock like Sputnik to speed the United States up again. It is for this reason that I am particularly happy to support the added amounts for R. & D.

On page 22 of the report I note there is \$15 million for rapid development R. & D. for southeast Asia. It has been pointed out that these items, although they have been partially identified could have qualified for inclusion in the 1966 southeast Asia supplemental appropriation. In this regard I was particularly impressed by an article in the June issue of Air Force which pointed out that the Vietcong is already half defeated. They can no longer move about in the day time without risking attack and heavy losses. Yet in some way we must take the night advantages away from the Vietcong. Some way we must find a method to help men see at night because the Vietnam war could be quickly won if we could defeat the current Communist tactic of expanding their control of terrain by night. We can quickly win the war if we can succeed in perfecting some sort of night vision device. This capability is being sought. If we can raise the night vision distance from 10 to 100 yards by a helmet mounted device then we can effectively turn night into day so far as our military is concerned and bring our firepower superiority to bear upon the Vietcong at night as well as the day. This phase of R. & D. is most important.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about whether we should be in Vietnam. In the month of May, I forwarded about 55,000 questionnaires or opinion polls to our constituents. Almost 20 percent were returned. As to Vietnam four questions were asked: First. To stand firm until aggression is repelled and free elections were held? Second. Expanding the war to seek military victory? Third. Withdraw? or Fourth, negotiate with the

Vietcong and North Vietnamese Communists at the peace table? It was most interesting to note that our hawk constituents—questions numbered 1 and 2—accounted for 42.8 percent and 23.3 percent, respectively, of the returns for a combined total of 66.1 percent.

The third and fourth questions concerning withdrawal or immediate negotiations, respectively, accounted for only 18 percent for withdrawal and 15.9 percent for negotiation or 33.9 percent total for these two questions. The conclusion would seem to be that two-thirds of our constituents favor either firmness or an effort to carry the war to victory as against one-third who favor withdrawal or continued efforts toward negotiation.

Before closing I would like to emphasize, however, that this procurement bill is not for the sole benefit of Vietnam. It has purposes and objectives which lie years ahead. Today in order to acquire good military hardware a long leadtime is required, sometimes 4 or 5 years. First there is the definition stage and then work on the planning boards followed by contract requirements to be in turn followed by the experimental stage on tests and evaluation all of which precede by many years the operational status or deployment of a new weapon. As a member of the Committee on the Armed Services I can assure my colleagues that a large portion of this procurement bill is for our defense in the years ahead and is not related to our present effort in southeast Asia. This is in accord with the belief of many of us on the committee that our entire attention should not be absorbed by the Vietnam conflict. There are other areas in the world which need our attention continuously. There is Western Europe. There is the Middle or Near East. And there is always Cuba, at our doorstep.

The bill before us today has been carefully considered. It deserves the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my 100-percent support of the bill S. 2950. At the same time I rise to express approval of the statements and join with the distinguished Speaker of the House and our other leaders and colleagues in paying tribute, particularly on this day on which we honor our flag, this Flag Day observance, to a man who has done as much as any other individual to keep Old Glory flying in all quarters of our world. One of the great inspiring periods of my life has been the past 2 years, during which I have been serving under the chairmanship of one of the great patriotic, able Americans who is doing a great job for the security of our great Nation, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of serving on the Armed Services Committee for 19 years, all of

them with the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. As chairman of a subcommittee, I think that I can speak for every member of my subcommittee in commending Chairman RIVERS for the encouragement and cooperation he has always given to us in the work assigned to us. I know that without his encouragement and his efforts the subcommittee would not have been able to delve as carefully and thoroughly into the many research programs conducted by the Defense Establishment.

When we bring a bill such as this to the floor, because of the direction of the gentleman from South Carolina, you can be assured that the Armed Services Committee has reviewed every single line item, research program and development program which is authorized in this bill.

The gentleman from South Carolina quickly saw the need for a specific Committee on Research and Development, so that this phase of the defense program could be kept under careful and complete surveillance.

We have said something here today about a few people who are responsible for the development of a nuclear navy.

I give a great deal of credit to the chairman of our full committee, because if it were not for his interest in a nuclear Navy—both the submarine program and the surface Navy—it would not be possible for us to bring to the floor the requests for authorizations that we do.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and I, who have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for some years, have been interested in a nuclear Navy. But we have been prodded by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to bring this interest to the attention of the full committee. We have not had the problem of going to our chairman and requesting him to give us support. He has urged us and has urged the full committee to do everything we possibly could to promote a nuclear surface Navy.

The things I have pointed out here today are specific instances of the dedication of Chairman RIVERS. There have been many who touched upon the general dedication of the chairman to the national defense of our country.

Also, may I point out that he has given me the honor of serving as chairman of the Military Airlift Subcommittee. I inherited that job from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] himself, who first chaired that subcommittee in 1960. We might refer to him as the father of the modern military airlift, because before the establishment of the 1960 Military Airlift Subcommittee, there were so many inadequacies in our military airlift that it was practically nonexistent. Today we have a modern airlift. We have improved it over 100 percent. We now have a jet airlift.

A subsequent Military Airlift Committee, headed by the gentleman from South Carolina, in 1963 added to the recommendations that further increased the efficiency and effectiveness of a military airlift. So the recommendations made by the subcommittee headed by

Mr. RIVERS in 1960 and 1963 have been accepted 100 percent by the Defense Establishment, and every recommendation made in those two committee reports has been put into effect.

I can only hope that the new Military Airlift Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, will be as successful as the previous subcommittees were in doing something to continue the modernization of the airlift program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my wholehearted support to this authorization bill, and to attempt to shed some additional light on several aspects of the research and development portion which are of particular interest to me. The R.D.T. & E. authorization restores about one-third of the most urgent projects which were left unfunded by the Secretary of Defense. This amounts to about \$373 million and even though it is not a cure-all, it does assist the military departments as an early step in resolving part of their fiscal year 1967 deficiencies. This expression of confidence in the research and development programs stems from an urgent need to maintain our deterrent posture against all-out war and to meet whatever threats develop in southeast Asia at a minimum cost in American and allied lives.

In reviewing the proposed R.D.T. & E. budget for fiscal year 1967, Subcommittee No. 3, of which I am privileged to be chairman, held some 17 hearing sessions and received testimony totaling over 1,500 pages. Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, made the following statement to our subcommittee:

Our review this year was so intensive as to leave much less flexibility than in Fiscal Year 1966, and hence our ability to cope with unforeseen eventualities during the coming year from within available resources will be very limited . . . I feel that the funds requested represent an austere amount required to meet our most important needs.

It was the committee's view that the budget submitted was too austere and undoubtedly would lead to a requirement for a supplemental authorization and appropriation during the year, if allowed to stand as submitted. The bulk of the cost estimates for known requirements was submitted in October of last year, 8 months ago. Many requirements were not identifiable at that time, but are now. For these reasons, the committee considered closely those projects reduced by the Department of Defense and attempted to identify new requirements that were not considered in the formulation of the budget submitted to the Congress. Based on this thorough review, the committee concluded that an additional \$373,200,000 is needed in the defense budget for research, development, test, and evaluation. The programs affected by this add-on are discussed on pages 18 to 23 in the committee report. I will take time to call attention to only a few of those programs.

ARMY

The Department of Defense reduced by \$390.5 million the amount requested by the Army for R.D.T. & E. and supporting appropriations. The committee restored \$62.8 million to be distributed among

some 13 projects. The amounts range from \$1 million for the field artillery direct support weapon, to \$14.4 million for the R. & D. related to preproduction of the Nike X. I will comment on six of these projects.

NIKE X

The decision to support the initiation of Nike X production and eventual deployment of an antimissile system is one of grave importance to the Nation. The matter has been thoroughly debated in the press, on television and in the statements of interested experts who both favor and oppose the deployment of Nike X. Without going into great detail, it is possible to focus on a few key factors that appear in most of the arguments that have been put forth.

The first factor is the threat. It is generally accepted that the U.S.S.R. can deliver nuclear warheads on our cities and key military installations by long-range missiles. It is also agreed that millions of casualties would result from such an attack and that major segments of our industrial capacity would be devastated. The Nation depends, at the present time, on deterrence alone to prevent an attack by ICBM or SLBM. The ability of Communist China to threaten the United States with long-range nuclear missiles is subject to much speculation. The consensus to date is that Red China could produce the necessary delivery vehicles in the middle or late 1970's if they wanted to make the effort. The conclusion on the threat is that the United States can be attacked today by Soviet Russia and that it could be attacked in the future by Red China. The threat is expected to grow with time both in complexity and volume and the only option the Nation has to retaliate with our own strategic attack forces.

Another factor is the possibility of the deployment of an antimissile system by the U.S.S.R. It is obvious that some disturbance of the strategic balance will result if the Soviets successfully deploy a defense against missiles and the United States does not. The credibility of our deterrence would certainly decline and the security of the Nation would be weakened even if the Soviet antimissile system is not totally effective. This leads to the next factor—time.

There can be no doubt that any system that can destroy enemy warheads in flight must be extremely complicated and technically difficult. The process of manufacture and deployment will be lengthy. Delays in beginning the job will certainly produce delays in attaining any worthwhile defense posture. The money in question for Nike X will start the clock running. It will not result in an antimissile defense next year, but it will lead to the attainment of that defense in the shortest possible time.

The final factor is cost. The Nike X and its predecessor, Nike-Zeus, have been and will continue to be very expensive research and development projects. Any defense of significance will be costly. The funds now under consideration are but the first step. However, they are a key step in that they prepare the way for an orderly production base upon which to build the complex components

that make up the Nike X system. Unless the foundation is laid, the structuring of an effective defense against missile attack is impossible.

ADVANCED AERIAL FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM
(AAFSS)

The war in Vietnam has conclusively proven the need for armed helicopters in Army combat operations. In fiscal year 1966, the Army initiated development of the Advanced Aerial Fire Support System, generally referred to as AAFSS. Its primary role will be to escort troop-carrying helicopters in airmobile operations and provide suppressive fires in the landing zones. For secondary missions, it is designed to engage and destroy area and point targets including fixed emplacements and armored vehicles. The AAFSS is a new advanced helicopter with significantly increased operational capabilities over other armed helicopters and it is capable of effectively employing a variety of point and area type weapons. It has armor protection and is capable of speeds in excess of 200 knots. This new weapons system will represent a significant increase in combat effectiveness.

Development of the AAFSS will require a number of years. The prime contractor for the AAFSS is the Lockheed-California Co.; however, it should be mentioned that over 55 percent of the contractor effort will be subcontracted to firms throughout the country.

In fiscal year 1966, additional funds were reprogrammed to provide essential impetus to the AAFSS development program. Currently, the fiscal year 1967 budget request includes a modest amount for continuation of the AAFSS. Army witnesses appeared before our committee and stated that this amount was under extensive review at the time the proposed budget was being printed. From that review, it became apparent that a less capable but more expensive system would result unless at least a one-third increased level of effort was pursued in fiscal year 1967. The increased funding program has been favorably reviewed by the Army and OSD, and they feel it represents the most practical approach for the early provision of the AAFSS to meet a valid operational requirement.

I believe it is most reasonable and prudent that the Congress should adjust the fiscal year 1967 funding level for AAFSS to this higher level.

NIGHT VISION

Daily reports from Vietnam emphasize the importance of a night combat troop capability. The Army has a highly promising and very successful program to provide night vision devices for the use of all three services. These devices will increase combat forces' capability to operate and to fire weapons at night. As an example, one of these devices is the Small Starlight Scope which was discussed by the Honorable "Cy" Vance on the television program "Issues and Answers" on Sunday, April 24, 1966.

Last year the Army sought to increase the emphasis on this important program by substantially increasing the annual funding level. Although the Department of Defense approved the in-

creased program, the net result of subsequent budgetary actions was to reduce the program back to the original level. The committee was advised that additional funds are required to prevent a significant delay in the following features of the proposed Army program:

First. Early production of special systems suitable for military field use.

Second. Early production of systems using advanced technology to provide improved performance, increased reliability, reduced size, weight and cost.

Third. Basic parametric studies to assure that vision systems are fully developed. These considerations are of special significance when one considers the fact that any nighttime vision system suffers from the total loss of peripheral vision for detection of motion and orientation. To overcome the drawbacks of what might be termed "tunnel vision," system design parameters must be carefully selected to provide the best possible features for target location and fire control operations.

The Committee recommended restoration of the Department of Defense reduction to this vital research program.

ACCELERATED ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
IN SUPPORT OF SOUTHEAST ASIA LIMITED
WAR LABORATORY

The U. S. Army Limited War Laboratory is a centralized research and development activity with a quick reaction capability for meeting Army operational requirements relating to limited war. Research effort is applied particularly to war in underdeveloped or remote areas of the world. This includes specifically the provision of a quick-reaction facility for accomplishing short-range development of specialized limited warfare items.

A large share of the laboratory's work is in support of Vietnam. For example, it has developed a device to enable helicopters to lay smokescreens for screening helicopter operations. It has also developed a long-range, lightweight radio for use in jungle warfare. It has developed a lightweight smoke signal. A soldier can carry 16 of these and still not be carrying the weight of one standard smoke grenade. It has developed a device to improve the mobility of the M113 armored personnel carrier. It is developing a jungle canopy platform to enable helicopters to load or unload personnel and cargo on top of the jungle canopy. This device should improve our medical evacuation capability in the jungle. It is currently working on devices to improve the ability of our front line troops to mark their positions for friendly aircraft; a bullet detector to tell helicopter crews they are being fired at; a battlefield illumination system; and a counterambush weapons system. There are other projects of a classified nature also in support of Vietnam operations.

With increased activity in southeast Asia, the effort required of the limited war laboratory has increased correspondingly. Recently the laboratory has been authorized a personnel increase from 7 officers and 76 civilians to 12 officers and 134 civilians. While expansion increased the capability to produce equipment in minimum time, it also in-

creased the requirement for funds to operate the laboratory. Operating and maintenance costs have gone up accordingly. I believe there is a valid requirement for increased funding above that which appeared in the Department of Defense-approved program.

MEDIUM ANTITANK/ASSAULT WEAPON (MAW)

Within the Army R.D.T. & E. program, the medium antitank/assault weapon (MAW) is intended to provide a simple, accurate, man-portable weapon for use in infantry platoons. The MAW will be useful in airborne or airmobile units to provide these lightly equipped forces with the necessary antitank/assault firepower. The requirement for this weapon was reconfirmed in a recent cost effectiveness study as being one of an optimum family of weapons which would give the most effective results against armor and hard point targets.

Based on carefully conducted evaluations and preliminary development work, a single MAW concept has been selected for full and final engineering development. The demonstrated performance of the selected concept reportedly has significantly exceeded stated requirements.

The MAW concept was scheduled to enter engineering development in fiscal year 1967 on an optimum development schedule, to include the use of many "off-the-shelf" components and utilization of technology available from the in-progress program for the heavy antitank/assault weapon—TOW.

A Department of Defense imposed reduction from the original Army program request will cause a less than optimum development program to be pursued and will have the effect of significantly delaying production of the weapon. This delay will increase the overall cost of the program and will require consideration of further procurement of obsolete M67 90-millimeter recoilless rifles.

The committee recommended restoration of the Department of Defense reduction to accelerate development of this highly promising MAW development program.

LAND COMBAT SUPPORT SETS/CONTACT SUPPORT
SETS (MULTIPLE TEST EQUIPMENT)

The development of complex missile systems requires maintenance support equipment to sustain reliable operation of these systems in the field. In order to efficiently support Army missile systems such as the Shillelagh, Lance, and TOW, the Army is preparing in fiscal year 1967, to enter an engineering development program for land combat support and contact support sets to fulfill the maintenance support role at field and depot levels. Contact support sets—CSS—will include three different forward area test and maintenance sets; each will be specifically designed—system-peculiar—to support the heavy antitank/assault weapon—TOW—or the Shillelagh guided missile or the Lance missile.

The land combat support sets—LCSS—will be a rear area general test and maintenance set which will support any and all of the three systems. The rear area general test and maintenance set

will eliminate the requirement for expensive individual system-peculiar test equipment required for each individual missile system.

A reduction in the Army fiscal year 1967 program request would result in a less-than-full development program. Further delivery of these systems will be delayed and the test and maintenance support equipment will have to come from the contractor, at increased cost. Failure to adequately fund this program will delay development and delivery to the field of a most important Army missile capability.

For these reasons, the committee restored the funds reduced by the Department of Defense.

NAVY

The Navy R.D.T. & E. budget recommended by the committee, including the add-on of \$142.7 million, reflects an increase of \$400 million over fiscal year 1966. Seventy-five percent of that increase is attributed to the Poseidon program, with the balance required to support additional requirements for anti-submarine warfare, the deep-submergence program, and the medium-range guided missile Condor.

The Navy research and development program has been particularly fruitful in providing a wide variety of weaponry, and in responding in southeast Asia with rapidity and flexibility to the ever-changing requirements of that quixotic and highly dangerous situation. We are all familiar with the sensational technological breakthrough which gave us the Polaris missile system. This year's program moves sea-launched strategic missile effort strongly forward by a commitment of \$294 million to the Poseidon missile, which will provide the successor to Polaris.

The Navy's antisubmarine warfare program is being continued with the high priority that has been accorded it over the past several years. The results are highly encouraging in the areas of airborne submarine sensors, long-range sonars, improved weaponry, and greater knowledge of the physical characteristics of the salt-water environment. The committee added \$50.2 million to ASW for a total of \$405.6 million, an increase of 11.8 percent over the previous year.

The recent successful recovery of the bomb off Palomares, Spain, is eloquent testimony to the immensely exciting things that are being done in the deep-submergence program. The committee has chosen to restore funds to this program above the amount in the President's budget up to \$30.1 million, the level of the original Navy estimate which was submitted to the Secretary of Defense.

The area of electronic warfare, both shipboard and airborne, has been too long neglected, as is evidenced by some of the problems that have arisen in southeast Asia. Our forces there have an urgent need for a greatly improved capability to counter enemy electronic equipment being used to search for our aircraft and to control their antiaircraft weapons. Improvement of our own search radars and fire-control equipment is equally essential.

Our surface-to-air missiles are the best in the world; despite heard criticism of the Navy's version of these missiles, really effective weapons are being developed. The committee is recommending a total of \$56.0 million to keep this fine family of missiles ahead of the increasing threat and to incorporate into them recent developments in missile technology. This is an increase of \$11.1 million over the President's budget.

Another major project included in the committee add-on is the Condor missile. This air-to-surface missile will have an excellent standoff range capability against enemy air defenses. The additional funds recommended by the committee will enable the Navy to accelerate this high priority missile development program.

AIR FORCE

The R. & D. budget request for the Department of the Air Force was \$3,053,800,000. This is a reduction of over \$300 million from the amount received by the Air Force in fiscal year 1966, including the supplemental authorization, and is the lowest R.D.T. & E. budget submitted for the Department of the Air Force since 1960. The Department of Defense reduced by over \$700 million the amount requested by the Air Force for R.D.T. & E. and supporting appropriations.

The committee restored \$167.7 million, to be distributed among six major projects or categories, which are explained in detail in the committee report on pages 20 through 22. The Secretary of the Air Force testified that he could not identify sources for the funds required to support these projects and suggested that one alternative available to the committee was to put the funds in the budget now. The committee chose to follow the Secretary's suggestion.

Almost half of the funds added by the committee are earmarked for the manned orbiting laboratory—MOL. The primary objectives of the MOL program are to:

First, learn more about what man is able to do in space and how that ability can be used for military purposes; second, develop technology and equipment which will help advance manned and unmanned space flight; and third, experiment with this technology and equipment.

The original request for funds for fiscal year 1967 totaled \$394 million. This amount was reduced by the Department of Defense to \$150 million. After several appeals, the Air Force reduced its final appeal to an additional \$80 million, or a total of \$230 million to support the program in the coming year. The program is nearing the completion of contract definition studies which will establish realistic program schedules and costs. The Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, Dr. Flax, advises that current estimates of the funding necessary to maintain a productive level of system development effort and continuity of contractor efforts toward program objectives is approximately \$230 million. These funds would be applied to laboratory development, Gemini and Titan III-C modifications, and developments in the experimental

payload. The committee feels that these additional funds are needed and can be effectively utilized to permit the earliest practicable development of this space capability.

Another major program affected by the committee add-on is the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA. The funds added will support the commencement of the contract definition phase in fiscal year 1967. It is not an unequivocal commitment to production of an aircraft, but is a step that must be taken before reaching a final decision to produce a new airplane. This program, I am sure, will be discussed in great detail by other members of the committee here today.

Additional funds totaling \$22.3 million were included by the committee for the F-111A, previously identified as the TFX. The need for the additional funds was verified by the Secretary of the Air Force, and supported by Dr. Foster, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

The United States is engaged in a joint effort with the Federal Republic of Germany to develop a vertical and short takeoff and landing strike reconnaissance airplane to meet Air Force requirements. The committee added the requested \$3 million to proceed with the contract definition phase of this program, which appears to have a great deal of promise.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

The bill includes authorization of \$467.6 million for R.D.T. & E. for the various defense agencies. This is \$27.4 million below the amount approved by the Congress last year. Over half of the amount authorized, \$262.9 million, is to support the Advanced Research Projects Agency—ARPA. The biggest program assigned to ARPA is Project Defender, which has the objective of advancing science and technology in the fields of ballistic missile defense and penetration aids. The next largest defense agency is the Defense Atomic Support Agency. Funds totaling \$93.2 million are authorized to support three programs: Nuclear weapons effects research, nuclear weapons effects tests, and nuclear weapons development.

EMERGENCY FUND

The bill also includes authorization of \$125 million for the R. & D. emergency fund. Since the fiscal year 1951 supplemental appropriation for Korea, Congress has provided the Secretary of Defense with the R.D.T. & E. emergency fund, augmented by the authority to transfer other appropriated funds within certain limitations for the purpose of facilitating selected military research and development programs. The amount authorized this year is the same as that appropriated for the past 2 years.

In summary, the bill S. 2950 reflects an increase of \$373.2 million over the amount requested for research, development, test, and evaluation. These funds will support those additional requirements identified subsequent to the budget submission and will support, at the proper level, those programs already in the budget which, in the committee's

opinion, were reduced too severely by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that a survey recently conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—M.I.T.—revealed that the cost of doing research increases at a rate of approximately 8 percent each year. The research and development portion of this bill reflects an increase of that magnitude over last year. For this increase in funds, we are buying the same level of effort as in previous years.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I hope this afternoon, as the gentleman from Louisiana urged, that the military procurement bill for fiscal year 1967 will be approved by the House by unanimous vote.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in support of the bill, S. 2950.

Mr. Chairman, this is my fourth year as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. However, this year I have experienced for the first time participation in a detailed review of the research and development budget at the subcommittee level so outstandingly chaired by my friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. This participation has been most informative and reassuring under the leadership of our great chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] who is so highly respected by not only the members of the committee but also by the entire House membership who just a few minutes ago exhibited the great esteem in which they hold the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina by giving him the longest standing ovation that I have seen given any Member on the floor of the House during congressional deliberations.

I feel that the contributions that our great chairman has made to the defense posture of this country have earned him the acclaim which the Members of the House have so generously given to him the emphasis on improving our limited war capability initiated by our late President Kennedy, has produced many of the weapon systems and equipment now in the hands of the troops and in use in Vietnam.

The research and development budget for this year was stated to have been influenced to a greater measure than in previous years by two major considerations. The first is the research and development to support our military effort in southeast Asia, and the second is to maintain the deterrent posture against all-out war. The problem of accelerating promising limited war research and development effort for early application in Vietnam was attacked last August on a project basis called "Priority Research and Development Objectives for Vietnam Operations Support—Project Provost."

A comprehensive Department of Defense review identified over 150 different developmental efforts on which accelerated effort could make new and needed

materiel operationally available in Vietnam. The most promising of those were initiated immediately utilizing fiscal year 1966 emergency funds, with follow-on effort being funded in the supplemental fiscal year 1966 budget and in the current fiscal year 1967 budget. Virtually the entire field of counterinsurgency and limited conventional warfare weaponry and equipment is involved in Provost. To name a few of these, a hand-held, one-shot, expendable flame projector was developed; a variety of projects aimed at enemy ambush detection; lightweight body and helicopter armor; grenade launchers; and, a jungle canopy to enhance airmobile operations in the dense foliage of southeast Asia. The jungle canopy consists of two steel nets, 20 by 200 feet, laid crosswise with an 18-foot hexagonal platform placed where the nets cross. Two helicopters can lay the three components in approximately 8 minutes. The steel nets will then support light helicopters for landing. Troops can then be lowered to the jungle floor within 60 seconds. Casualties can be evacuated in litters by hauling them up to the platform with a power-driven winch. The nets and the platform can also be used as a resupply base. The canopy also can be retrieved and reused on subsequent missions.

A number of other items are currently undergoing accelerated development in order to reach Vietnam during the coming fiscal year. For improvement in ground combat capability, work is proceeding on helicopter-transportable armored combat and logistics vehicles that will be mobile in difficult rice-paddy terrain, and a smoke generator for screening troops entering a landing zone. In the air warfare area, there are a number of weapons improvements in such items as napalm, jungle-penetrating bomblets, and airburst fuses. The OV-10 counterinsurgency aircraft also is being accelerated into production to meet expressed Marine Corps and Air Force requirements for use in Vietnam. These projects and a variety of other projects, many of which are classified, have given us, and will continue to give us a greater capability of fighting the type of warfare carried on in the Vietnam environment with which the Vietcong and North Vietnamese just cannot cope.

Many of these projects have been supported by the Limited War Laboratory at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. Most of the Laboratory's work consists of quick reaction development of limited war items. In fact, the Laboratory has developed and delivered items for field deployment within 6 months after receiving a requirement and rarely does a development project extend beyond 18 months. In the last 2 years, the Limited War Laboratory has shipped items from 22 different projects to Vietnam. Presently, there are 85 projects underway at the Laboratory, one of the most important of which is an acoustic detector which indicates to a helicopter pilot when he is being fired upon from the ground, from what direction, and what type of fire. On the basis of my visit to Vietnam last year, I can assure you this

device will be most welcomed by the helicopter pilots flying in Vietnam.

Turning to the Navy, I would like to describe some of the pioneering work being done in two areas which are of special interest to me and are of vital concern to the defense of the Nation. One, the deep submergence program supported in this bill at a level of \$30.1 million. It is difficult to imagine a more promising area of research and development. Its overall objective is the mastery of the major part of the volume of the sea. Specific objectives are four in number. It is proposed to develop a capability to effect submarine rescues at depths down to the crush depth of our submarines. The Navy will develop and build six submersible rescue vehicles which can travel down to the disabled submarine; there they will extract the personnel in small groups and deliver them to another submarine for their safe return to the surface. This bill provides only for the research and development costs of this work; the procurement of the vehicles will, of course, be funded under the ship construction appropriation. I am sure I need not emphasize to this body the importance of the submarine rescue mission after the unfortunate experience of the *Thresher*.

For the second portion of the program, it is proposed to develop equipment and techniques for the search of the ocean floor, the identification of the small objects there, and the recovery of these objects from depths as great as 20,000 feet.

The third portion of the program provides a current capability for the salvage of large objects—up to 1,000 tons—from depths of 600 feet, and a long-range program to accommodate depths of 2,000 feet.

The "Sea Lab" is the fourth part of the program; it contains the "Man in the Sea" project that has received so much publicity and captured the imagination of the world. During Sea Lab I in Bermuda in 1964, four men stayed on the floor of the ocean at a depth of 193 feet for 11 days. In August, September, and October of 1965, Sea Lab II at La Jolla, Calif., was undertaken. A team of 28 men lived and worked at a depth of 205 feet for a total of 43 days. These experiments were spectacularly successful in demonstrating man's capacity to live and work at the bottom of the sea. In 1967, Sea Lab III will be conducted at San Clemente Island off the coast of southern California at a depth of 450 feet.

These initial efforts are indicative of the scope of this dynamic program which certainly requires the timeliness and level of support included in this bill.

Another Navy research and development program to which I attach particular importance is the development of the Condor missile. This weapon will be carried and launched by Navy carrier-based attack aircraft, and used to destroy hard targets from a stand-off distance of at least 50 miles. The major advantage of Condor over existing air-to-ground weapons will be in the improved safety of the launching pilot, as he will remain outside the effective range of defensive gunfire and short-range missiles in the vicinity of the target.

Another feature of Condor will be the extreme accuracy which is achieved with its self-contained guidance system, giving an average miss distance of only a few feet on most targets. This bill contains \$45.5 million for development of Condor in fiscal year 1967, and this amount will permit a development program leading to operational availability of this missile in the shortest practicable time. Our pilots in Vietnam could use a weapon like Condor to good advantage right now, and the committee would like to see its development carried out with all possible dispatch.

Mr. Chairman, I have touched upon only a few of the many very important projects supported in the research and development portion of this bill. In the time allotted me, I could not do justice to the balance of the programs; however, many of these have been described by my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. Again I say, this bill has my full support and I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to speak of my very high admiration for the gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS. Regrettably negative things have been printed today about him and about his health. No one can be blamed for illness; and in my long association with him, I have never seen any other defect in him whatsoever. His enthusiasm for strong national defense is irritating to some people, but our country is more secure and the cause of liberty is more secure throughout the world because of this man's fine dedication to the national defense of our country.

I pay sincere tribute to him at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us has been explained in detail and all of the important elements have been, to my mind, adequately dealt with by previous speakers.

I do, however, wish to have the RECORD clearly show my own strong personal support for two particular elements of the program. The first of these is the advanced manned strategic aircraft for which we added \$11.8 million to the bill.

I do not need to tell the House of the long history of support for this kind of advanced aircraft in the Armed Services Committee. It goes back literally years. We have never given up on this extremely important offensive and defensive system and we do not intend to give up. We are right—we know we are right—and we are going to continue to fight.

Another part of the program which I want to lend my personal support to is the Nike-X antiballistic missile defense system. In this instance the House added \$153.5 million to the procurement portion of the bill and \$14.4 million to the research and development part of the bill. This is a grand total of \$167.9 million, an identical sum added by the Senate committee also. The Armed

Services Committee of the House, therefore, finds itself in complete agreement with the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate itself with respect to this defensive system.

I urge that the House follow the lead of its committee in these two instances and I say this with the deepest conviction.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the words of praise which have been heaped upon our illustrious chairman by the Members of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2950.

Our national policies require the Air Force to have the capability to respond to any military threat which may confront us, from counterinsurgency actions to general nuclear war. It is easy to define at the time of need, the characteristics of the weapon systems required to meet the particular threat. The ability to produce such weapon systems, however, depends upon the existence of a foundation of scientific and engineering knowledge on which the weapon systems can be built. The difficult thing to do is to specify exactly what basic and applied research should be pursued 2, 5, or 10 years in advance, in order to provide this foundation.

The difficulty in defining explicitly the high payoff research areas in advance and the importance of the available technology base make the support of a broad, aggressive technological effort mandatory. Such a technological effort involves the long-range basic research sponsored in colleges and universities as well as the exploratory and advanced development programs supported in our Government laboratories and industrial complexes. It is well to keep in mind that this effort not only provides the technology and experienced personnel which will permit us to fulfill our military commitments but also enhances our civilian technological base as well.

There are many examples of the importance of our technology programs to both strategic systems and tactical systems. I would like to mention only a few to remind you of the close coupling between in-being system capabilities and the long-range technological base.

One outstanding example is the field of inertial guidance and navigation. The original foundation for this industry was laid by Air Force exploratory development work. The Apollo guidance and Titan guidance systems, for example, can be traced directly to a 1948 Air Force program. As the results of the early work were disseminated by the Air Force, other exploratory development programs in bearings, components, and concepts led directly to the Minuteman guidance system. Another exploratory development program provided the prototype of the inertial navigation system now in our F-4 aircraft in Vietnam and being installed in the F-111. Similarly, Air Force exploratory development work in star trackers, combined with the inertial

developments, provided the celestial-inertial systems which are vital to our latest reconnaissance aircraft. This Air Force exploratory development laid the original foundation for and has continued to stimulate progress for a multibillion-dollar industry which employs many thousands.

The work on concepts of flight control and aircraft stabilization in the Air Force exploratory programs has made possible the self-adaptive flight control systems which provide the handling qualities and safety of flight so vital for high performance aircraft. The F-111 family of aircraft fully utilizes this self-adaptive technique. Another technique which is widely used in the new generation of operational aircraft is terrain following. The concept was originated and proven feasible as an exploratory development. The technique enables our latest high performance aircraft to fly automatically at high speeds at altitudes below the detection capabilities of surface-to-air missile defense systems thereby insuring their survival.

The high resolution side-looking radar systems now employed in the RF-4C reconnaissance aircraft are also a direct outgrowth of the exploratory development program of the Air Force. These systems have resolutions of about 50 feet, independent of range and altitude and permit long-range reconnaissance.

Work on "molecular electronics" started by the Air Force and industry in 1958 amid much skepticism, has been immensely successful. The initial investments of approximately \$8 million in 1959-60 have sparked industry investments, estimated in excess of \$200 million, to exploit this revolutionary technology. The invention of the vacuum tube really started what we now think of as the electronics industry; the invention of the transistor in 1948 revolutionized this industry; but a third and probably most profound revolution is being caused by the advent of molecular electronics. These circuits, which are entirely contained in a single piece of material, provide orders of magnitude decreases in size and weight; and a manifold increase in reliability over those of conventional construction.

The first large scale application of this technology was to the Minuteman II guidance package. This provided a greater than 50 percent weight reduction while at the same time increasing the functional capability of the computer by 50 percent and the reliability by a factor estimated at between 2 and 5. This was in the early days of molecular electronics, and even more exciting possibilities exist today.

Development technology applicable to the latest Minuteman missile has provided significant improvement. These improvements can be attributed directly to the timely incorporation of the results of latest technologies in nozzle design, thrust vector control—also incorporated into Polaris—lighter case, and an improved propellant.

The jet engine industry supported by the Air Force is entering what appears to be a period of great expansion and technological advance. Five new engines are

in the early stages of development; a turbofan for the C-5A heavy logistics aircraft; a turbojet and cruise engine for vertical takeoff aircraft; a new generation engine for a possible new strategic bomber; and finally, the largest engine ever built, to power the supersonic transport.

The Air Force technological base in bioastronautics and life support has been one of the primary reasons for our accomplishments in the manned space flight program. Here, it is a matter of record that Air Force knowledge and experience has been directly applied to the design and operation of pressure cabins and pressure garments; to oxygen delivery systems; and to escape systems and equipment which are critical to astronaut safety. Today, this area of activity is mutually supporting to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Air Force and the technical programs of both are coordinated to the point where program integration is a way of life.

My final examples are ones which further exemplify the breadth of our technology program. Environmental research on the physics of clouds has previously led to methods of "contrail suppression" which make aircraft condensation trails invisible to an observer. More recently, successful methods of dissipating fog which forms at below freezing temperatures have been developed. This program is being continued in an attempt to understand the physics of the more common, warm fog formation and to develop methods of warm fog dissipation. Such methods would have obvious military and civilian application.

In conclusion then I feel we must continually insure that the military technological programs have a balanced share of the resources available to the military establishments. I am particularly pleased to note that the Air Force budget authorization for fiscal year 1967 reflects this kind of balance. The pressure and emphasis on systems in-being or near-term developments occasioned by the Vietnamese conflict must not cause us to lose sight of the importance of the military technological program. As I have pointed out, the Air Force technology program is contributing in a major way to our efforts in Vietnam. Equally important, it will give us the required capability and flexibility to develop and produce the weapon systems necessary for our national posture 10 to 20 years in the future.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I urge your adoption of S. 2950 and the committee amendments.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I very seldom ask for time to address my colleagues in the House, but there have been a few times when I felt that a subject was of such vast importance, that I have overcome my reluctance and asked for time to do so. This is one of those times.

An act which cries out for justice has been perpetrated against one of my

colleagues whom I respect and admire, whom I consider a friend and trusted Member of this House. He may have faults, but it is not for me to judge. All I know is that he is a friend, and was a friend to me when I really needed friends during my first days as a Member of this House. I speak of my friend and colleague, the very distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the able, efficient and courageous chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman, I can only say he is a friend, and that shall suffice, but now I speak for those from my district who serve in the armed services of the United States. Those valiant men who endure the filth, the stench of war without complaint, those men who leave their dear ones to fight for us, for our country, for democracy, for peace in the world. Those men who shed their blood and give their very lives, so that we might meet here today, so that your children and mine might go to school, so that we might attend the church of our choice, yes and so that newspaper people might write their stories, and columnists express their views. I speak for them, and I say here as an echo of their voices. MENDEL RIVERS is the best friend they ever had. I echo their voices when I say MENDEL RIVERS understands their problems. MENDEL RIVERS, thank God, sees them as people, as Americans, as the patriots they really are. For the sacrifices they and their families make for us can never be repaid with money. He understands this, so he treats them with compassion, with understanding. He gives them his hand, and his heart. He really is a friend to the servicemen of our country, and I know that those who serve from my district would never forgive me, if I did not stand up and speak their feelings about L. MENDEL RIVERS, their friend and my friend, a dedicated, hard working, courageous Member of this House, and great leader of the Committee on Armed Services.

It is very opportune that today, the 191st anniversary of the Army of the United States, the 189th anniversary of our flag, I should speak for those who have fought for that flag, who are fighting now, in tribute to a man who is their friend, who serves them with humility and who will stand to fight for them, and will not retreat, come what may. This is MENDEL RIVERS—this is the serviceman's friend, this is the dedicated American, this is the courageous leader and again, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of all who serve their country from my district, I say, thank God for MENDEL RIVERS, and in their behalf I thank him and his committee for this legislation and I shall support it 100 percent.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman and Members, we are here today to approve a \$17.858 billion American defense procurement bill for fiscal year 1967.

Our great chairman from South Carolina is today pioneering once again a very modest step and inroad on Execu-

tive civilian-military authority which has been assumed without much remonstrance from the Congress over the past many years.

As I read the amendments made by our committee, after diligent consideration and cogitation, we have really very modestly affected the proposed bill.

There is \$19.9 million for a much needed light observation helicopter.

There is \$20 million for a much needed airborne TV system over in Saigon, which was pioneered by my colleague from Michigan.

There is \$55 million for a new IMI, to make the SR-71, developed by the CIA, a truly useful instrument of defense policy.

There is \$51.2 million for the CX-2, in a critical new capability to accelerate our air medical evacuation capability. I might point out in this respect that we are still returning our men stateside to their homes, when they are injured in old Convairs and dilapidated under-capability aircraft.

There is \$167.9 million for the Nike X, a much needed anti-ICBM capability.

There is \$258.3 million for two nuclear DLGN's, one of which was authorized last year at \$130.5 million.

There is \$62.8 million for Nike X research.

There is \$142.7 million for Poseidon research, to make the Polaris capability what it was intended to be.

And there is \$167.7 million for the MOL, AMSA, and the F-111-A and V/STOL.

That is a total of about \$815 million new authorization.

The amounts of money the committee recommends as additions to the bill comprise but 5 percent of the total legislation, but the areas in which the committee urges such emphasis and concentration I believe are of critical importance.

It is regrettable, I believe, that there is not more rapport between the very able Members and leadership and staff of our committee and the Department of Defense.

I believe the committee report, filed with the bill, is one of the monumental reports that has been filed during my service in the past 4 years in the Congress. I certainly commend it to every Member, to read diligently.

The fact that the committee must go to the mat, so to speak, to affect the budget under the control of the committee, allegedly after critical scrutinizing, study and review, a mere 5 percent, indicates the degree of power which has been lost by this Congress to affect this very critical instrument of American policy and our very existence.

I want to commend the chairman for the very able leadership which he has given to our committee over the last 2 years. We need you in the future, and our committee is 100 percent behind your able leadership.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he requires to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly honored today to join with my

dear friend, the outstanding leader of the House Committee on Armed Services, and my most able and distinguished friend, Mr. BATES, the ranking minority member of the committee, and a tower of strength indeed to all of us, and the able and distinguished gentleman, my valued friend and colleague, Mr. ARENDS, and my distinguished and dear friends, Mr. HÉBERT and Mr. PRICE, and all of the distinguished members and others who have spoken here so impressively and well in support of this vital defense procurement bill.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments for this bill are irrefutable, as has been so well demonstrated by the brilliant speech that has been made by our very distinguished chairman. These arguments have been brilliantly presented to the House.

Therefore, I will not indulge in repetition and speak at length about the ramifications of this very comprehensive and important measure. To do so, particularly after the fine, informative, and forceful talks we have heard, would be much like carrying coals to Newcastle, and I shall not essay that difficult, but needless task.

However, I would like to emphasize to the House the amount of hard, grueling work that has gone into this bill, and thank our most esteemed Committee on Armed Services, and each and every one of its members, who in respect to this bill, as well as in all of our deliberations and decisions on other very important measures to strengthen and perfect the national defense and the striking power of this country, has shown such sound judgment, such good commonsense, such deep knowledge and awareness of the complex problems we face, and such commendable, praiseworthy loyalty, and solidarity in upholding and sustaining the masterful, dedicated leadership of the great American who heads our committee, the beloved, respected, learned, and patriotic gentleman, our dear friend and leader, Chairman MENDEL RIVERS.

This session, under the leadership of MENDEL RIVERS, the committee has faced unprecedented problems, sometimes highlighted by burning controversy with the executive department. Unfortunate and unhappy as this has been for all of us, our chairman has pressed forward with the heavy committee program, securing very favorable results and making a most significant contribution to the security and the defense of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am gratified indeed that our great committee is united, as it is, and as it has demonstrated itself to be, independent in its deliberations, unfettered in shaping its policies and carrying out the mandate imposed upon the committee and the Congress by the Constitution of the United States. And I may add that I am proud of the cohesive front we have formed in support of our fine, knowledgeable leadership to come to grips with every aspect and every facet of the difficult problems and responsibilities that reside with us in these very difficult and trying days when the values of our free way of life are being tested in so many areas and always to extend our wholehearted cooperation to

all those sharing our responsibility for defending this country.

Mr. Chairman, let us adopt this bill. I know we will do it without undue delay. I hope we will do it unanimously. It will demonstrate unmistakably to the American people, to the free world, and to all those who threaten us and seek our destruction that we shall preserve our heritage and our freedoms at all costs.

Mr. Chairman, let all of us stand with confidence, with faith, and with strength behind our great chairman and in unswerving support of the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States as set forth in the Constitution, for a strong, adequate, and powerful defense, a striking force which will bring us, we hope and we pray, the peace that all of us so fervently desire and that the world so earnestly seeks and needs, through firmness, resolution, and strength, and with fairness and justice, with compassion and amity, toward all nations and all peoples. As we pass this bill, let us again pledge ourselves anew to these cherished ends.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON].

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in support of this legislation, S. 2950.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of the impact on our defense and in dollars authorized, this is truly a gigantic bill, or as we would say in California, a colossal bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the product of diligent effort on the part of the members of our Committee on Armed Services and particularly on the part of our able chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Mr. Chairman, the future of our Nation is far more secure because of the strong and faithful, dedicated leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS. In my book he is one of the great men of our time, and I deem it a privilege to serve with him and to work with him for a stronger and more secure America.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from South Carolina will continue to give of himself unstintingly, because no man arrives at work earlier in the morning and no man works harder than MENDEL RIVERS of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, we are involved here today in discussion of research and development funds for deep submergence programs. The amount of money involved is \$8.6 million and is but a fraction of the amount that our Government is spending this year to explore outer space. It is time to wake up. It is time we realized that we are in a race to control inner space, that great mass of ocean water that covers 75 percent of this globe on which we live.

Our future survival may well be more dependent on our leadership in the inner space race, than our ability to orbit or

explore the voids of space. R and D money for deep submergence programs is an investment in our future. Its dividends will be at least double. Our national security is paramount. We know that other nations have embarked on vast programs to conquer the depths. Navy officials have freely admitted that whichever nation can control the seas can control the world. Militarily, the need is absolute.

Commercially, deep submergence programs offer the prospect of vast supplies of minerals, food, and chemicals contained in prodigious volume in the seas. Sophisticated vehicles and vast knowledge will be needed to reap these treasures laid up by centuries of nature's work. Perhaps no investment made by the Government today offers more opportunity for pyramiding returns than an adequate deep submergence research program.

A recent, dramatic example of the value of our deep submergence capability was the recovery of one of our H-bombs 5 miles off the coast of Spain, near Palomares. I shudder to think what would have been the result had another nation recovered this bomb. If we had not been able to search, find, and retrieve the bomb, the international implications would have plagued us for years. The Communists would have made strident and continued claims of recklessness against us, even though its loss was the result of an accident that was part of the price of the around-the-clock vigilance necessary in today's tumultuous global situation.

The tragedy of the submarine *Thresher* first focused attention on the deep submergence program. After that example, the Deep Submergence Systems Review Group recommended a program for development of undersea vehicles capable of extensive search of the sea bottom, recovery of heavy objects and extension of the limitations on manned diving techniques.

This program has not been received enthusiastically in the Department of Defense. It was crimped at its inception. Today it faces further DOD-directed cutbacks, at a time when the Nation can ill afford to slight this vital field. Despite the fact that the Secretary of the Navy has given the program high priority, the Secretary of Defense has asked that research and development be slowed, that fewer vehicles be developed, that their range and function be curtailed, and their development time extended over a longer period.

We all realize that there is a war on. We all also realize that there may be future military engagements. This Nation has termed itself the most powerful on earth. Yet, when our atomic submarine *Thresher* went down, we required weeks to locate the hull, and finally had to press into service the European-developed bathyscaphe *Trieste* to find the hull. The need for deep-ocean salvage technology has been illustrated repeatedly, but apparently DOD has lost its import in its maze of computerized statistics.

The amount we are concerned with here today is less than a single day's cost

of the war in Vietnam. Yet we are dealing with a program that is absolutely vital to our military future. Plain economics would dictate that if economies are to be practiced, they should be applied to programs of much lower priority than our capability to operate effectively underseas.

This is not a program of guesswork. We have already accomplished much. Witness the work done by *Alvin*, the two-man submersible built by the Office of Naval Research for the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. *Alvin* made 145 dives in the period between January 17 when the bomber and tanker collided and March 15 when it sighted the bomb in 2,532 feet of water. *Alvin* could lift only 20 pounds with its mechanical appendages. The bomb weighed 8 tons. The bomb dislodged itself, rolled down to 2,800 feet when the research ship *Mizar* attempted to lift it by a cable. An unmanned submersible, *Curv*, was flown in from California, and despite the difficulty of remote control from the surface, actually working "blind" Navy personnel were able to secure grapnels to the bomb parachute. The U.S.S. *Petrel* pulled the bomb and the *Curv* to the surface—80 days after the retrieval operations had begun.

The lessons learned were invaluable. Sediment obscured visibility, sonar and other electronic gear revealed shortcomings. The human eye proved to be most effective. But, the most important lesson of all was the revelation that we have a long way to go before we can provide undersea rescue and recovery capability which our growing undersea Navy needs.

The Congress has a responsibility to those brave men who are entering our undersea service. We have a responsibility to foresee and provide adequate funds for research and development of the means of locating and recovering vehicles or objects from deep water.

I feel deeply that it would be a mistake to allow pinchpenny preparedness to cripple undersea research. This is a high-priority program we are dealing with, and as such should have high-priority financing. We in the Congress have the duty to study and fund the programs necessary for the common defense. Investment in future defense systems is more important than so-called cost effectiveness when the military security of the Nation is at stake. I strongly recommend that the House Armed Services Committee recommendation for an increase of the \$8.6 million in the proposed budget for undersea deep submergence research and development be fully authorized for fiscal 1967.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, there can be no question that adequate funds must be provided for the national defense. It would be folly to shortchange the security of our country. But the converse is equally true: It would be wasteful of our limited resources and harmful to other national efforts if we were to provide more than is required.

The Department of Defense recommended a figure which it believed was adequate. I might add that it was a substantial figure—\$16.9 billion. But the Committee on Armed Services has boosted this figure by another \$931.1 million.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this increase is unnecessary and unwise. One of the programs that would be funded, for example, is the preproduction of an anti-ballistic-missile system. This program would inevitably lead to escalating costs and a further spur to the race between offensive and defensive weapons systems. It raises anew the question of a massive civil defense program of fallout shelters.

I am also seriously disturbed by the fact that we can quickly add nearly a billion dollars to the defense bill while we are having difficulty in providing urgently needed funds for education efforts, health programs, and the war against poverty. If another billion dollars is to be spent I believe it could be put to wiser and more productive use in one or more of these areas.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this bill because I support a strong national defense. But I am unalterably opposed to the additional funds added by the committee. I hope they will be removed by the other body. I hope that this inflated bill will be appropriately reduced. If these additional funds are not eliminated, however, I will reserve the right to express my opposition to what I believe is an uncalled-for increase in the defense budget by voting against the final bill reported by a conference committee.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the procurement bill which our committee has reported to this House unanimously. While I am somewhat concerned about the fact that our bill exceeds the recommendations of the Defense Department by a fairly sizable figure, I believe that at a time when our military forces are heavily engaged in Vietnam it is probably safer and wiser for us in military matters to err on the side of generosity rather than on the side of inadequacy. Actually this bill represents only about a 5 percent increase over the budget estimates. And I believe that we can afford to make that change rather than run the risk of seriously degrading our ability to defend ourselves in Vietnam or in other areas of the world against active Communist aggression.

Apart from the overall size of authorization recommended by the committee, Mr. Chairman, there are one or two other points I would like to comment on. First is the point about the proper authority of the Congress in making the military policy of our country. I have on many occasions spoken out on the floor of this House in praise of the Secretary of Defense. He has done an outstanding job and I believe we are all indebted to him for his courage and his leadership. But no man is infallible. Surely the basic issues of the defense of this country must be made by this Congress, the elected representatives of the people, not just by the Secretary of Defense alone. We

have the ultimate constitutional authority, and we would be remiss in our duty if we did not exercise that authority in the legislation we pass.

Second, I want to affirm my own support for the committee's decision to include an additional \$12 million for a stepped-up program leading toward the development of a follow-on bomber, the so-called AMSA. I have in the past, as Members will recall, opposed additional funds for the B-70 and for the AMSA program. This year I believe the situation is different for two reasons:

First, because our experience with the B-52's in Vietnam has shown us that the so-called strategic, heavy-load-bearing bomber is still of great value in a nonnuclear conventional war. The B-58 cannot do the vital job the B-52 is doing in Vietnam, because it has no conventional capacity. The FB-111 cannot really do this conventional job either since conventional ordnance must largely be carried onboard on the wings of the FB-111. We now can see that we do need a new follow-on bomber to the B-52, and we ought to get moving in that direction rapidly.

Second, the new Secretary of the Air Force, Secretary Brown, the former Director of Research and Development for the Department of Defense, now supports the addition of these \$12 million. Secretary Brown who previously felt that Air Force plans for a follow-on bomber had not progressed far enough to warrant the use of extra funds, now supports the additional funds, and feels they can be put to valuable use.

The third point I want to comment on is the recommendation for an increase in the Navy's nuclear fleet. After hearing the testimony of Admiral Rickover, the father of our nuclear Navy, I am convinced we must move swiftly toward the creation of a real nuclear task force in the Navy. We will soon have two nuclear carriers in the Navy. It is important that we also have an adequate number of nuclear escorts to accompany these nuclear carriers. I do not feel there can be any longer any doubt on this score and I am glad that our committee is moving to resolve that issue in favor of a greater nuclear fleet in the provisions of this bill.

Fourth, Mr. Chairman, I believe our decision to support increased development of an antiballistic missile is a wise one. I realize the arguments against all-out deployment of an ABM system to defend ourselves against the Soviet Union. The cost of such a system would indeed be enormous, and it could not be successful without the development, along with it, of a nationwide system of fallout shelters. Nevertheless, I do believe that we would be making a mistake not to get started now on the smaller ABM deployment required to protect ourselves against a possible Red Chinese nuclear threat. This is what the committee's action would do, and I fully support the recommendation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I support enthusiastically the pay raise for the armed services included in this bill. One thing is certainly clear, and that is that our armed services deserve to receive pay

at least comparable to that received by their civilian counterparts in government. Last year we passed a bill to achieve that comparability and to close that gap. It would be most unfortunate to adopt a new civilian pay bill this year that would give the civilian employees of government a further increase without granting our men in uniform an equal boost. This is what our bill does. It maintains that comparability.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close by adding my sincere tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. He has been a great chairman and has done a remarkable job. He has been most patient and considerate of the views of all the members of the committee. And I am deeply grateful to him for the opportunity of representing the full committee as chairman of a special subcommittee which recently visited the fighting fronts in Vietnam. This bill today is a tribute to the tireless hard work and persistence of MENDEL RIVERS. We can be proud of his achievement here in this House today. And I know from my own personal experience that the men and women in the uniforms of the United States, serving from Berlin to Vietnam, will salute MENDEL RIVERS and thank him for what this bill will do in days to come to bolster the defense of our great country.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill in its entirety. It is a good bill, and I can attest the committee on which I am privileged to serve, the Committee on Armed Services, has given every bit of the intelligence, knowledge, experience and conscientiousness we possess into the bill. Our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, particularly has done his usual excellent job. And that may be a comment within a comment, Mr. Chairman, for the gentleman from South Carolina does his job always with such remarkable excellence that we come to accept the remarkable as "usual" for him.

This much may be interpreted as selfish interest on my part: That this bill, or any military bill, has a profound effect on the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. We have a great Army post, Fort Lewis. We have a fine and expanding Air Force Base, McChord. We have a naval shipyard of unsurpassed excellence at Bremerton. We have the Pacific Polaris facility, the Keyport Naval Torpedo Station, two fine military hospitals. Through the years, in war and in peace, this district has made a tremendous contribution to the defense of our country.

We have provided, in this bill, Mr. Chairman, for the continuing defense of our country, including my district's share in that demanding and rewarding job. We have done so with full awareness of the immense responsibility involved, and we have done so with a careful eye also on the budget. There is no fat here.

And we have done more, Mr. Chairman. We have looked ahead, too, into the needs that will be upon us soon. We have taken hold of the future, so to speak. I consider it a particular responsibility to serve on the subcom-

mittee whose specific job it is to handle matters of research, development, test, and evaluation. This is the area of tying the past and the present to the projected needs of the future, and of meeting the needs of the future.

For this, we have provided \$7,278,559,000. It is not too much to invest in defense research and development specifically. I say specifically, for this entire bill is geared to both present and future.

I am particularly pleased that we have earmarked \$431,400,000 for preproduction activities related to development of the Nike X anti-ballistic-missile system. It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Defense will not obstruct the will of the committee and, also my hope, the will of the Congress. I hope that this money will be used as we have committed it to be used, in the development of a system which I feel is necessary.

Also notable in the area of procurement for the future is the inclusion of two nuclear-powered frigates. We provided for one such vessel last year, Mr. Chairman, but the Department of Defense decided to abort the will of the Congress and did not proceed as directed. This I regard as a grievous error, not only in the sense of this additional evidence of the Department's tendency to ignore the Congress, but in the sense of failing to provide adequately for this phase of defense.

During my recent trip to Vietnam as a member of our committee's special Subcommittee on Vietnam, I saw personally the work being done by our nuclear carrier. And I saw clearly why it is possible for this great warship to do more than conventionally powered ships. Everyone knows of the great staying power possible with nuclear propulsion, which permits a vessel to stay at sea for almost incredible periods of time without refueling. Less is said, however, about the greater payload in arms and supplies possible with a nuclear power plant, whose fuel requires so much less space that a markedly higher proportion of the vessel's capacity may be devoted to the arts of war instead of the business of getting to and from the scene of action.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, basing its provisions on past and present experience, is carefully designed to give us an unbeatable combination of weaponry for the present and for the future.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill should be passed unanimously by the House.

The Committee on Armed Services has reported a bill which meets our constitutional responsibility as Members of Congress, and will assuredly contribute in a significant way to the strength of our defenses and the security of the Nation. Our hopes for an enduring peace in future years, based on strength and military readiness, will also assuredly benefit.

I share the committee's conclusions that no further delay should be permitted in steps to provide a nuclear task force for the Navy, and that experience in the Pacific strongly supports the wisdom of this course.

I also agree that we need to expedite our efforts to provide effective, jet air-

craft for medical evacuation, and to speed our efforts to secure a new manned bomber to replace the B-52.

Finally, I wholeheartedly endorse the committee's firm assertion of congressional responsibility and determination to fulfill that responsibility in the defense field.

The action recommended on military pay, nuclear propulsion for the Navy, and the manned bomber is a proper exercise of that responsibility, and the Nation will surely benefit in the years ahead.

I hope and trust every Member of this body will share the committee's well-considered conclusions, and vote for the bill.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2950 which will authorize appropriations of nearly \$18 billion for military procurement and research, development and testing during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966.

This Nation's first President, George Washington, handed down wise counsel which is as applicable today as it was when he declared in his first address to both Houses of Congress:

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

Today American military men are involved in a difficult war in far-off Vietnam. We must not deny them the necessary equipment to meet their adversaries. However, the Congress also has a responsibility for the future security of this Nation.

I commend the Committee on Armed Services and the subcommittees which have pursued vigorously and thoroughly the many aspects of our Nation's defense posture.

The committee has thrown necessary light upon the need for speeding up the planning and development of the advanced manned strategic aircraft. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have spoken out before the Armed Services Committee in support of AMSA.

The B-52 bomber is proving its versatility as a nonnuclear bomber in Vietnam today. However, we know that increased usage of this strategic jet aircraft will also accentuate the need for a follow-on manned weapons system in the mid-1970's.

The Secretary of the Air Force in testimony before the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has emphasized the importance of working harder on the AMSA program:

ADVANCED MANNED STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. SIKES. To turn briefly to the AMSA, what is the real justification for speeding up the AMSA program beyond the level which is provided in this budget?

Secretary BROWN. The fundamental reason for working harder on AMSA, Mr. Chairman, is that it is a prime candidate—I think it is not only one candidate, but a prime candidate, for a number of missions which the B-52 G and H will be able to do until the mid-seventies. The B-52 G and H should last, with structural changes which are programmed and funded, until about 1975.

At that point General McConnell and I agree, and it is the Air Force position, that a replacement should be made available for the B-52 G and H. This replacement will have a variety of functions. The most

important one is to supplement the missile force in providing a long-range, cost-effective bomber, with air breathing delivery in the assured destruction role against the Soviet Union.

The B-52's are being used in a nonnuclear role, outside of the Soviet Union and China, very effectively.

We have studies in progress of what the alternatives are to fill this role. One can mention a number of other possibilities.

One can try to keep the G's and H's beyond 1975 by making still further structural modifications. One can convert the C-5 into a nonnuclear bomber. It is not particularly useful as a nuclear bomber.

One can go to a bigger version of the FB-111. The FB-111 which is programed to replace the B-52C's through the F's does not have the range or payload to replace the G's and H's but you might try stretching it further. All of these are alternatives and we are presently looking at them.

The AMSA combines the B-52 range and payload with the FB-111 speed and maneuverability, so in a sense is the best.

However, it is also the most expensive. Whether it is the best choice, therefore, depends on the details of how you are going to use it.

The AMSA, if we do build it, and no decision has been made by the Secretary of Defense either to approve production or to approve full-scale development, but if we build it will take on the order of 10 years to get it into the inventory in any substantial numbers.

Mr. SIKES. Could this be a dangerous delay?

Secretary BROWN. It is a risk. It is one we can accept for another year but it is a risk.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently supported a defense policy which provides for a balanced mixture of missiles and manned aircraft. The Secretary of Defense may not be able to see a "clear need for a new strategic bomber to replace the B-52 G-H's," but our military experts and the Secretary of the Air Force have spoken out before the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee for accelerated development of a follow-on for the B-52.

I support the committee's action in recommending the addition of \$11.8 million over and above the \$11 million requested in the budget for avionics to enable the Air Force to start contract definition on AMSA in fiscal 1967.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for S. 2950 because I believe a strong Military Establishment is absolutely essential in today's world of conflicting ideologies and threatening military policies for the security of our country. I wish I could do so without reservations but unfortunately based upon my observations and understanding of the many hours of hearings and the prodigious quantity of other materials available to a member of the Armed Services Committee, I believe the committee's recommendations are without proper foundation and create more problems than they seek to solve.

For the record, I do not believe that a need for additional money for the AMSA has been demonstrated. I do not believe that an antimissile missile system is the best way in which we can utilize our resources for the preservation of lives in the event of a nuclear attack. I do not believe that enemy capabilities

warrant a commitment at this time to an IMI program. I do not believe that we can reasonably digest the additional funds which the committee has approved for research and development.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, while I support the idea of additional nuclear frigates, I am totally in opposition to the mandatory language which the committee has injected into the bill. A serious constitutional question arises and I have great reservations that the judgment of a committee of Congress can be imposed upon the executive in matters requiring the expertise which as a practical matter does not and cannot exist in a committee. We can debate; we can question; we can authorize; we can withhold funds; but, we cannot compel. In turn, the Executive cannot compel Congress. Only the people through their votes at the polling places can compel. And that is the way it should be.

These checks and balances are the very basis of our democratic system. By implication, if not by admission, the committee seeks to test "whether Congress has the power to so mandate." The test has been attempted on several occasions in the past, and has always been resolved through sensible action on behalf of both branches without an unnecessary show-down which undermines the faith in and understanding of our form of government. A test serves no useful purpose now and I trust that, as in the past, cooler heads will prevail and this language will be deleted and a spirit of cooperation return between the executive and legislative branches of our government in order that the best interests of the United States can be served.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I say these words as one who feels compelled by the defense needs of our country to vote for this procurement bill but one who is profoundly disturbed by the size of this budget and what it signifies in our national life.

I intend to vote for final passage of S. 2950 although with a great deal of reluctance and hesitancy. I intend to support any action to reduce this budget; more pointedly, any amendment to delete funds earmarked to continue the B-58 program, to construct nuclear powered surface ships or frigates, and to develop an anti-missile-missile system.

The cold war period has been fed and supported by an arms race and an emphasis on military might which has prompted the United States alone to spend over a trillion, four hundred billion dollars in arms since World War II. Each year, our defense budget grows larger. Our yearly military budget of \$58 billion approaches that of the years we were engaged in a world war—\$63 billion.

Each year, the Congress blindly accepts the increases. Indeed, it is most difficult to argue against money to defend our Nation. I would suggest, however, that we need to step back and, with a different perspective, take a good hard look at our spiraling defense budget and our stance in a cold war of two opposing, unbending forces. There are tremendous changes going on within and between nations of the world. It is time to pursue a different tack. I am always

distressed to juxtapose the treatment given this budget with the careful, detailed, and negative approach to funds proposed for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, foreign assistance, and support of the United Nations and other international bodies.

So, therefore, I am reluctant to do that which I feel is necessary and vote for S. 2950. As I said, I do oppose funds in this bill for projects which through extensive study and analysis have been shown to involve great costs for what will be an unavailing and fruitless effort. This simply does not make sense.

I am confident that this statement will clarify for my colleagues and the record, my position—of which a simple vote would not be an accurate reflection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. The House Armed Services Committee is to be commended for the excellent job it has done in evaluating proposals which it has heard regarding Defense Department procurement. Under the capable leadership of Committee Chairman MENDEL RIVERS, the committee has adopted an outstanding report on legislation which is of vital concern to every American.

The committee deserves particular recognition for providing an additional \$8.6 million funds for the Navy's deep sea submergence programs.

DSSP is one of the most important aspects of the Navy's rapidly developing technology linked to oceanography and undersea exploration. The loss of the *Thresher* in April 1963 was painful proof of this Nation's inability to operate in an undersea environment of 8,300 feet, even though modern space technology has conquered altitudes far beyond this distance. The loss of an H-bomb off Spain last January again demonstrated the difficulty the United States faces in operating at undersea depths. Although the bomb incident had a more favorable ending after an 80-day search, the *Thresher* has not yet been recovered.

The committee's vision in authorizing additional funds for the critical new field of deep submergence stands as a vote of confidence in the governmental, scientific, and industrial sectors of the oceanographic community. Even though knowledge of the oceans has long held the imagination of mankind, oceanography is still a relatively new science. However, progress is being made in this field, and much of it is being made by the Russians. They are dedicated to the achievement of seapower. Soviet oceanography and submarine technology have been given high national priority. Unable to force a major gap in the outer space race, the Soviets are beginning to concentrate scientific and financial resources in the seas. Action such as the one taken by the committee will do much to strengthen America's position in the ocean age. The restoration of funds for deep submergence gives notice to the Soviets that the United States will not let ocean supremacy go by default.

As the Secretary of the Navy told the Navy League last Friday:

Oceanography—and in this reference it is used in its broadest sense to include ocean

technology, ocean engineering, deep submergence—all things wet—is an integral part of sea power.

How true. The committee has given the Nation a new muscle to use in the development of seapower. If used often and with good judgment, that muscle will become stronger. I urge that the Congress uphold the committee action by approving the restoration of funds for the development of deep sea submergence programs within the Navy.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the excellent bill before us today. The unanimous Armed Services Committee report reveals a thorough and searching examination of our defense needs; it is a cogent and thought-provoking document. The committee should be commended for its spirited and often witty defense of the constitutional role of the Congress in providing for and maintaining the Nation's defenses. In this time of national emergency, when the United States must protect herself against violent Communist aggression, and must rely upon her Armed Forces for the preservation of our basic freedoms, it is essential that the elected representatives of the people continue their vigilance over our national security.

This Nation and this Congress can be rightfully proud of this legislation. We can be proud of authorizing for our boys in Vietnam and elsewhere the finest military equipment in the world. We can be proud of possessing a modern defense system second to none; we can be proud of giving our Armed Forces the best protection this Nation can devise.

Mr. Chairman, I am profoundly gratified at the \$357 million military pay raise provided for in this bill. I have often been to Fort Benning, where the 1st Air Cavalry, now serving in Vietnam, was trained, as well as to Robins Air Force Base, all in my district. I know the men who are prepared to give their lives for this Nation and these freedoms. I know their dedication to the cause of liberty; I know of their courage and vigilance, and I feel more secure with my country's security in their hands.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there are those in this country who take every opportunity to malign our Armed Forces, who contemptuously cast insults and abuse upon these brave men. I know that these people are only a tiny minority and am glad that this House will again demonstrate the overwhelming support of this Nation for our loyal defenders by enacting this pay raise into law. We do indeed hold a solemn obligation to give the utmost possible support to those who are dying to preserve the many freedoms which we all tend too much to take for granted.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. Particularly am I pleased to note the emphasis which our colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee have placed on congressional responsibility in our Nation's defense. The Constitution leaves no doubt as to our proper role. We are doing our coun-

try service, I believe, when we clearly spell out that we intend to discharge, as capably as we know how, the grave responsibility imposed on us in this area.

Several aspects of this legislation deserve particular note. One is the \$167.9 million authorization for preproduction activities on the Nike X antiballistic missile defense system.

As the committee has noted in its comprehensive report, there appears to be little doubt that the Soviet Union could, at this moment, inflict tremendous damage on the United States with its long-range missiles. Not only is the Soviet threat likely to continue, but there arises the additional specter of Red Chinese development of intercontinental missiles. To ignore these dangers is to shirk the responsibility the Congress properly feels in the defense of our country.

I congratulate the committee for its efforts to provide funds now for necessary preproduction activities for the Nike X. What we are doing, as the committee has so wisely pointed out, is buying time—the scarcest commodity in this age of nuclear weaponry. If the Nation decides to go ahead and deploy a ballistic missile defense system, the action of this House today in making available the \$167.9 million preproduction authorization should shave 1 year off the time that would otherwise be required to put the Nike X operational system on site. In an era in which a nuclear intercontinental missile can streak across the top of the world in hardly more than half an hour, a year's worth of lead-time can be a precious commodity indeed—worth far more than the amount being discussed here today.

All responsible Americans look forward hopefully to the day when our vast defense expenditures can be safely trimmed back and devoted to the causes of peace—hospitals, schools, and all the other things which this beleaguered world so desperately needs.

But the time when this can safely be done has not yet arrived. Today in Vietnam, American fighting men are committed to a war that none of us wanted. On those of us left at home has been thrust the responsibility for providing the tools with which they can finish the job.

It is my privilege in the House to represent the Fort Worth area—an area which is contributing significantly to our defense efforts by producing the F-111 fighter plane and the Iroquois helicopter.

Today's bill contains an authorization of \$100.3 million for the F-111A for fiscal 1967. The budget message recommended only \$78 million for this program and the additional \$22.3 million was added by the committee.

I am certain that the committee's confidence in the F-111 is well placed. To date, this new weapons system has met or exceeded every major development milestone. Even its first flight—in December 1964—was well ahead of schedule.

On May 27, F-111A No. 12 made its first flight. This is significant because

plane No. 12 is believed to be almost identical to the production aircraft that will begin rolling off the assembly line in numbers at the General Dynamics plant early next year.

Plane No. 12 incorporates several significant improvements over the 11 previously produced. For one thing, there has been a 2-ton weight reduction in comparison with previous models. Significant improvements also have been made in the matching of engine and airframe. Additionally, plane No. 12 incorporates high-lift devices that are 9 percent more effective than those of previous models of the aircraft.

These test program refinements, being incorporated as they are at the two-thirds point in the development program, will give the Air Force a chance to evaluate what essentially is a production-line ship 6 months earlier than otherwise would have been the case.

At Fort Worth's Bell helicopter plant, the report is similarly encouraging. To anyone who reads the daily newspapers, there is no need to elaborate on the tremendously effective role which helicopters have played in the Vietnam war. Not only do they provide our men with the greatest mobility ever known to warfare, but these machines have established an outstanding safety record. Battlefield statistics show there have been 18,000 successful sorties for every loss of a helicopter.

Such outstanding records do not just happen. They reflect great skill upon the brave men who fly these machines in battle, and tremendous know-how among the engineers and technicians who build them.

As magnificent as the record is for Bell's Iroquois, there is reason to believe even this may be bested by the new Bell Cobra, which will go into production at the end of this year. Developed by the company with its own resources to meet the particular needs of the Vietnam war, the Cobra promises to be faster, better armed, and less vulnerable to ground fire, while retaining the same basic components as the old reliable Iroquois. Significantly, no substantial increase in overall funding will be required for Cobra production.

The demands of Vietnam have made it necessary for Bell to double its production in the past year. Yet it has been able to retain its proud record of meeting all its production schedules for the military. In October, the company will not have missed a delivery date for 10 years.

In summation, Mr. Chairman, let me again congratulate the committee for refocusing attention on congressional responsibility for the defense of our country. It should be obvious to anyone who has studied the report that the committee has not hesitated to exercise the power vested in this body by the Constitution itself. This is a good bill, and deserves the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the defense authorization bill be-

fore us because I believe we must maintain a strong national defense establishment.

However, I have several reservations. I am opposed to the provision in the bill which purports to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy to "proceed with the design, engineering and construction of two nuclear powered guided missile frigates as soon as possible."

In my judgment, this provision goes far beyond the responsibilities of the Congress as laid down in article I, section 8 of the Constitution. President Kennedy was greatly disturbed by a similar effort on the part of the Congress, and I am sure President Johnson will be also, and rightly, in my view.

I am also seriously troubled about those provisions of the bill which add almost a billion dollars to the amounts requested by the President. Having listened carefully to the debate on this bill and having studied the committee's report, I am still not convinced that these additional expenditures are necessary or even wise, in view of the inflationary pressures we are facing in this country.

Since no one rose during the debate to present the point of view of the Secretary of Defense on these items, and since the committee report does not attempt to present or summarize his views, it is extremely difficult for a nonmember of the committee to assess the merits of the various controversies. While the bill as a whole was reported out unanimously by the committee, I am informed that there were differences of opinion within the committee with respect to some or all of these items.

In such an important matter as this, with billions of dollars and vitally important questions of national defense at stake, I wish that it were possible for the Members to have before them the comments of the Secretary of Defense on the various items which the committee has added to the administration's request.

In the absence of such comments, I have tried, within obviously severe limitations of time, to examine the record of the hearings before the committee so as to determine on what basis the Secretary of Defense had decided against asking for these various items. Although not succeeding wholly in this endeavor, I have found certain statements made by the Secretary of Defense which concern me and which do not appear to be answered in the committee report.

For example: On page 16 of the report the following appears:

The committee added \$167,900,000 in authorization of appropriations for preproduction activities directed toward the deployment of an antiballistic missile defense system.

Yet on page 7356 of the hearings, Secretary McNamara said:

There is no system or combination of systems within presently available technology which would permit the deployment now of an anti-ballistic missile defense capable of giving us any reasonable hope of keeping U.S. fatalities below some tens of millions in a major Soviet nuclear attack upon our cities.

At another point he did indicate that an antiballistic missile system might be useful with respect to a possible Chinese Communist attack in the mid-1970's, but stated, at page 7345:

On the basis of our present knowledge of Chinese Communist nuclear progress, no deployment decision need be made now—

And that—
the development of the essential components should be pressed forward vigorously.

There was brief reference during the debate to the matter of Soviet progress in the development of antiballistic missiles.

It seems to me that this is an area where it may be dangerous for us to attempt to develop capabilities that far exceed those of the Soviets. For instance, if we were to decide to proceed vigorously with the deployment of an antiballistic missile system intended to provide complete protection against Soviet missile capabilities, and the Soviets were not in a position to follow suit, the Soviets might be so thoroughly alarmed at the prospect of losing the protection of their deterrent potential that they might feel driven to launch a nuclear attack upon us before our defensive system could be completed.

The committee also decided to add \$11,800,000 "to support the contract definition phase for the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA." On this subject, Secretary McNamara said, among other things:

We will duplicate in the future the errors of the past if we push ahead with this airplane before we have a clear concept of why it is required, what it is to do, and what specifications it should have to accomplish that task. (Hearings, p. 7373.)

During the debate, some critical references were made to the Secretary of Defense. I want to disassociate myself from these views. I believe we have a great Secretary of Defense. Though I have not always agreed with his views, particularly with regard to Vietnam, I am full of admiration for the systematic and thorough way in which he has endeavored to provide this country with a balanced and effective defense establishment without unnecessary expenditure. In so doing he has often had to overrule the requests of Army, Navy and Air Force officers, but that, to my mind, is what a Secretary of Defense has to do. That is the essence of the idea of civilian supremacy which is fundamental to our system of government.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, after reading the report on the military procurement authorization bill, I regret that I do not have an opportunity to vote for a motion to recommit or an amendment to strike the amount of money added by the committee to the money requested by the Defense Department.

It strikes me that when the Defense Department, with its expert assessment of its needs, comes to Congress for appropriations in the amount of nearly \$17 billion, nearly one-sixth of our national

budget, it is time for Congress to examine the request most diligently.

Instead we are provided a bill which not only accepts the requests of the Defense Department, but which also includes a drastic increase in the appropriations requested of nearly \$1 billion.

There is always a reluctance to question defense spending. As a result, the record is that military spending is the largest consumer of the American taxpayers' dollar, enjoys the status of a sacred cow and continues to go unchecked and unpunished by critical congressional committees. To add an additional billion dollars, is an unfortunate alternative, because there is some necessity to exercise restraint in the dollars the Federal Government spends.

It is a great disappointment to me therefore to see a congressional committee rushing in to spend even more money than the military experts ask. Further, I do not believe the Department of Defense would understate its own critical needs. It is particularly distressing when large amounts of additional funds recommended by the committee are for programs of dubious merit and commit us to programs about which many Americans have serious policy reservations. The preproduction moneys recommended for Nike X and the funds for MOL are two examples of programs that have not yet been fully explained to or accepted by the American people as necessary or desirable. In fact, both programs, if implemented, could result in a renewal of the arms race at even greater costs to American taxpayers.

It is also unfortunate that these spendthrift recommendations of the committee come at a time when domestic programs are already seriously jeopardized by the increasing day-to-day costs of the Vietnam war.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of the executive branch exercising Congress prerogatives. It is a question which has exercised the greatest prudence. In this case, I think Mr. McNamara has.

While there is little question that present world conditions do not permit a drastic reduction in the funds requested by the Defense Department for military procurement—and this measure will, therefore, have my vote—there is grave question that the defense and well-being of the United States requires the increased spending requested by the committee. I know that I speak for many Americans concerned with questions of war and peace and for many Wisconsin taxpayers when I say that I hope the Senate will eliminate the excess written into the bill by the House committee as well as examine most closely the funds requested by the Department. I cannot state more strongly my opposition to the addition of the \$931,100,000 to this bill recommended by the committee.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, under general leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I rise in support of S. 2950, for defense procurement and research and development and military pay, which has

“Warrant officers

“Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	\$449.40	\$482.10	\$482.10	\$493.20	\$515.70	\$538.20	\$560.40	\$600.00	\$627.90	\$650.40	\$667.20	\$689.40	\$712.20	\$767.70	\$767.70
W-3	408.60	443.10	443.10	448.50	454.20	487.50	515.70	532.50	549.30	565.80	583.20	605.70	627.90	650.40	650.40
W-2	357.60	387.00	387.00	398.10	420.30	443.10	459.90	476.40	493.20	510.30	526.80	543.60	565.80	565.80	565.80
W-1	298.20	342.00	342.00	370.20	387.00	403.80	420.30	437.40	454.20	471.00	487.50	504.60	504.60	504.60	504.60

“Enlisted members

“Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9							\$510.60	\$522.30	\$534.30	\$546.00	\$558.00	\$569.40	\$599.10	\$657.30	\$657.30
E-8						\$428.40	440.40	452.10	463.80	475.50	487.20	499.20	528.60	587.10	587.10
E-7	\$269.40	\$322.80	\$334.80	\$346.50	\$358.20	369.60	381.30	393.60	411.00	422.70	434.40	440.40	469.80	528.60	528.60
E-6	232.20	281.70	293.40	305.40	317.40	328.80	340.50	358.20	369.60	381.30	387.60	387.60	387.60	387.60	387.60
E-5	200.40	246.90	258.60	270.00	287.70	299.40	311.10	322.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80
E-4	168.60	211.50	222.90	240.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60
E-3	121.80	170.10	182.10	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80
E-2	100.50	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00
E-1	96.90	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00
E-1 (under 4 months)	90.60														

SEC. 302. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member or former member of a uniformed service who initially becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the effective date of this title shall be entitled to have that pay computed using the rates of basic pay prescribed by the first section of this title.

SEC. 303. The provisions of this title become effective on July 1, 1966.

TITLE IV—WEAPONS SYSTEMS

SEC. 401. Section 125(c) of title 10, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding the following:

“However, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, the Secretary of Defense shall not direct or approve a plan to initiate or effect a substantial reduction or elimination of a major weapons system until the Secretary of Defense has reported all the pertinent details of the proposed action to the Congress of the United States while the Congress is in session. The Congress shall within ninety days thereafter advise the Secretary of Defense through the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives respectively, of the recommendations of these Committees on the proposed action.”

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (during reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF ALABAMA

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama: On page 6, line 10, change the semicolon to a comma and add “giving due regard in all such research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American Merchant Marine;”.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, one of the great problems facing this Nation today is the problem of the deterioration of our American merchant marine.

The merchant marine is not a part of the Defense Department, although it is

commonly referred to as the “fourth arm of defense” in this Nation. In fact, it is because of the needs of defense that I personally can go along with subsidies for our American merchant marine. Defense needs are the very basis for merchant marine subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, the American merchant marine is carrying less than 9 percent of our own commerce, and to me this is shocking. We rank about 12th as a shipbuilding nation and this to me is disgraceful. Our merchant marine is slowly sinking into a sea of bureaucratic twaddle, and no policy seems to be forthcoming from the administration which will bring us out of this chaos and confusion. Secretary of Defense McNamara says the merchant marine is adequate to the needs of the Defense Department; but I say it will never be adequate as long as we must charter foreign-flag ships to carry supplies to our boys in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy can perform a real service to this country and its proud merchant marine by giving due regard in all its research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American merchant marine. That is the purpose of this amendment. The Air Force does much which works to the benefit of the airline industry. The Navy can do much which will give the American merchant marine some greatly needed help as a result of its research program.

This is an uncomplicated amendment, but it can be a great first step toward revitalizing our merchant marine. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has explained this amendment to me. We have no objection to this amendment on this side.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have likewise discussed this amendment with the gentleman.

This amendment is designed to help our merchant marine, and I must applaud the gentleman from Alabama. It will give our research department an opportunity to do something about this dwindling merchant marine. We gladly accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question or two concerning the present status of the F-111, the plane that was supposed to go both ways, that is, operate off carrier decks and land based.

What is the status of the F-111? Is it capable now of being flown in combat off carrier decks or is it too heavy for this purpose?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They are having problems in this area. The Hébert subcommittee has made some recommendations, that additional inquiries be made into the F-111 program. But generally, the F-111 is coming along. I think the Navy version is a little heavy. I do not know what it will do. It is still in the development stage.

Let me say this to the gentleman. Nobody living or dead ever built an airplane in less than 5 years. This plane is not due yet, I do not care what the DOD tells you.

Mr. GROSS. It is not due yet? Does the gentleman say this plane is not due yet?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It cannot be due because it has not been born long enough.

Mr. GROSS. Is there no plane in being? Is there no operational F-111?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think they have some experimentals flying. This plane is going to be all right for certain things and we have a number of them flying. But as an operational plane, its time has not come. This

is what I am trying to say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know exactly what the gentleman means when he says we have the plane but its time has not come.

Now this is quite a long story as the gentleman well knows. The Joint Chiefs of Staff asked Secretary McNamara for a plane that could be flown off carrier decks as well as land based; to serve both purposes. To make a long story short, McNamara awarded the contract to a company which, it was evident at the time, could not produce a dual purpose plane.

Now I am trying to learn the status of this contract. How many hundreds of millions of dollars have gone down the drain; and whether we have any right to expect that this proposed dual purpose plane will ever come into being under the \$6 billion dollar contract that was awarded to General Dynamics at Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like to read this to the gentleman:

The development and testing of the F-111 aircraft has proceeded substantially as programmed.

Eight air force F-111-A's and 3 navy 11-B's were delivered through January, 1966. All were delivered on schedule.

Over 500 flight test hours have been flown with successful flights up to the maximum continuous designed speed at altitudes above 59,000 feet.

Let me say this—and this is what I am trying to say to the gentleman—that the test models have come off the line. They are testing them. As to whether they will be operational, I just do not know when they will be operational—I just do not know. I pray America will not someday have to suffer because of any plane unable to fulfill its alleged capabilities. I want an AMSA—and now.

Mr. GROSS. I would think that as badly as we need a new supersonic fighter plane—

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I do not need 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I was trying to say in my prepared statement that we do not have a new airplane. We just do not have a new airplane.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct. That is why I am deeply concerned about what has happened in this matter.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Except the F-12. Earlier I spoke about the fast plane that will make 2,000-plus miles an hour. This is what we are concerned with. We do not have an improved manned interceptor. I hope and pray that the F-111 will do what some people say it will do. But as yet it has not done it, and I do not know when it will do it if it will do it. Certainly it will be a good airplane, I am sure of that, but

I do not believe in my heart that it will ever do what some people say that it will do.

Mr. GROSS. Or what the Joint Chiefs of Staff requested that the plane do, although the contract was awarded by McNamara on the basis that it would be a dual-purpose plane.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have accepted this plane, as shown in the testimony before the Hébert committee. The reason they accepted the plan is that there was not anything else to accept. They took it as an interim plane and not as a permanent answer to the B-52.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes, there was another plane that they could accept, which, according to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, would have been a dual-purpose plane. I do not want to prolong this discussion for the hour is late, but is it my firm conviction that had the gentleman been the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee at the time this contract was awarded, and with the support that he is given by the members of the House Armed Services Committee and their interest in maintaining the independence of Congress and the integrity of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—had those things prevailed, and had the House Armed Services Committee not been in the status of an appendage of the Pentagon—we would have had them on the way. We would have had on the way a dual-purpose plane for the defense of this country, something that we badly need.

Along with others who have spoken, I appreciate the dedication that the gentleman from South Carolina has given to the Armed Services Committee and to his work, and the support that the members of the committee have given to him. We would have a brighter day in the defense picture in this country had the gentleman from South Carolina been the chairman some years ago.

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

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am not deserving of what you said, but let me say this to you: So help me God, we are going to have a follow-on bomber if it kills me. I am not convinced that the B-111 is the answer. This is not possible. I do not care what anyone says. I cannot and must not enter into the controversy of the award of the TFX contract. That was before my time. I get enough trouble. As you see, trouble picks me out of the crowd. Do not get me any further.

Let me say this to you: If I live, I am determined to get my Nation a bomber. We have too many of our eggs in the missile basket now. This could be our end.

Mr. GROSS. I am not saying to the gentleman that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are always right; that the military is always right, or that Congress is always right. What I am saying is that if the Joint Chiefs of Staff merit their existence, they ought to be protected by Congress when they are right. When a man puts on a uniform in the service of his

country, it should not mean he has to put a zipper on his lips.

We cannot have a defense system in this country unless we work in partnership with the military. Instead of such men as General LeMay being put on probation for 1 year; on notice that he would be through because he supported the specifications for a dual purpose TFX plane that would fly, and compelling such men as Admiral Anderson, also of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at that time, to walk the plank as other admirals have been made to walk the plank, they should be protected in telling the truth. This form of punishment must be ended, and I am sure the gentleman and his committee will end it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as we come to the end of the debate, I most sincerely tell the Members again how much I have appreciated their cooperation today, and I mean that—every word.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be brief as it is late in the day and many of us have other commitments, and besides, so many appropriate compliments have already been paid to the gentleman from South Carolina.

But I do want to express my personal friendship for MENDEL RIVERS and to congratulate him on the fine manner in which he has handled the bill on the floor today. He has demonstrated that he is knowledgeable in the intricate and complicated area of national defense policy. He has shown beyond any doubt whatsoever that he is the master of this important legislation.

The gentleman from South Carolina is not only deeply concerned and interested in our national security but he is determined to insure that the Congress be permitted to exercise its lawful authority in this area. He has carried the ball for the Congress in demanding that it be permitted to exercise its own independent judgment which is the proper role for the Congress to play.

I feel strongly that we owe the gentleman from South Carolina our deepest congratulations and applause.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I certainly thank the gentleman. I am very grateful to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation

for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 859, 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 the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 356, nays 2, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—356

Abbutt	Culver	Hanley
Adair	Cunningham	Hanna
Adams	Curtin	Hansen, Idaho
Addabbo	Daddario	Hansen, Iowa
Albert	Dague	Hansen, Wash.
Anderson, III.	Davis, Ga.	Harsha
Anderson, Tenn.	Davis, Wis.	Harvey, Mich.
Andrews,	de la Garza	Hathaway
George W.	Delaney	Hawkins
Andrews,	Dent	Hébert
Glenn	Denton	Hechler
Andrews,	Devine	Helstoski
N. Dak.	Dickinson	Henderson
Arends	Dingell	Herlong
Ashbrook	Dole	Hicks
Ashley	Donohue	Hollifield
Aspinall	Dow	Holland
Ayres	Dowdy	Horton
Bandstra	Downing	Hosmer
Barrett	Duncan, Oreg.	Howard
Bates	Duncan, Tenn.	Howard
Battin	Dwyer	Hull
Beckworth	Dyal	Hungate
Belcher	Edmondson	Huot
Bell	Edwards, Ala.	Hutchinson
Bennett	Edwards, Calif.	Ichord
Berry	Edwards, La.	Irwin
Betts	Evans, Colo.	Jarman
Bingham	Everett	Jennings
Blatnik	Fallon	Joelson
Boggs	Farnsley	Johnson, Calif.
Boland	Farnum	Johnson, Okla.
Bolling	Fascell	Johnson, Pa.
Bow	Feighan	Jonas
Brademas	Findley	Jones, Ala.
Bray	Fisher	Jones, N.C.
Brook	Flood	Karsten
Brooks	Foley	Karsh
Broomfield	Ford, Gerald R.	Kastenmeier
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Ford,	Kee
Broyhill, N.C.	William D.	Keith
Broyhill, Va.	Fountain	Kelly
Burke	Fraser	Keogh
Burleson	Frelinghuysen	King, Calif.
Burton, Calif.	Friedel	King, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Fulton, Pa.	King, Utah
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton, Tenn.	Kirwan
Byrnes, Wis.	Fuqua	Kluczynski
Cabell	Gallagher	Kornegay
Callan	Garmatz	Kunkel
Cameron	Gathings	Kupferman
Carey	Giammo	Laird
Carter	Gibbons	Landrum
Casey	Gilligan	Langen
Celler	Gonzalez	Latta
Chamberlain	Goodell	Leggett
Chelf	Grabowski	Lennon
Clancy	Gray	Lipscomb
Clark	Green, Oreg.	Long, La.
Clawson, Del	Green, Pa.	Long, Md.
Cleveland	Greigg	Love
Clevenger	Grider	McClory
Cohelan	Griffiths	McCulloch
Collier	Gross	McDade
Colmer	Grover	McDowell
Conable	Gubser	McFall
Conte	Gurney	McGrath
Cooley	Hagan, Ga.	McVicker
Corman	Hagen, Calif.	Macdonald
Craley	Haley	Machen
Cramer	Hall	Mackay
	Halpern	Mahon
	Hamilton	Mailliard

Marsh	Qule	Staggers
Martin, Nebr.	Quillen	Stalbaum
Mathias	Race	Stanton
Matthews	Randall	Steed
May	Redlin	Stephens
Michel	Rees	Stratton
Miller	Reid, III.	Stubblefield
Mills	Reid, N.Y.	Sullivan
Minish	Reifel	Sweeney
Mink	Reinecke	Talcott
Minshall	Resnick	Teague, Calif.
Mize	Reuss	Teague, Tex.
Moeller	Rhodes, Pa.	Tenzer
Monagan	Rivers, S.C.	Thomas
Moore	Roberts	Thompson, Tex.
Moorhead	Robison	Thomson, Wis.
Morgan	Rodino	Todd
Morris	Rogers, Colo.	Trimble
Morrison	Rogers, Fla.	Tuck
Morse	Rogers, Tex.	Tunney
Morton	Rooney, Pa.	Tupper
Mosher	Rosenthal	Tuten
Murphy, N.Y.	Roudebush	Udall
Natcher	Roush	Ullman
Nedzi	Roybal	Van Deerlin
Nelsen	Rumsfeld	Vanik
Nix	Ryan	Vigorito
O'Konski	Satterfield	Vivian
Olsen, Mont.	St Germain	Walker, N. Mex.
Olson, Minn.	St. Onge	Watkins
O'Neal, Ga.	Saylor	Watson
O'Neill, Mass.	Scheuer	Watts
Ottinger	Schisler	Weltner
Passman	Schmidhauser	Whalley
Patman	Schneebeil	White, Tex.
Patten	Schweiker	Whitener
Pelly	Scott	Whitten
Pepper	Secrest	Widnall
Perkins	Selden	Willis
Philbin	Shipley	Wilson, Bob
Pickle	Shriver	Wilson,
Pike	Sisk	Charles H.
Pirnie	Skubitz	Wolf
Poage	Slack	Wright
PoT	Smith, Calif.	Wydler
Pool	Smith, N.Y.	Yates
Price	Smith, Va.	Younger
Purcell	Springer	Zablocki

NAYS—2

Brown, Calif. Curtis

NOT VOTING—73

Abernethy	Fogarty	O'Hara, Mich.
Annunzio	Gettys	Powell
Ashmore	Gilbert	Pucinski
Baring	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Hardy	Rivers, Alaska
Buchanan	Harvey, Ind.	Ronan
Cahill	Jacobs	Roncallo
Callaway	Jones, Mo.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cederberg	Krebs	Rostenkowski
Clausen,	McCarthy	Senner
Don H.	McEwen	Sickles
Conyers	McMillan	Sikes
Corbett	MacGregor	Smith, Iowa
Daniels	Mackie	Stafford
Dawson	Madden	Taylor
Derwinski	Martin, Ala.	Thompson, N.J.
Dorwin	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Dorn	Matsunaga	Utt
Dulski	Meeds	Waggonner
Ellsworth	Moss	Walker, Miss.
Erlenborn	Multer	White, Idaho
Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Williams
Farbstein	Murray	Wyatt
Fino	O'Brien	Young
Flynt	O'Hara, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Corbett.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Stafford.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Callaway.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Morse.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Daniels with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sickles.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Teague, Tex. with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Jacobs.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Meeds.
 Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.
 Mr. Krebs with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Mackie with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Murray.
 Mr. Ronan with Mr. Roncallo.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
 Mr. Williams with Mr. Young.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on S. 2950.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STEED submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14266) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

INTIMIDATION IN BOND DRIVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Young, who specializes in writing articles on civil service employees, wrote a most astonishing column in the Washington Star of June 13 entitled "U.S. Employees Cite Threats, Intimidation in Bond Drive." It certainly is a sad commentary on the respect and confidence in which our country is held by the employees if it is true that the President,

through the power of his office, must intimidate and threaten the employees to sign up for savings bonds deductions.

Just what right has the President, or any member of the executive department, to ask the employees of the Government to put their savings in Government bonds paying 4.15 percent when the same Government is issuing Federal National Mortgage Association participation certificates guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Government at a coupon rate of 5¾ percent. Is there any wonder that such a procedure would cause anyone to hesitate to buy savings bonds. The wonder is that the people who do hold savings bonds are not persuaded to cash them in and reinvest them in these participation certificates at more than 1½ increase in interest.

Recently I have had some letters from constituents complaining about acts of the Government which are gradually destroying their business, yet they will not publicly state their complaints for fear of increased retaliation from the Government. Just what is happening in this country to cause our people to fear their Government? It seems to me that history points to the fact that when such ideas on the part of citizens occur it is the beginning of dictatorships.

Apparently the only place the citizen can express himself without fear of intimidation is in the ballot booth come this November and apparently the results of this election is going to determine whether this trend of creating fear in the minds of our people of their Government is going to continue or whether there is going to be some relief.

Mr. Young's column follows:

U.S. EMPLOYEES CITE THREATS, INTIMIDATION IN BOND DRIVE

(By Joseph Young)

There are numerous complaints among federal employees about being pressured to participate in the government's 1966 savings bond drive.

The employees report that they are being threatened and intimidated by their supervisors, who in turn are under pressure from their bosses who are under the gun from the White House to make the drive a success.

The "loyalty" of those who refuse to buy savings bonds also is being questioned.

President Johnson has apparently made it a matter of personal prestige that the government's savings bond drive this year be a resounding success. And Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, who is chairman of the President's savings bond campaign, is handling the drive with the vigor and determination he used to use in directing John F. Kennedy's political campaigns.

In a letter to all department and agency heads, O'Brien set the tone of the campaign when he said:

"The President personally is following the progress of this campaign and he will accept *nothing less* than the minimum immediate goal of 75 percent," O'Brien said.

The PMG went on to say that Johnson "will consider adequate *nothing less* than realization of our long-range goal of 90 percent, and will be satisfied with *nothing less* than achievement of the 100 percent record established by the White House."

Employees say the pressure of this year's savings bond drive is much greater than in previous years' campaigns or in United Givers Fund or health agencies campaigns.

The employees say they are being threatened with denial of promotions or even loss of jobs if they don't sign up to buy bonds.

At the National Institutes of Health, 40 guards complained that one of their superiors threatened to "make life miserable" for them if they didn't come through.

At the Office of Economic Opportunity, one memo questioned the "loyalty" of those employees who refused to buy savings bonds.

At Commerce, Secretary John Connor informed recalcitrant employees that there will be "a personal canvass" of them to see why they are not supporting "this important program."

In other agencies, employees are being required to write memorandums to explain why they are not purchasing bonds.

The whole situation has angered a lot of government employees, including those who agreed to buy savings bonds because of the pressure brought to bear on them.

Some employees say their financial situation is such that they can't afford to buy savings bonds. Others say they want to invest their money in stocks and other securities that will bring them a greater return. Still others say they just don't like to be pressured into doing things.

And there are those who say they disapprove of the President's Viet Nam policies and don't want to do anything that would give impetus to them.

One astute Commerce employee got around the pressure by signing up to purchase savings bonds starting in June, 1967. It apparently satisfied hard-pressed Commerce officials who listed him as one who joined the campaign.

U.S. SUPREME COURT AUTHORITY

Mr. DEVINE. 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. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, for over 10 years the U.S. Supreme Court has been rendering landmark decisions vastly altering the foundations of what was believed to be the law of the land. The time-worn doctrine of "stare decisis," meaning "precedent by previous decisions," apparently has gone by the boards.

The overwhelming majority of Americans are law-abiding citizens who respect authority and obey the law, even though they may disagree. However, where constitutionality is involved, the propriety of "one-man rule" of American life is being questioned more frequently. Five-to-four split in decisions by the Supreme Court, time and again, clearly demonstrates the complete lack of unanimity if not the uncertainty of the Court on key matters of law.

It seems to me where the Court is called upon to rule upon constitutionality, it should be required that at least two-thirds or six of the nine Justices must agree before the law of the land can be completely reversed. This, in itself, would require a constitutional amendment.

Acts of Congress are the result of long arduous hours of legislation study, testimony of witnesses, deliberation, debate, and vote by both the House and Senate, as well as approved by the Executive.

This process now can be and is nullified by a determination of "unconsti-

tutional" by not more than five men, often with four dissenting.

Amending our Constitution to require two-thirds vote before an act of Congress can be declared unconstitutional would certainly prevent capricious or emotional decisions. This does not seem burdensome to me, particularly when 12 persons on a jury are required to render unanimous decisions in order to convict 1 person for a violation of our criminal laws.

Decisions affecting 190 million persons might well merit a consensus of at least six out of nine Justices.

The fact that the Supreme Court on yesterday rendered another 5-to-4 landmark decision, further hindering our police officials and law enforcement, although not involving the question of constitutionality, also points up again the sharp split among the Justices on the Supreme Court as now constituted.

This most recent decision is a further limitation in the area of police enforcement which commenced with the rendering of the Mallory decision in 1957. There seems to be a tendency by the Court in the interest of the lawbreakers and in disregard of the rights of the law-abiding.

In any event, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment requiring the Supreme Court to have at least a two-thirds majority to declare any law unconstitutional.

PROPOSED FEDERAL BANK FOR RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of our colleagues an article by Raymond Moley that appeared in the May 30 issue of Newsweek. It explains briefly and pointedly the real nature and purpose of the proposed Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems.

Proponents of the bank claim that it is essential for meeting the growing capital needs of those systems. Yet it is apparent that if the Rural Electric Administration cooperatives were limited to the original purpose they were intended to serve when the REA was established 30 years ago, they would have no very great need for additional capital.

Now 98 percent of the Nation's farms have central station electricity, more than half of them being served by REA cooperatives. Whatever further expansion of the cooperatives' rural electric service may be needed can to a large extent be financed from their earnings. The supposed need for a bank for rural electric systems evidently assumes a broad expansion in the generating and transmission field that would, for the most part, simply compete with the power supply facilities of noncooperative companies.

I have commented before on the great advantages already accorded the REA cooperatives by the Federal Government. Unlike the noncooperative electric companies, they are exempt from the corporation income tax and they are financed by money borrowed from the Federal Government at only 2 percent—while the Government now must pay nearly 5 percent on its current borrowings from the public. A bill that I introduced on January 6, 1965—H.R. 1738—would put an end to this fantastic 2-percent subsidy.

Mr. Moley has stressed the potential for monopoly that would exist if the present proposal for a bank for rural electric systems were adopted. He says of it:

When and if the co-ops gain control [of the bank], this huge financial institution would be completely independent of the government but retain all the privileges originally accorded it as a government agency.

This surpasses any previous example of government competition with an investor-owned business. Ultimately the bank and the co-ops could absorb or destroy all competition.

I commend this brief but cogent article to you, as follows:

ANOTHER CO-OP CRUTCH
(By Raymond Moley)

Thirty years ago Congress established the Rural Electrification Administration. It was designed to provide electric service to farmers remote from the lines of private companies. Co-ops pay only 2 percent for the money, although as time has passed the Treasury has had to pay much more in its borrowings.

Nourished by this subsidy, electric co-ops have grown in number, size and affluence. There are nearly 1,000 of them. Their original purpose has long since been achieved, for electricity is now within reach of substantially every farm owner.

Hence, the co-ops have thrust their operations into urban and suburban areas and into the industrial market. Some of their operations go well beyond selling electricity.

But they have no intention of giving up the 2 per cent subsidy crutch, and every year the REA demands more lending money from Congress. For fiscal 1967 it will be approximately \$365 million.

Because of growing criticism of this subsidy, the co-ops' lobbying agency, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, has planned for an ingenious new crutch to supplement the REA and ultimately to get free from Congress entirely.

One version of this scheme is in a bill introduced in the House by Congressman POAGE. A somewhat different one is the Administration's plan, emanating from the Department of Agriculture (DA) and introduced by Chairman COOLEY of the Committee on Agriculture. The following is the Administration plan.

A NEW FEDERAL BANK

There would be created in the Treasury a "Rural Electrification Account," and in the DA a "Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems." Into the account would be deposited all money received in repayment of loans to co-ops and interest, all notes, bonds and property held by the REA, all appropriations for electrification loans.

The bank would have a board of seven. Four would be officers of the DA appointed by the Secretary. The other three board members would eventually be elected by borrowers holding Class B stock. The administrator of the REA would also be administrator of the bank.

Every year for fifteen years the bank would receive \$50 million from the account and would pay for this with its Class A stock. Thus, it would receive \$750 million by 1981. Every borrower from the bank would have to buy Class B voting stock in an amount equal to 5 per cent of its loan. Also, Class C and D stock could be bought for investment. The general idea is that sometime, by and by, the Class A stock would be bought back and eliminated, and the holders of the other stock would own the bank and thus get the government out—except for the perennial loans by the REA. Nobody knows when this would happen.

DESIGN FOR MONOPOLY

The bank would be exempt from supervision by all state authorities, and presumably from supervision by the Comptroller of the Currency. It would pay no Federal income tax, and the co-ops, as before, would have similar exemptions.

The REA would still operate. As long as Congress should approve, it would lend at 2 percent. Presumably, the bank would lend at various rates of interest on a 50-year basis.

The big source of capital would be debentures to be sold in amounts ten times the capital of the bank. Thus, by 1981 the bank would have capital assets of nearly \$10 billion. The debentures would not specifically be guaranteed by the Federal government, but if the bank at any time should be unable to pay interest or principal, it could borrow for such purposes from the Treasury. These debentures would thus be made attractive for private investors. When and if the co-ops gain control, this huge financial institution would be completely independent of the government but retain all the privileges originally accorded it as a government agency.

This surpasses any previous example of government competition with an investor-owned business. Ultimately the bank and the co-ops could absorb or destroy all competition.

This, then, is the reality of the Johnson Administration's attitude toward the free-enterprise system.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WATER-FOR-PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. FASCELL. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967.

The request for the introduction and enactment of this legislation originated with the executive branch.

For the information of the membership of the House, I will place in the RECORD the text of Executive Communication No. 2451, consisting of a letter from the Secretary of State to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the text of the joint resolution:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 30, 1966.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith a proposed Joint Resolution which would en-

able the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967; and which further provides for an appropriation authorization to the Department of State for expenses incident to organizing and holding the conference.

The President, in announcing the Water for Peace Program of the United States Government, recognized that the solution of water problems is of common interest throughout the world and pointed out the value of sharing knowledge in this important field with other countries in a cooperative effort to find solutions for man's water problems.

The proposed world-wide conference is the most effective means of bringing together representatives of all governments and agencies concerned, as well as experts, on the varying aspects of the water problems; of focusing attention on current and future water problems; and of contributing to the development of policies and programs necessary to cope with these problems.

I hope that the House will be able to give favorable consideration to this request during the present session.

A similar communication is being sent to the President of the Senate.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Enclosure: Proposed draft legislation.

H.J. RES. 1169

Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor

Whereas there exists throughout the world a common problem in planning the use of water to meet adequately the needs of the world's rapidly expanding population; and

Whereas the President, in announcing the Water for Peace Program of the United States Government, recognized the great value of a mutual sharing of knowledge in this important field with other countries in a world-wide cooperative effort to find solutions of man's water problems; and

Whereas a world-wide conference would be the most effective means of bringing together representatives of all governments and agencies concerned, as well as experts, on the varying aspects of the water problems; would focus attention on current and future water problems; and would contribute to the development of policies and programs necessary to meet these problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other concerned departments and agencies, are authorized to take all necessary steps to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in Washington, D.C. in 1967.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed \$1,200,000 for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to organizing and holding such an International Conference. Funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenses incurred on behalf of the United States as host government, including personal services without regard to civil service and classification laws, except no salary rate shall exceed the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; employment of aliens, printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized

Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, of principal foreign delegates in the United States and of United States personnel and foreign technical experts; rent of facilities by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; official functions and courtesies; and design, construction, and display of exhibits. Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available for obligation until December 31, 1967.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior are authorized to accept and use contributions of funds, property, services, and facilities, including the loan of articles, specimens, and exhibits for display, for the purpose of organizing and holding such an International Conference.

SEC. 4. The head of any department, agency, or establishment of the United States Government is authorized, on request, to assist with or without reimbursement the Department of State and the Department of the Interior in carrying out the functions herein authorized, including the furnishing of personnel and facilities and the procurement, installation and display of exhibits.

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, there have been more than a dozen catastrophic aircraft accidents in this country in the past 18 months, and no less than 300 persons were fatally injured.

Whether any of these accidents could have been avoided may be a matter of conjecture.

These unfortunate mishaps, however, have made it apparent that there is a definite lag in the processes of aircraft accident investigation.

Air transportation has reached the supersonic level, yet aircraft accident analysis—in some respects—has not passed the Kitty Hawk level.

Officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board admit that it takes as long as 9 months on the average to investigate a major air accident and report on the probable cause. And, one recently adopted aircraft accident report took more than 18 months.

I believe that users of this Nation's commercial air transportation facilities are entitled to know the probable causes of major air accidents at a time more realistic to the mishap.

One of the most useful tools available for investigation of air accidents is the flight recorder, which has provided much essential information to investigators that would otherwise be unobtainable.

The flight recorder produces a tracing of an aircraft's flight history on aluminum foil about 2 inches wide. It is wound on a stainless steel spool from a spindle in a crashproof cassette assembly. Currently, the flight record consists of five parameters, or channels—altitude, airspeed, vertical acceleration, magnetic heading and time.

In-flight recorders have furnished proof of or essential leads to numerous

factors. This vital information has also included the elimination of suspected possibilities, such as excessive turbulence, sabotage, and other sudden occurrences.

Unusual variations on the recorded traces sometimes provide leads to essential information not directly measured. In a landing accident, for example, the altitude parameter began fluctuating very rapidly a few seconds after touchdown on the runway. The fluctuation was traced to disturbed airflow at the static ports as the result of unsymmetrical reversing due to a system malfunction. This started a yaw—a deviation from the line of flight—ending in a fatal crash.

It is the feeling of CAB officials that more rapid investigation of major air accidents can be attained by the addition of more parameters or channels to flight recorders. One official went so far as to say that the investigation time could be reduced to an average of 2 to 3 months.

I feel that the best interests of the public can be served by speedier investigations of large turbine engine powered aircraft disasters.

Various airline officials have agreed that additional parameters would be helpful in the investigation of air crashes, however, they have not reached any type of agreement which or how many new channels should be added.

Several commercial carriers have installed maintenance recorders in the newer and more sophisticated planes as a means of keeping a constant check on possible mechanical or system malfunctions.

These recorders, however, are not of the crashproof variety and would not be helpful to the investigative processes because they would more than likely be destroyed by impact or fire in the event of a crash.

The maintenance recorders, nevertheless, are inscribing as many as 300 channels in connection with the flight operation of aircrafts.

I think that the time has come to give serious consideration to requiring that additional parameters be required on in-flight recorders.

It has been suggested that these additional channels include engine power; pitch attitude and angle of bank; angle of attack; position of primary controls; position of horizontal stabilizer and wing flaps; pitch, yaw, and roll rates; and ambient air temperatures.

With the addition of these channels, procedures for sampling at intervals should be established. A probable total of 12 channels does not seem unreasonable.

Commercial carriers using maintenance recorders should be instructed to make the equipment crashproof. The increased number of parameters should be required on newly manufactured aircraft at the earliest practicable date.

Information obtained from the data flight recorders should be invaluable in keeping with a high standard of aircraft safety as this Nation enters into the supersonic age.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON QUESTIONS PROPOSED COMPUTER CENTRAL FOR FEDERAL DATA

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in line with the comments of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], I am pleased to join in support of his statement and indicate my intention to cooperate with him and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] as our Subcommittee on the Invasion of Privacy of the Government Operations Committee moves into an inquiry of data banks. The announcement of this new phase of our subcommittee's exploration is welcome and pertinent.

In fact, I am sure many of us in Congress are growing increasingly concerned with the reports of proposals to create some kind of computer central for the merger and storage of the information on individuals held separately at the present time by various Federal agencies. Clearly, a step so bold should not be allowed without congressional concurrence. And, if the wisdom of Congress shows the plan will endanger the precious privacy rights, steps must be taken to afford necessary protection of that right.

Just recently, Mr. Speaker, I addressed my constituents on this problem and the work of our subcommittee. I take pleasure in sharing that statement with my colleagues:

THE CASE OF THE DAMAGING DOSSIERS

"Dossier" to the French means literally a bundle of papers. However, when the term travels across the Atlantic Ocean to our shores, the "bundle of papers" becomes a collection of documents recording information about people and their problems.

Information gathering on citizens has been standard operating procedure for many Government agencies now for at least three decades. In fact, looking into people's lives is big business in Washington these days, and the dimensions of such investigations and the information produced have reached proportions some of us in Congress consider perplexing and problematical.

My particular concern has been stimulated by service on the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy of the House Government Operations Committee. With our Chairman, Congressman GALLAGHER, another member of the majority, and myself, as the single member of the minority, we have been probing the probers for just over one year.

The first phase of the Subcommittee's work dealt with psychological testing administered by Government agencies on present or potential employees. We made clear at the outset that our purpose was not to inhibit legitimate inquiries needed to determine the suitability of employees for critical posts. However, we made equally plain that we wanted to end abuses of testing.

As we moved into the field, example after example was uncovered of agencies making indiscriminate use of examinations, failing to obtain the consent of individuals, and not using professional psychological standards for evaluation. We got results, too. One by one the agencies changed their conduct and applied new limits and protections.

It was during the study of testing that we became increasingly aware of information collection and dossier storage by many agencies. The data, we found, related not alone to Federal workers or would-be workers but to a vast number of private citizens.

Banks of extremely personal information exist in files of the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Housing Administration, the Social Security Administration, the Passport Office, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and, as expected, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Defense Department.

These dossier banks pose two problems. First, how fully can the Government justify collecting all this information, and, secondly, even if it can prove the necessity, what protection exists against the damaging disclosure of dossiers to those without a need to know.

"Confidential" FHA reports on applicants cost mortgage lenders only \$1.50. And, many Federal agencies readily share facts and figures with their State and local "brothers".

The relevance of Federal data banks to privacy protection is obvious, and our Subcommittee will open a series of public hearings on the problem later this month. I intend to take an active role in the inquiry, and I shall keep my constituents informed through this and other reports.

LEE M. WOODRUFF

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 Mr. Lee M. Woodruff, editor of the Grand Rapids, Mich., Press, will close out a distinguished career as a Michigan newspaperman.

Mr. Woodruff can take leave of his desk at the Grand Rapids Press with the knowledge that he has helped to make his hometown one of the outstanding cities in America—winner of an All America City Award in 1961. He can write his last editorial with the feeling that his contribution on the local scene has been second to none.

There can be no better record for a man than to live the kind of life that Lee Woodruff has. His every year as a newspaperman for more than four decades has been stamped with his own enviable brand of personal integrity.

As editor of the Grand Rapids Press since 1934, Mr. Woodruff has given strong backing to projects aimed at improving his city and enhancing its growth, has made fairness in dealing with the issues a hallmark of his editorial policy, and personally has striven for betterment of his community as a member of various civic, fraternal and religious organizations.

It was with good reason that Mr. Woodruff in 1963 was named an honorary Michigan State highway engineer. This was well-deserved recognition of the efforts made by Mr. Woodruff to promote the construction of adequate freeways in Kent County and throughout the State.

Mr. Woodruff also has shown his love for children with a record of outstanding service to the youngsters of Grand Rap-

ids. The Grand Rapids Variety Club paid him tribute in this connection in 1965 by giving him its "Great Guy" award. The youth commonwealth program owes much to Lee Woodruff's leadership.

Although he never worked as a printer's devil, Lee Woodruff must have ink in his veins. He first began his journalism career as editor of the Central High School paper in Grand Rapids and became a sportswriter for the Grand Rapids Press in 1919 while a student at the University of Michigan.

Mr. Woodruff made history in 1919 while serving as aviation editor of the Grand Rapids Press. He rode with one of our early pilots, who flew close enough to the ground so that Mr. Woodruff could toss out bundles of the Grand Rapids Press. That marked the first aerial delivery of a newspaper in Michigan. Mr. Woodruff also took the first aerial photos of west Michigan ever published in a newspaper.

After 10 years as Grand Rapids Press editorial writer, Mr. Woodruff was named managing editor in 1931. In 1934 he was made editor, a capacity in which he made great contributions to his city and his State.

Mr. Speaker, on June 9 the Michigan Legislature adopted a resolution honoring Mr. Woodruff on the eve of his retirement. Under unanimous consent, I insert the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

Whereas, Lee Mackie Woodruff, Editor of the Grand Rapids Press from 1934, has announced his retirement as of July 1, 1966; and

Whereas, Mr. Woodruff, educated in the Grand Rapids schools, having graduated from Central High School in 1917, received his A.B. degree with honors from the University of Michigan in 1921, graduating as a Phi Beta Kappa; and

Whereas, starting his career with the Grand Rapids Press upon his graduation from the University of Michigan, Mr. Woodruff became the managing editor of the Grand Rapids Press in 1931 and the editor-in-chief in 1934; and

Whereas, while the editor of the Grand Rapids Press, Mr. Woodruff consistently supported civic and political improvements in the City of Grand Rapids, conducted a newspaper which always dealt fairly with all issues and consistently supported bond issues and annexation procedures which provided for the orderly growth of the City of Grand Rapids; and

Whereas, Mr. Lee Mackie Woodruff, in his position as Editor of the Grand Rapids Press, consistently directed his energies toward the improvement of his own city and served in various capacities of a civic, fraternal and religious nature; and

Whereas, Mr. Woodruff is a vestryman of the Grace Episcopal Church, a trustee of Butterworth Hospital, a member and former director of the Peninsular Club, a member of the Grand Rapids Rotary Club, director of the Youth Commonwealth, charter member of the Furniture City Post of the American Revolution, charter member of the Torch Club—York Lodge—32nd Degree Mason, a member of the Sons of American Revolution and active in the Michigan Associated Press Editorial Association and American Society of Newspaper Editors, as well as being a veteran, having served in the United States Naval Reserve Forces in World War I from 1918-22; and

Whereas, Mr. Woodruff was named an Honorary Michigan State Highway Engineer

in 1963 for his effort relative to the building of freeways in the State of Michigan and Kent County, and in 1965 was a recipient of the "Great Guy" Award by the Grand Rapids Variety Club in recognition of his outstanding services to the children of Grand Rapids; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the members of the Michigan House of Representatives take this opportunity to honor an outstanding person, Mr. Lee Mackie Woodruff, for his devotion, not only to his profession and to his community but to the State of Michigan as a whole, and to wish Mr. Woodruff the very best of success in a retirement well earned and deserved; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Mr. Lee Mackie Woodruff.

A BUSINESS IS AN IDEA

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., developed a very interesting and intriguing subject in an address entitled "A Business Is an Idea," which was delivered before the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Michigan at the time he received the Business Leadership Award in Ann Arbor, March 18, 1966. His concluding statement is a very challenging one where he says:

We must have in business, and in government no less, men who understand the need for management freedom, genuine freedom, to make good judgments and decisions; men who appreciate the absolute necessity for priorities, for doing the most important things first and others later; men who above all will do what they do because careful study and strict judgment convince them it is sound and right.

This surely is a concise and understandable explanation of our needs today. His address follows:

A BUSINESS IS AN IDEA

(By Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.)

It is an honor indeed to be named to receive this award. I deeply appreciate it. I appreciate it not only in a personal way but also, and especially, on another count. No one could spend 42 years in the Bell System, as I have, without realizing how much each person's part, each individual contribution, depends on the contributions that others are making. So on this occasion I think of myself as the representative of many wonderful associates, and I am proud of the privilege of representing them and proud of the recognition this award extends to them, as well as to me.

I am very pleased also that this recognition comes from students as well as faculty.

The Bell System is not exactly a new business. In fact, we had our 90th birthday just eleven days ago, on March 7. That was the day, back in 1876, when Alexander Graham Bell was granted his first telephone patent.

But if we are not new, nevertheless I assure you we are still young. We are full of young

ideas and we are every day getting new knowledge to help put them to work. We have hundreds of thousands of young people working in the business. We serve young people everywhere. And we care a lot about what the oncoming generation thinks of us. I say again, therefore—I especially appreciate the fact that students as well as faculty are in on this award.

Incidentally, I checked the other day and learned that at last count we had about 500 University of Michigan graduates, including 35 from the Graduate School of Business, working in the various Bell companies. I hope the feedback you are getting from them is good. If it isn't good I wish you would tell me. I'll be through with this talk in about 20 minutes and all ready to listen—and I can assure you that young people and their opportunity to grow and realize their potential are a very special interest of mine.

Some time back Dean Bond encouraged me to talk out of personal experience and observation and that is what I shall do. This of course means saying something about the telephone business, for that is where my experience mainly lies. I hope you will not mind this, but if I am to express some of the thoughts that are most on my mind I can hardly leave the Bell System out.

Also, we are somewhat in the limelight these days by reason of the coming F.C.C. hearings on Bell System interstate rates and earnings, for which we are now preparing testimony.

Reading the newspapers, I occasionally come across statements that this proceeding could go on for years and years. Heaven forbid. I don't think anyone wants to see a thing of this kind drag along indefinitely and I don't really believe that it will.

At the moment, however, it is getting considerable public attention, and partly for that reason I feel the urge to state a point of view—although I shall not, of course, use this hall as a hearing room. I can also say at the start that the basic thought I want to emphasize has broad application. It is not limited to the telephone business.

I'll begin by summarizing a few comments I happened to make in conversation recently with a small group in Washington. This was a government committee charged with responsibility for advising the President and Congress on national communications policy. They asked me to sit down with them and think out loud with them with no holds barred. In effect they wanted to try out some of their ideas and among other things to know directly from me how the Bell System looks at its job and its share in meeting the overall communications responsibility. They also wanted to know what factors in my opinion made our business different from other businesses.

Well, I said first of all that I would like to state the first and all-important idea in our business. This is, in my judgment, that we have only one license to exist and that is to do a positively A-number one job of providing communications service and striving everlastingly to make it better. I said that to me this means we don't mix the job up with trying to do a lot of other things—I mean, we limit our manufacturing of things we need in communications, we are not in the auto-renting business, we don't operate a mutual fund, and so on. Not that there is anything wrong with those activities. They simply don't belong in our operation. We are dedicated to providing communications service, period, and we aim to do this as well as we possibly can.

The second point I emphasized in this conversation was that to make communications service readily accessible and useful and valuable and dependable, you have to have a system that is compatible in all its parts. If you do not have this, then the

service is bound to be erratic, uncertain, and sometimes downright exasperating.

The need for compatibility applies to any communication system, even the simplest. In a nationwide interconnecting network with billions, even trillions of parts, the problem is multiplied. You have to take great care to keep all the bits and pieces dependable and in good harmony. This says quality is the word, and it applies to every element of the system—telephones and other instruments, transmission lines, switching machines, all their parts, everything. On a call from New York to San Francisco something like 14,000 electron tubes along the way amplify the voice signals over and over again. The total amplification is represented by a fantastic number with more than 3,000 zeroes in it. But what comes out at the far end has to be a good, undistorted facsimile of what went in—and the call has to work both ways, too, not just in one direction. Yet one bad element in the wrong place can spoil everything.

Or take a shorter call, from Ann Arbor to downtown Detroit, for example. In a typical instance some 37,000 contacts will operate to make and maintain the connection. And I repeat, if all parts of the system are not in tune and working, from the simple terminal in your house to the most sophisticated equipment, the service cannot be relied on.

I say this much on this point, and said as much during the conversation I am telling you about, mainly to bring out that to get a good compatible system that people can swear by and not at, there is great advantage in being able to bring together, in a single organization, the development and design of equipment, its manufacture and installation, and day-to-day operation and maintenance.

This is one of the important reasons why the Bell System for many years has included, along with operating telephone companies, the Bell Telephone Laboratories, our research and development organization, and Western Electric Company, our manufacturing and supply unit. This arrangement brings other advantages too—for example, economies of scale, fast action in emergencies, speed in translating new developments into use, and very importantly, the sense that service is everybody's job. But the need for compatibility cuts across everything we do and is one of the broad underlying factors in our form of organization.

The third point I emphasized in talking with the committee in Washington is probably obvious to you already. This is that it is right that communications service to the general public should be under public regulation.

I also said I thought the ideal situation would be one where we who operate this regulated business would do our job so well that the regulators wouldn't have anything left to regulate. This is our goal and it is just as realistic and important as any I could mention.

It means that we should try to do a job that is so good that the most exacting regulator will have a hard time finding fault. It means that we private citizens who manage the telephone business should have a sense of responsibility for the public interest that is just as deep and strong and alert as that of the most zealous public servant. It means we should have a commensurate talent for getting the right things done, and that in actual accomplishment we would continually outrun other people's imagination.

Well, you will say, this is a pretty strong commitment. I freely concede this. But I think we ought to commit ourselves. These commitments in effect are hostages to the future and they have to be redeemed.

Now I have expressed to you some of the thoughts that I was trying to convey to the

government's committee on national communications policy. And you will observe, I am sure, that these ideas are very plain and simple. You may even be asking, "What good can ideas as elementary as these accomplish?"

My answer is equally simple. Concepts like these have tremendous power. They force action. They demand it. They are ideas that every employee no matter what his job can have a part in working for. And the root idea, which is the simplest, is the most powerful and influential of all. I mean the concept of service—of good, ever-improving, universal communication service. This is a compelling idea." You cannot hold to it if you are not going to do something about it. Actually, when the concept was first advanced, many years ago, even the crudest means for attaining it did not exist. The necessary technology had still to be created. So it was a great leap of the imagination.

But this very leap was what generated action to develop the technology, to get the knowledge, to learn, to discover, to accomplish the goal.

Also, the concept of universal, ever-improving service threw a bright light on the need for compatibility, the need for harmony in all parts in a complex network.

Further, this same concept entailed full acceptance of public regulation, for the development and operation of such a service is a responsibility so large that it must, as I have said, come under public scrutiny. This does not mean that public authority should try to manage communications service. On the contrary, I think the evidence is conclusive that private enterprise management, working with reasonable freedom under regulation, has given this country consistent leadership in communications. I am confident also that this leadership will be maintained as long as the same conditions prevail.

However, that is not the main concern of these remarks. I have taken the liberty of discussing certain basic concepts in the telephone business, but as I said earlier, the point I want to bring out has broader application—much broader. And by now, I am confident, what I am getting at must be clear to you.

The point is that a business—any business—is first of all an idea. The nature and shape and character of the business will necessarily grow out of the fundamental thought that drives it. And there must be such a driving thought—some germinal, inspiring, action-compelling concept—if the business is really to live and grow.

It need not be a complicated notion, or a highfalutin one. On the contrary, it needs to be simple to be widely understood and it will have to be broad to generate much action. If you take a narrow view you limit yourself at the start. The important thing is a concept that not only makes itself understood at once but will push and pull and tug at you and give you no rest.

In the Bell System, the value of a few enduring themes for action has been, in my judgment, beyond calculation. The concept of universal service has been realized in one sense through development of a nationwide communication system. But the concept itself has broadened through the years. Today we can think of universal service in the sense of a communication system that can transmit information in every form—sight as well as sound, and data at various speeds between computers and other machines. The distinction between voice and non-voice communications has lost significance. We have developed techniques for sending words spoken or written, pictures, drawings, binary digits, electrocardiograms, alternatively or simultaneously. Intelligence in every form can be translated to a rushing river of coded pulses that moments later

will be decodded and reconstituted at the distant end.

And again I point out that broad, uncomplicated, deeply felt concepts have powerfully influenced this whole development. I do not imply, of course, that our Bell Telephone Laboratories is the only source of technical progress in communications. There are numerous great contributors. I am convinced, however, that the basic driving idea behind Bell Laboratories—to do whatever it can, and all it can, to advance the communications art—this broad driving purpose, I am certain, has had tremendous influence throughout the world.

I say again, therefore, a business is an idea. And I have made this my theme song tonight mainly because I hope it may be meaningful to those of you who have yet to launch yourselves, who still stand on the thresholds of your careers.

How can this theme be meaningful to you? Well, it seems to me there are two views you can take of the future. You have a choice.

One view is expressed in the question "What will the future require of me?" From there you proceed logically to see your current activities and efforts as useful in helping you get ready to meet those requirements as best you can.

The other kind of forward look is very different. This is expressed, not in the words, "What will the future require of me?" but in the question, "What do I want the future to be?"

The difference I think is roughly the difference between following and leading. And if the approach you take is to see what you can do to build the future, then you will be bound to search for the energizing concept. As I said, it need not be grandiose. It need not be a "big business" concept. But it will demand action—action by you.

One or two more thoughts and then I'll be done. I think business as a whole, the business function as such, has the same need for driving concepts that a particular business has. And I would say especially to those here who are preparing for business careers, and to their teachers:

Business needs men who will bring with them strong and meaningful ideas of what business is all about. Men who see business management as an opportunity to achieve important, worthwhile social ends. Men who have goals for business in mind, and not merely goals for themselves. Men who have the will and determination to make business more productive, more effective, more responsive to human needs. Men, in short, who are ambitious not alone to make their mark, but to leave their mark on business.

Why do we go into business, anyway? Some will say, to make a living, of course. But there are many ways to do that. I am asking "Don't you feel the need to see your life in business in relation to some basic concept of business that gives it significance? And doesn't the business you enter need you to see yourself that way?"

Again I am not talking about something grandiose, or about going off half-cocked with big ideas before you have them thought out. You have to learn your way. But I do believe it is essential to see one's personal life and work in their social context. Otherwise you can hardly know for what reason you do whatever you may be doing.

Perhaps it is because I have spent my life in a business that for many years has been grounded in science, but it seems to me that the relationship between science, technology and the business function will largely determine the future. You may ask, "What about education?" I do not mean to omit that. I think of education rather as the very process that will make the relationship whatever it is to be. But to put the matter

in a nutshell, we have a scientific and technological revolution going on and the question is, how is this to be dealt with?

I would say it is our job in industry to assimilate this revolution so that practical values will flow to the public, to society at large, in abundance and in the most orderly and economical manner. This to me is about as broad and challenging a goal as we in business could ask for.

I do not ask students at this or any other school to accept my way of expressing it. And maybe there are other concepts more meaningful to you. The important thing, I repeat, is to strive for them and live by them. For I do believe that any business, and business as a whole, cannot be more than the ideas that enliven and guide it, and I am sure the most important asset of anyone entering business—important to his company as well as to himself—is the ideas he brings with him.

Lastly I would say this:

It cannot be denied that government's role in economic life is expanding. And there may be some who think this tends to diminish the role of the business manager.

I would take just the opposite view. I believe the need for management competence thereby grows larger, not smaller.

As the wealth the welfare state depends on increases, the temptations to be careless with it increase also.

We can become so fascinated by wide-ranging possibilities—whether in space, in communications, in medicine and medical care, or in any other field—that in the fullness of our imagination we can lose our sense of proportion.

But we cannot afford this. We cannot afford to be careless, extravagant, impractical. We cannot afford to squander talent, time, and money on haphazard undertakings or dreamy projects that have little chance of bearing fruit. We cannot afford to guess our way into the future, at vast expense.

I suggest to you therefore that the need for objective business leadership—imaginative, thoughtful, dedicated to forward-looking concepts, yes, but at the same time rigorous in applying tests of practical judgment—I suggest that there has never been a time when such leadership was more needed.

We must have in business, and in government no less, men who understand the need for management freedom, genuine freedom, to make good judgments and decisions; men who appreciate the absolute necessity for priorities, for doing the most important things first and others later; men who above all will do what they do because careful study and strict judgment convince them it is sound and right.

What is required is simply enough of these men, and with my thanks for the honor you do me this evening, I express also my hope, and my expectation, that from this school, year by year, will come more and more of them.

NEW TWIST ON THE ARM TWIST

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Young, of the Washington Star, reported yesterday:

There are numerous complaints among Federal employes about being pressured to

participate in the Government's 1966 savings bond drive. The employes report that they are being threatened and intimidated by their supervisors, who in turn are under pressure from their bosses who are under the White House to make the drive a success.

Mr. Young went on to report:

The "loyalty" of those who refuse to buy savings bonds also is being questioned. * * * The employes say they are being threatened with denial of promotions or even loss of jobs if they don't sign up to buy bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should be opposed to the intimidation of Government workers for political or any other kind of contributions. Government must respect the dignity of Federal workers no less than it respects the dignity of all other citizens.

It is to be hoped that citizens will generously support their Government by buying U.S. savings bonds. But this is a patriotic act to be undertaken privately, without coercion from any source.

As chairman of the Republican Task Force on the Federal Civil Service Merit System, I fail to understand why Federal workers should be coerced into the purchase of 4¼ percent interest-bearing savings bonds when the administration-promoted Sales Participation Act yields the Wall Street banker anywhere from 5½ to 6 percent interest return on his investment.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that portion of Mr. Young's "Federal Spotlight" column dealing with this serious matter:

U.S. EMPLOYEES CITE THREATS, INTIMIDATION IN BOND DRIVE

(By Joseph Young, Star staff writer)

There are numerous complaints among federal employes about being pressured to participate in the government's 1966 savings bond drive.

The employes report that they are being threatened and intimidated by their supervisors, who in turn are under pressure from their bosses who are under the gun from the White House to make the drive a success.

The "loyalty" of those who refuse to buy savings bonds also is being questioned.

President Johnson has apparently made it a matter of personal prestige that the government's savings bond drive this year be a resounding success. And Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, who is chairman of the President's savings bond campaign, is handling the drive with the vigor and determination he used to use in directing John F. Kennedy's political campaigns.

In a letter to all department and agency heads, O'Brien set the tone of the campaign when he said:

"The President personally is following the progress of this campaign and he will accept *nothing less* than the minimum immediate goal of 75 percent," O'Brien said.

The PGM went on to say that Johnson "will consider adequate *nothing less* than realization of our long-range goal of 90 percent, and will be satisfied with *nothing less* than achievement of the 100 percent record established by the White House."

Employes say the pressure of this year's savings bond drive is much greater than in previous years' campaigns or in United Givers Fund or health agencies campaigns.

The employes say they are being threatened with denial of promotions or even loss of jobs if they don't sign up to buy bonds.

At the National Institutes of Health, 40 guards complained that one of their superiors threatened to "make life miserable" for them if they didn't come through.

At the Office of Economic Opportunity, one memo questioned the "loyalty" of those employees who refused to buy savings bonds.

At Commerce, Secretary John Connor informed recalcitrant employes that there will be "a personal canvass" of them to see why they are not supporting "this important program."

In other agencies, employes are being required to write memorandums to explain why they are not purchasing bonds.

The whole situation has angered a lot of government employes, including those who agreed to buy savings bonds because of the pressure brought to bear on them.

Some employes say their financial situation is such that they can't afford to buy savings bonds. Others say they want to invest their money in stocks and other securities that will bring them a greater return. Still others say they just don't like to be pressured into doing things.

And there are those who say they disapprove of the President's Viet Nam policies and don't want to do anything that would give impetus to them.

One astute Commerce employe got around the pressure by signing up to purchase savings bonds starting in June, 1967. It apparently satisfied hard-pressed Commerce officials who listed him as one who joined the campaign.

A PATHETIC CONTRAST

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this is National Flag Week, and today, Tuesday, June 14, commemorates the 50th anniversary of the national observance of Flag Day. Although it was on June 14, 1777, 189 years ago, that the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as the official flag for the Armed Forces of the United States, it required much time, patience, and dedication on the part of one citizen, Bernard J. Cigrand, to have this day nationally recognized as Flag Day. For many years the flag had been flown on national holidays, but until President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed June 14 as Flag Day, our flag had no day of its own.

Cigrand, a smalltown schoolteacher, became the father of Flag Day when he conducted ceremonies June 14, 1885, in a small schoolhouse near Fredonia, Wis. On that day children read essays on the flag and discussed its history and meaning.

Seeking wider recognition for the flag's commemoration, Cigrand began his own public relations campaign through letters and speeches to have a day set aside, and in 1894, the first observance of a special day for our Nation's flag was held in Chicago with over 100,000 persons attending the ceremonies in the city's parks. It was not until over 20 years later that Bernard Cigrand's years of patriotic toil were rewarded with success with President Wilson's proclamation in 1916.

In pathetic contrast to Cigrand's dedication in honoring our Nation's banner are the various recent incidents in which

the flag has been desecrated at Purdue University; Cordele, Ga.; and in an off-Broadway theater in New York City. Although some States have statutes punishing willful abuse of the flag, there is at present no Federal law which covers deliberate defacement of the flag. On April 19, 1966, I introduced legislation which proposes:

Whoever publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, tramples upon, or casts contempt, either by word or act, upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than 1 year and a fine of not more than \$1,000.

To show more specifically the contrast in respect for the flag, I include the following items: "Family Proud To Fly Flag," from the Chicago Tribune of June 7, 1966, and "Theater Faces License Hearing on Flag Burning," from the New York Times of April 12, 1966, in the RECORD. I am sure that after reading both accounts there will be no doubt as to which party personifies the dignity and respect which this Nation renders to its national symbol on this, the 50th anniversary of Flag Day:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 7, 1966]

FAMILY PROUD TO FLY FLAG

"Frankly, we don't mind being called flag-waving Americans," said Mrs. Eugene J. Tamillo, 278 N. Wolf rd., Des Plaines.

Proof of that unconcern is the American flag flying from an 18-foot flagpole in the Tamillos' front yard.

The Tamillos, who have been flying the flag for four years, find it's become a landmark.

"It's the easiest way to find our house," Mrs. Tamillo said.

GIRL SCOUT LEADER

Mrs. Tamillo first got the idea to fly the flag when she was den mother for her son Michael's Cub Scout troop. Michael, 15, is no longer a Cub Scout but his sister, Margaret, 13, is a Girl Scout Cadette. Mrs. Tamillo is leader of troop No. 11.

"This is a wonderful way to teach the flag ceremony to the girls," she said. Every Tuesday, the Scouts gather outside for the traditional Girl Scout flag ceremony.

LEARN FLAG ETIQUETTE

The girls learn the correct way to display and honor the flag, she said. The Tamillos don't confine their teaching of patriotism to flag flying.

"We plan our vacation trips around historical landmarks," Mrs. Tamillo said.

Mr. and Mrs. Tamillo also enjoy parades and martial music. Tamillo served four years in the South Pacific during World War II. He was a major in the United States army. He is now a vice president of Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust company.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1966]

THEATER FACES LICENSE HEARING ON FLAG BURNING—USE OF 2 CHILDREN IN PLAY PROTESTING VIETNAM WAR ALSO TO BE STUDIED (By John Kifner)

The Department of Licenses announced early yesterday that it had ordered an immediate hearing on the license of a small East Village theater where an American flag was burned during a production Saturday night.

However, by late afternoon the departmental show-cause order had not been served on the managers of the Bridge Theater, 4 Saint Mark's Place, which specializes in experimental plays and avant-garde "underground" movies.

"All I know about this is what you gentlemen have been kind enough to tell me," Miss Elsa Tambellini, the producer of the show, said at a hastily called news conference at the office of her attorneys, Kunstler, Kunstler & Kinoy, 511 Fifth Avenue.

The department also charged that two children, 5 and 8 years old, had appeared without the permission of the Mayor's office in the post-midnight skit attacking the war in Vietnam, and that "the foulest words were put into their mouths, both in English and Spanish."

ACTIONS CONFIRMED

Miss Tambellini, who was accompanied by the theater manager, Arthur Sainer, confirmed that an American flag was burned and that children did appear in the production. But they and several other persons at the performance said that the children had said nothing and were not on stage during the flag burning.

License Commissioner Joel J. Tyler said that he began the action at 10 A.M. yesterday after a report on the play by one of his inspectors had been brought to his attention.

He said that both the burning of the flag and the performance of a child under 16 on stage without the written consent of their parents and the Mayor and the notification of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children were violations of the state penal law.

"The Mayor? What's he got to do with this?" officials of the theater asked after they had been told of the latter statute.

Miss Tambellini angrily said that the department's action was "a complete distortion of freedom of speech" and contended that the theater was being attacked for being critical of the war, Mr. Tyler denied this.

The playlet in question was "LBJ," one of 10 skits and underground movies presented during a three-hour, fifty-minute production entitled "Underground Benefit Bash—Night-crawlers at the Bridge."

The \$2.50 show, which played to a packed 88-seat house, was to raise funds for the theater. The "LBJ" portion was advertised as a "live, multiscreen, love-hate paradox." Its author, Jose Rodriguez-Saltero, was not available for comment.

DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT IN EAST PAKISTAN

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week, it was my privilege to chair a panel discussion sponsored by the Washington Chapter of the Society of International Development on the problems of encouraging the growth of governmental capacity and private political participation in the developing countries. The panelists put particular emphasis on programs developed in East Pakistan where each had considerable experience.

One of the panel members was Edgar L. Owens, a young AID official, who has just completed a book at the Brookings Institution entitled "A Democratic Strategy of Development." Mr. Owens' remarks before the society are a particularly lucid explanation of the problems and possibilities in this area of develop-

ment and I believe that deserve the attention of all Members of the House. Under unanimous consent, I include the text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT IN EAST PAKISTAN
(A summary of remarks made by Edgar L. Owens at the Society for International Development, June 8, 1966)

The theory of the local development program in East Pakistan is an old idea, not a new one, and one which we know very well ourselves—the idea of democracy. Those who started the program believe that by the end of the 19th century there can be drawn from the history of the Western democracies certain principles and institutions of democratic development which explain our own progress, and which are transferable. Because of their familiarity with Britain, they talk about Britain more than the other democracies. In fact, any of the democracies could be taken as a model.

There are several ways of explaining why the Pakistani architects begin with democratic theory. One of them is to say that only governments can create the legal and institutional framework which development requires. It is true that it is machines, and not political ideas, that can abolish poverty. But governments have had to invent new laws and institutions, to enable a society to use technology efficiently. Our system of money and credit, the market, the private corporation, the public corporation, modern local government, the law of contracts—these and many others are just as much inventions as the steam engine and just as necessary for development as the products of the assembly line.

These kinds of inventions require government action, but they are not a political doctrine. Not only the Western democracies, but many authoritarian states—the Communist nations, Germany and Italy during their Fascist period, pre-war Japan, and more recently Nasser's Egypt—all of these countries have demonstrated a capacity to produce bread. The critical question, therefore, is the political philosophy of the government which creates the necessary legal and institutional framework.

Of our own Founding Fathers or the 19th century British reformers we would say: they valued freedom more highly than bread. After they had institutionalized freedom in the forms of democratic government, they simply assumed that people could use these forms to solve whatever problems concerned them—including what is today known as the problem of development.

Today the emphasis is on bread, not freedom. In the rush for riches there is little talk of freedom except for expressions of hope that somehow or other freedom will happen. But freedom, as a principle for organizing society, is a design and not an accident. The East Pakistan program is based on what its creators believe is the design of freedom. One of its purposes, but not its only purpose, is the production of bread.

Another way to describe the East Pakistan program is through two well-known quotations. The first, the nature of the problem, is from John Adams:

"The poor man's conscience is clear; yet he is ashamed He feels himself out of sight of the others, groping in the dark. Mankind takes no notice of him. He rambles and wanders unheeded. In the midst of a crowd, at church, in the market . . . he is in as much obscurity as he could be in a garret or cellar. He is not disapproved, censured, or reproached; he is only not seen. To be wholly overlooked, and to know it, is intolerable."

The solution is from de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*:

"Local assemblies of citizens constitute the strength of free nations. Town meetings are

to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring it within reach; they teach men how to use it and enjoy it. A nation may establish a system of free government, but without the spirit of municipal institutions it cannot have the spirit of liberty."

The East Pakistan program can be described as the creation of municipal institutions in which men can learn how to use and enjoy liberty. It is the creation of political power for people who have never possessed it in the institutions of democracy. This is the essential difference between local development in East Pakistan and in other developing countries. Of other countries we would say, in de Tocqueville's words, that there are many which have created a "system of free government" at the level of central and provincial governments, but they have not yet created the municipal institutions which bring liberty "within reach" so that people en masse can learn how to "use and enjoy" it. In countries which have a system of free government only at the top, democracy has no meaning in the everyday activities of ordinary people.

"When a politician tells us in his speeches that he is on the side of the people, that he is only in politics in order to improve our living conditions, asking for our votes, promising to freeze prices, he is well aware that by touching on these grave problems he will win at the polls. Afterward he divorces himself from the people. He looks at them with half-closed eyes, and with a pride that hurts us." This is from "Child of the Dark," the autobiography of a slumdweller in Sao Paulo, Brazil, and is typical of the attitude of the unseen and unheeded toward what is said to be democratic politics.

In East Pakistan, the meaning of democracy in the everyday activities of ordinary people, in the first three years of the program, 1962-1965, has been these things:

1. 70,000 miles of farm-to-market roads, which is possibly more than all the developing countries combined, with the exception of Communist China. The average cost is \$610 per mile. These roads have reduced the cost of transport from \$1.50 per ton mile to .50¢ per ton mile as the means of transport has shifted from people's heads to the bicycle rickshaw. By Western standards, where truck transport on modern highways costs .05¢-10¢ per ton mile, the cost is still high and the means of transport still primitive. But to the village farmers of East Pakistan, these dirt roads are the beginning of a transport revolution which increases their income by 10-20% without any change in the prices paid by the consumers. In the experimental county of the Province, where there are now five ton trucks operating on brick surfaced roads, the cost of transport per ton mile is down to about 15¢, just 10% of the cost of a few years ago.

Today, East Pakistan is one of the few places in the underdeveloped world where all the farmers can get to market.

2. Four million acres, or 15% of the cultivated land area of the Province has been improved through small-scale drainage and irrigation schemes or flood protection embankments at an average cost of less than \$10 per acre and possibly less than \$5 per acre.

3. An increase of more than two million tons, or about a fourth, in rice production, and the start of crop diversification and commercial farming. All the standard indicators of agricultural progress are rising, but the statistics cover up the essential difference between East Pakistan and a number of other places in which the standard indicators are also rising. In West Pakistan, Mexico, Brazil, to some extent in India, and in several other countries, central governments have used price policy, improved supply systems, better marketing, export incentives, and other inducements to persuade many large and medium sized farmers to go modern. But none of these countries has solved the

problem of the subsistence farmer. In East Pakistan it is masses of subsistence farmers, literally hundreds of thousands who are going modern. Hence, we say that there may be an agricultural revolution underway in the Province, though we must also say that it is too soon to be sure this is really happening.

The urban program has not progressed as rapidly as the rural program. Thus far, it consists of paved streets and city drainage systems, municipal water supplies and sewerage systems, city planning, agricultural markets, and recreational facilities. Except for streets and drainage systems, not much has happened yet, and the urban program has yet to create the widespread expectation of a brighter future, which now exists in the countryside, and which is justified, people believe, by recent personal experience.

All of these programs are operated on the formula of modern local government. Again the model is said to be mainly British, though it could be taken from other democracies as well.

Modern local government is a method of modernization imposed by central governments upon local governments for the purpose of transforming them into democratic development institutions. According to the formula, the Provincial government of East Pakistan defines the general policy and sets standards of technical and administrative performance. The standards are enforced through inspection, auditing the accounts, and by withholding funds when the standards are not met. The provincial government also supports local programs with technical advice and information and by expanding training programs of many levels and kinds. But the Provincial government does not interfere in the operational decisions of the local councils. It supervises the processes and methods of the local institutions, but not the individual activities themselves. It is the local councils which do the planning, make the operational decisions, determine the priorities of investment, and do the work. Thus, within the framework of a uniform provincial policy, there is diversity of local solution.

The formula of modern local government represents an almost complete reversal of the traditional centralist control of local government which is common throughout the underdeveloped world. I am sure that many of you know that local governments in most of the developing countries are moribund, often corrupt, distrusted by the people and uninvolved in development. They operate more as local offices of the central government rather than as semi-autonomous local self-governing development institutions as in the Western democracies. Central governments impose uniformity of implementation as well as uniformity of policy. Central control is exercised through minute regulation and review of activities individually, as if one thing were not related to another, as if, for example, a number of separate roads could not be combined into a road network. Local initiative is stifled, not encouraged. Local solution is not adjusted to local circumstance and local attitudes by local people. Peter the Great once said of such a system, when explaining to one of his Ministers why he wanted to decentralize tax administration in Russia, "It is difficult for a man to understand everything, and govern from a distance."

Local government in East Pakistan is an integrated county-township system in rural areas, and the incorporated city and unincorporated town in urban areas. In the rural system there are, on average, ten townships per county. In the smaller cities and towns there is a single municipal council. But in the several large cities, the two-tiered system is used. In the provincial capital of Dacca, there are 27 urban townships plus

the municipal council. This system is reminiscent of Thomas Jefferson's conception of an urban precinct as the base unit of city government.

In the two-tiered system, the larger unit is regarded as the level of coordination, planning, supervision and training. The smaller unit is the level of operation.

County or municipal coordination and planning are based largely on the proposals of the townships, assisted by whatever technical staff is available. Each local authority is required to prepare a three-year development plan. In the countryside, this now includes many of the fields which Westerners would call the traditional functions of local government. In the cities, it includes the activities mentioned earlier. The Plan is, literally, a Big Book, about three feet by four feet, full of maps and diagrams and data sheets of many kinds that would be described by us bureaucrats as a detailed feasibility study and work plan.

All activities are planned on the basis of networks and systems. Thus, the local councils do not plan a road here and a road there, which is common in local development programs throughout the world, but a road network which links all villages with each other, with their township and county headquarters, and county headquarters with the national transportation system. The councils are not trying to push fertilizers and better seeds, but to prepare a comprehensive agricultural production plan which is linked with storage and marketing and includes the necessary 'agro-industries.' Though here, we must note that progress in storage, marketing, and industry is limited to the pilot areas. Many of these economic activities are organized through co-operatives because, in this overcrowded land, where the average farm is only 3.4 acres, practically every individual person is too small to use modern technology efficiently as an individual.

The training programs are a combination of vocational courses, extension programs and a general information system. Vocational courses have been organized in literacy, simple construction, and brick-burning. In the extension courses, the villagers themselves are the extension agents. The role of the technical staff, which is mostly assigned at the county level, is to instruct them and then supervise the programs which they organize in the village, on the farm, or in the slum. Experience, to date, suggests that these programs work well if supervision is persistent.

The various local programs are operated through an elaborate system of committees and subcommittees. The system is admittedly a bit cumbersome, but it was designed to create more leadership positions than there were traditional leaders. Today, there are around a half million people, out of seven million rural families, who are members of either planning committees or project implementation committees.

This, in brief, is the way the program works. Because the primary institutions are political, self-governing institutions, we call it democratic development, and in the long run, it is the political and social changes induced by the program which matter most.

In the political sphere, there is rapid progress in what the political scientist would call the identification of local interest, but only a little progress in what he would call the fusion of local interest with national interest.

First, let me explain that in the Basic Democracies system, the election of Basic Democrats, or township councillors, as we would call them in America, is by universal adult suffrage. The election of the President and the members of the national and provincial assemblies by the councillors, of whom there are 80,000, not the electorate at large.

In the elections of 1964-1965, there is considerable evidence that the people are beginning to believe that development is possible in their lives now, that development begins with political institutions, and that they equate development leadership with political leadership. In the pilot areas, which cover about a fifth of the province, practically all the candidates were products of the local development committee system. A number of incumbents, elected in 1960, before the program began and who were indifferent to development after the program was started, were defeated. In the rest of the Province, where progress has been less, the trend is not so clear-cut, but it is the same trend.

At the national level, the only evidence of a relationship between the local program and politics is from the presidential race. Nearly all observers of the election agree that the program was a source of electoral strength for President Ayub. There is no way of measuring how much, but even Ayub's political opponents agree that there is a popular identification of the program with the President. The opposition has been obliged to temper its original hostility to the program as they have come to realize its popularity in the countryside.

On the other hand, the local program seems to have had no particular influence on the elections for the national and provincial assemblies.

The problem here is that subsistence societies are atomized societies, as we all know. The villager or the urban slum-dweller must first of all be able to think of himself as a citizen of his township and county or city before he can be expected to understand a governmental unit as remote from his personal life as the provincial and national government. Whereas members of the local development committees had no difficulty in understanding that some of their number should run for the township councils, they have not yet persuaded themselves that local leaders might also become members of the higher legislative bodies, or that local people can influence candidates for the higher bodies. Thus, development was a major campaign issue at the township level, but in the elections for the two higher assemblies, development was hardly mentioned. The villager must be able to distinguish between policy and implementation so that he knows whether the politician to be influenced is the member of the local council or the local member of the higher assemblies. At the time the election was held, the villagers were still learning about the implementation and still thinking in county and township terms. How quickly their level of understanding will expand nobody knows, but hopefully, in the 1970 elections there will be some evidence that the fusion of national and local interest is underway.

The social trends are of the kind which suggest that the democratic faith in gradual change is still a practicable ideal. In Mao Tse Tung's peasant version of Mr. Marx, there is supposed to be an irreconcilable conflict between traditional leaders and subsistence farmers. If the present trend continues, history will record that the Bengali villagers are incompetent Marxists but good Jeffersonians. There is considerable evidence that the villagers will continue to accept the traditional leaders if they are willing to become development leaders. The other way round, there is considerable evidence that the traditional leaders prefer to accept development rather than risk the loss of their inherited position of power and privilege. The evidence consists of the continuation in office or participation in the committee system of many of the traditional leaders. In the village, reorganization in favor of development seems to start happening spontaneously as an indirect result of development activities. Those who participate in development gradually become the dominant

group, often before they become the majority. Gradually trust begins to replace suspicion. The villagers begin to work together and with others from the same township and county as they realize that all can benefit from common effort, and as they come to realize that an irrigation ditch follows the contour of the land and not the contour of local rivalries. The nature of argument is beginning to change. People are learning that compromising differences of opinion or accepting the will of the majority is a necessary prelude to action, that meeting deadlines is important if plans are to be turned into reality.

Finally, Government employees are beginning to work with the people and the people are beginning to think of public officials as helpers, not masters. Of the problem of bringing local people and local officials together in Britain a century ago, one constitutional authority wrote: "The county magistrates, instead of sulking at their partial dethronement, came forward with public spirit to assume a new role and new duties. To their experienced guidance is owing the fact that a profound transition has been effected without friction and without breach of continuity." There is the same trend in East Pakistan today.

I would like to close with a few sentences from the final volume of Churchill's "History of the English Speaking Peoples." He wrote them as a summary statement about the rise of democracy in Britain in the 19th century. In future tense, they could as well be a statement of the ultimate purpose of democratic development in Britain, in East Pakistan, or Puerto Rico, or any country. "The aristocracy, who had guided for centuries the advance of Britain, was merged in the rising mass of the nation. . . progress and prosperity had been continuous in all classes. Conservative forces had shown that they could ride the storm, and indeed that there was no great storm between the domestic parties. . . No one felt himself left out of the constitution. . . It did not matter which party ruled; though they found fault with one another, as they had a perfect right to do. None of the ancient inhibitions obstructed the adventurous. . . Active and vigorous politics should be sustained. To go forward gradually but boldly seemed to be fully justified."

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LATIN AMERICAN NUCLEAR FREE ZONE

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is generally recognized that one of our most critical international problems in the years ahead will be the possibility of the increase in the number of nations possessing the capability of using nuclear weapons and a consequent increase in the potential for world instability. There is less consent on the steps that should be taken to prevent the spread. As we know, the administration has a proposal pending at the 18-nation talks in Geneva and a number of scholars and commentators have offered alternate routes to the goal of restricting nuclear capability in the interests of international peace and stability.

One of the possibilities frequently mentioned is that of regional nuclear free zones. This idea has been current in Latin America for some time. In fact, the preparatory commission established by the hemispheric nations is scheduled to meet again in August.

Mr. Peter Barnes, Washington bureau manager for the Lowell, Mass., Sun, recently analyzed the history and prospects of proposals for a Latin American nuclear free zone in a paper prepared for Dr. William Manger's course on inter-American relations at Georgetown University. I think that Mr. Barnes' paper is a constructive contribution to the discussion of this vital issue, and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LATIN AMERICAN NUCLEAR FREE ZONE

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of a "nuclear free zone" is a rather recent one, stemming from efforts that have been made in the past few years to halt the spread of atomic weapons. Adam Rapacki, the Polish foreign minister, was the first to introduce formally the notion of a zone from which nuclear weapons would be excluded when he proposed that Central Europe be denuclearized. Since the Rapacki Plan, similar proposals have been put forward for other geographical areas, notably Africa, Scandinavia and Latin America. The United Nations General Assembly in 1961 passed a resolution endorsing the idea of an African nuclear free zone. In 1963 the General Assembly expressed the hope that the Latin American nations would study measures that might be taken to ban nuclear weapons in the Western Hemisphere south of the United States.

The problems of establishing a nuclear free zone are much greater than would appear on the surface. In the first place, the will must exist among all the nations of the geographical area to forswear atomic weapons. In many cases where nations believe atomic weapons to be essential for security or prestige, they have been reluctant to commit themselves to permanent non-nuclear status. Another requirement for a non-nuclear zone is that it be guaranteed by the existing nuclear powers. A nuclear free zone must enhance, and not diminish, the military stability and security of the area in question. Additional problems arise from the difficulties of inspection and verification and of punishing any violators of the accord.

Of all the geographic regions and sub-regions in the world, Latin America is perhaps best suited for the purpose of establishing a nuclear free zone. It has, unlike Africa, a tradition of regional cooperation for the purpose of excluding extra-continental military conflict. During the early months of World War II, Latin America and the United States declared the lands and waters from Greenland to Cape Horn to be "off limits" for the European and Asian combatants. In 1947, the nations of the Western Hemisphere followed up their wartime solidarity by concluding the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. (The fact that the World War II declaration of Western Hemisphere neutrality was not respected by extra-continental powers points out the need to obtain such respect for a nuclear free zone.)

Moreover, unlike Central Europe, Latin America is not a major theatre of the Cold War. No Soviet troops and only small numbers of American troops are stationed in the region. The balance of power would not be upset by the establishment of a nuclear free zone. And, except for a few brief months in

1962, nuclear weapons have never been deployed in any Latin American country.

Latin America is also fortunate that, despite the role played by arms and military men throughout its history, no state in the region currently aspires to nuclear status. President Juan Perón of Argentina is reputed at one time to have toyed with the idea of making Argentina a nuclear power, but nothing came of his fancy once the rather backward atomic capacity of post-war Argentina was explained to him.¹

Today only three Latin American nations—Argentina, Brazil and Mexico—could realistically be said to possess the industrial and scientific capability of building atomic bombs within the next decade. At present, however, according to the March, 1966, Foreign Reactor List of the US Atomic Energy Commission, Argentina has only one small research reactor in operation in Buenos Aires (30 thermal kilowatts), and another (1 to 5 thermal megawatts) being built in Ezeiza that will reach criticality late this year. Brazil has three small research reactors (all under 5 thermal megawatts) in operation in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Belo Horizonte. Mexico as of yet has none.

The only other reactors in Latin America are near Bogotá, Colombia (10 thermal kilowatts) and in Caracas, Venezuela (3 thermal megawatts). Since it would require a reactor generating approximately 25 megawatts of thermal energy to produce enough plutonium to build one small atomic bomb per year, it is clear that the existing reactors in Latin America are virtually without military significance.

Argentina, Brazil and Mexico all have announced plans to build large power reactors in the near future which would have military significance. However, it is quite a jump from possessing a civilian power reactor to being able to fabricate an atomic bomb. One basic requirement for building a bomb is a plant to separate plutonium from the spent reactor fuel. If any Latin American nation should in the future build such a plant, this step would indeed have grave military implications. But neither Brazil, Mexico or Argentina have evidenced any desire to go beyond what is necessary for the peaceful exploitation of atomic energy.

It is to be noted, too, that all the reactors presently in Latin America have been opened to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. This organization, an autonomous United Nations agency with headquarters in Vienna, Austria, inspects some 40 reactors throughout the world to check against the diversion of plutonium to military ends.

Finally, Latin America has established a strong record—at the UN, at the 18-nation Geneva Disarmament Conference (where Mexico and Brazil are participants), in the Organization of American States, and in adherence to international treaties—as a supporter of nuclear arms control efforts. All Latin American nations except Cuba signed the 1963 Moscow Treaty banning atomic tests in the atmosphere. Similarly, Argentina and Chile adhered to the 12-nation 1959 treaty excluding atomic weapons from Antarctica. In the single instance when nuclear armaments were introduced into Cuba by an extra-continental power, the OAS acted swiftly to authorize members to take "all measures, individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, which they deem necessary to insure that the Government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet powers military material . . . which may threaten the peace and security of the continent, and to prevent the missiles in Cuba with offensive ca-

¹ Cf. John Beaton, *Must the Bomb Spread?*, London, 1966; p. 59.

pability from ever becoming an active threat to the peace and security of the continent."²

II. STAGE ONE TO DENUCLEARIZATION: THE UNITED NATIONS

One of the less noted side effects of the Cuban missile crisis was the launching of a movement to establish a permanent Latin American nuclear free zone.

The missiles in Cuba, as President Kennedy pointed out, were capable of hitting targets as far south as Lima, Peru. Though it was not likely that the missiles in Cuba would be aimed in a southerly direction, the suddenness with which the Western Hemisphere had become a nuclear theatre jolted Latin Americans into recognizing that there was a need for collective action to preserve—once the Cuban missile were removed—the nuclear free status of the continent.

The first step was taken by Brazil while the sparks from the missile crisis were still hot. On October 29, 1962, Brazil submitted to the UN General Assembly's Political Committee a draft resolution seeking to extend to Latin America the UN's 1961 resolution recommending a nuclear free zone for Africa. The immediate problem at the time was still to obtain removal from Cuba of the Soviet missiles and to verify that complete withdrawal was in fact being carried out. With this in mind, the Brazilian resolution called upon all Latin American countries to "dispose forthwith of any nuclear weapons or nuclear delivery vehicles which may now be situated in territory under their jurisdiction."³ Several days later Bolivia, Chile and Ecuador joined Brazil in sponsoring the resolution, and a new clause was added appealing to Latin American nations to "make provision for such verification of these arrangements as may be agreed in order to insure that they are . . . being observed."⁴ But the heart of the resolution was its call to prohibit permanently in Latin America the building, storing and testing of atomic weapons and delivery vehicles.

The Cuban delegate at the UN, Carlos M. Lechuga-Hévia, termed the Brazilian idea for a Latin American nuclear free zone "very laudable." However, he said the resolution should include a provision calling on nuclear powers not to use atomic weapons "against" Latin American states.⁵

On November 19, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile and Ecuador agreed, upon United States urging, to defer consideration of the resolution until the following year. The United States apparently felt that the resolution would serve no useful purpose until an agreement for verifying the withdrawal of missiles from Cuba could be reached. President Kennedy, asked about the nuclear free zone plan at a press conference November 20, replied that "the question comes down to the willingness of the countries of Latin America to accept the Brazilian proposal and the development of an adequate inspection system. That's the issue."⁶

The next move came on March 21, 1963, when President Adolfo López Mateos of Mexico wrote to the presidents of Brazil, Bolivia, Chile and Ecuador—the sponsors of the 1962 UN resolution—urging the continuation of efforts to denuclearize Latin America. The Mexican initiative was favorably received by the other presidents, and on April 29, 1963, López Mateos and President João Goulart of Brazil released simultaneously in Mexico City and Rio de Janeiro the texts of a declaration signed by themselves and the chief executives

² The New York Times, October 24, 1962, p. 10.

³ The New York Times, October 30, 1962, p. 16.

⁴ *Ibid.*, November 9, 1962, p. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, November 17, 1962, p. 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, November 20, 1962, p. 14; and November 21, 1962, p. 10.

of Bolivia, Chile and Ecuador. The declaration called upon the other 15 states of Latin America, including Cuba, to join in an agreement committing all nations in the region to refrain from "manufacturing, receiving, storing or testing nuclear arms or instruments to deliver these arms."⁷ The joint declaration marked the entrance into the denuclearization movement of Mexico—the country which was soon to take over from Brazil as the prime mover of the nuclear ban effort. The immediate reaction to the April 29 declaration, however, was a deafening silence. Only Haiti, of the 15 Latin American states appealed to, said it was willing to commit itself to the renunciation of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles as called for by the five presidents.⁸ Haiti, of course, did not have much to lose.

Latin American support for a denuclearized continent grew when the proposal was introduced again in the UN in November, 1963. Brazil and Mexico, joined by Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Haiti, Costa Rica, Panama and Uruguay, introduced a resolution in the General Assembly which "noted with satisfaction" the declaration of April 29 and expressed the hope that the Latin American nations would take steps to implement that declaration.⁹

The United States privately objected to the Latin American resolution as being too strong. In a speech to the General Assembly's Political Committee, Charles C. Stelle of the U.S. delegation indicated that the U.S. supported the principle of nuclear free zones, but only if they met three conditions. Stelle listed these conditions as: (1) all states in the geographical area must be included; (2) there must be "adequate verification;" and (3) the military balance in the region must not be upset.¹⁰

Since it was not at all clear that Cuba would join a verified Latin American nuclear free zone, the United States indicated that it could not support a resolution which called for actual steps to implement the April 29 declaration.

Cuba, earlier in the Political Committee debates, had stated that it thought the idea of a Latin American nuclear free zone was worthwhile, but that it had its own conditions for participation. These conditions were that the Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be included in the denuclearized territory, and that the United States restore to Cuba the "illegally usurped" Guantánamo naval base.¹¹

To win U.S. support, the sponsors of the resolution watered down the text to say merely that the General Assembly "expresses the hope that the States of Latin America will initiate studies . . . in light of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations . . . concerning the measures that should be taken to achieve the aims" of the April 29 declaration.¹²

On November 13, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson announced that the U.S. would support the modified resolution, and on November 19, the Political Committee approved the measure 89-0, with 14 abstentions. Among those abstaining were Cuba, France, the Soviet Union and other Communist-bloc countries, and Venezuela, which sided with Cuba in claiming that the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands should be included in the atom-free zone. Strangely, Albania and Rumania broke from the rest of the Communist bloc and voted in favor of the resolution. Eight days later the General Assembly formally adopted the resolution by a vote of 91-0, with 15 abstentions. The line-up of the

key countries was the same as in the Political Committee.

Thus ended the United Nations phase of the effort to exclude nuclear weapons from Latin America. Before proceeding to discuss the next stage, it might be useful to point out some of the issues and positions which emerged at the UN and which were to crop up again in subsequent negotiations.

First and foremost was the problem of Cuba. The United States' chief interest in a Latin American nuclear free zone, it appeared, was to stabilize the present balance of military power, which involved keeping Soviet missiles out of the Western Hemisphere. Washington therefore insisted that any Latin American nuclear free zone which was to have its support must include Cuba and must provide for international inspection of that island. Brazil was later to become the leading Latin American advocate of this position.

Cuba, on the other hand, while voicing theoretical support for a nuclear free zone, was not eager to formalize in a treaty the humiliation it suffered in 1962 with the abrupt removal of the Soviet missiles. Moreover, the regime of Premier Fidel Castro was undoubtedly reluctant to sign away that small shadow of a military threat which Cuba represented as a possible launching pad for future Soviet or Chinese nuclear weapons. Clearly, if Castro was going to give up his right to brandish nuclear missiles again, he was not going to do so without getting some major concessions from the United States.

A second thorny issue concerned lands in Latin America controlled by the United States and extra-hemispheric countries (Great Britain, France and the Netherlands). Cuba, supported by Venezuela, asserted that all U.S. possessions in Latin America should be covered by the atom ban. The U.S. thus far has agreed to include the Panama Canal Zone and possibly Guantánamo in a Latin American nuclear free zone, but not Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

These problems, along with several others that will be discussed below, were to become major stumbling blocks when the Latin Americans got down to the brass-tacks business of drafting a treaty and trying to get it signed.

III. STAGE TWO: THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION

The overthrow of President Goulart in 1964 put a damper on Brazil's leadership in establishing a Latin American nuclear free zone. But President López Mateos of Mexico eagerly picked up whatever slack was created and convoked a meeting for November, 1964, to consider how to proceed.

The self-styled Preliminary Conference on the Denuclearization of Latin America, held in Mexico City November 23-27, 1964, was attended by representatives of 17 Latin American nations. Most of the delegates were the ambassadors of their respective countries in Mexico. The absent countries were Cuba, Venezuela and Guatemala.¹³

The Preliminary Conference approved five resolutions, of which the most important was Resolution II, moved by Chile. This resolution established a permanent Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America (Comisión Preparatoria para la Denuclearización de América Latina—Copredal) with its seat in Mexico City. The Preparatory Commission was to be made up of the 17 nations at the conference, with the understanding that the absent Latin American governments could join at any time. The Commission would have three tasks: (1) to draft a treaty for creating a Latin American nuclear free zone; (2) to negotiate with the nuclear powers to obtain their respect for the zone; and (3) to negotiate with the colonial powers to seek inclusion of their

hemispheric territories in the denuclearized zone. Alfonso García Robles, the Mexican Undersecretary of Foreign Relations, was named President of the permanent Preparatory Commission. The two vice-presidents were José Sette Cámara, the Brazilian ambassador to the UN, and Rafael Equizábal Tobías, ambassador of El Salvador to Mexico.

The Preparatory Commission, it is to be noted, was set up independently and outside of the OAS. The primary reasons for this were the presence in the OAS of the United States and the exclusion from the OAS of Cuba. At Copredal's next session, an effort was made by Colombia and Costa Rica to move the Commission under OAS auspices. The attempt was opposed by Mexico, Chile, Ecuador and Peru, and was defeated.¹⁴ The question of the role of the OAS was to arise again, however, at the third session of Copredal in April, 1966.

The Preparatory Commission held its first session March 15-22, 1965, in Mexico City. The major accomplishment of the March meeting was the appointment of three working groups and a coordinating committee. Working Group A was assigned the task of studying the geographical limits of the nuclear free zone and the problems of territories within the zone controlled by extra-zonal countries. Working Group B was to study the problems of inspection, verification and control of a denuclearization treaty. Working Group C was charged with undertaking the necessary negotiations to get the support of the nuclear powers for the treaty. A five-man Coordinating Committee, chaired by García Robles, was to tie together the efforts of the working groups and draw up a preliminary draft treaty.

The second session of Copredal was held in Mexico City August 23-September 3, 1965. Nineteen Latin American nations were present. The sole absentee was Cuba, which again rejected its invitation. Observers from the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, Japan, Canada, Norway, Denmark and Sweden also attended.

Among the highlights of Copredal's second session were statements by extra-continental countries regarding their attitude towards a Latin American nuclear free zone. The observer from the Netherlands, a nation with no independent nuclear aspirations, stated that his government was prepared to contract, on behalf of its "overseas provinces" (Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles), the same obligations in a denuclearization treaty as the other sovereign states of Latin America. This declaration was warmly welcomed by the delegates.

A few days later, the British ambassador to Mexico, Nicholas J. A. Cheetham, in a communication to the president of Copredal, stated that "Her Majesty's government are prepared to consider carefully, at the opportune time and in consultation with the affected governments, whatever steps the Preparatory Commission may desire to make in order to include the Western Hemisphere territories of the United Kingdom in a formal agreement." Though Cheetham added that this was not a final decision to permit the inclusion of Belize, the Falkland Islands, the Bahamas or the British West Indies in the denuclearized zone, the Latin American delegates were pleased with the British position. Diplomats noted that it was perhaps the first time in history that Britain had indicated willingness to yield some sovereign rights over any of its territories.

An earlier British statement, however, was a source of consternation to the conference. In reply to inquiries made by Working Group C, London stated that it "reserved the right" to refuse to submit its planes or warships to inspection by the Latin Americans when travelling through the waters or airspace of the

⁷ Ibid., April 30, 1963, p. 1.

⁸ Ibid., May 8, 1963, p. 6.

⁹ Ibid., November 10, 1963, p. 33.

¹⁰ Ibid., November 5, 1963, p. 9.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., November 12, 1963, p. 2.

¹³ *Excelsior* (Mexico City), November 24, 1964, p. 1.

¹⁴ Ibid., August 28, 1965, p. 12.

denuclearized zones. The U.S. was later to take a similar position.

The response of France to the inquiries of Working Groups A and C was terse. France would not permit inclusion of French Guiana or the French-held islands in the Caribbean in the denuclearized zone, nor, since she had not signed the Moscow Treaty, would she commit herself not to test nuclear devices in the Western Hemisphere.¹⁵

The Soviet Union, a nuclear power with no Western Hemisphere possession, declared in a communication to Working Groups A and C: "The denuclearization of Latin America should include all the Latin American states, without exception, including territories administered by extra-continental powers." Here Russia was taking a position that could be interpreted in two ways. The latter part of the statement referring to extra-continental powers (which presumably included the United States), was directly in line with the Cuban position. However, Soviet insistence on the inclusion of all Latin American states—a position corresponding to that of the U.S.—could be viewed either as an attempt to get Castro off its hands, or as an effort to enhance Castro's bargaining position by giving him a veto power.

Among the decisions of the second session were agreement to include Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago in the nuclear free zone, and, most importantly, to authorize the Coordinating Committee to "prepare . . . a working paper for use in drafting a . . . preliminary draft" treaty. The conference expressed the hope that from the working document prepared by the Coordinating Committee, the third session of Copredal would be able to draw up a preliminary draft treaty which all states would approve.

The third and most recent session of the Preparatory Commission was held in Mexico City April 19–May 4. At this session the working paper prepared by the Coordinating Committee—which actually took the form of a preliminary draft treaty—was discussed. But contrary to the hopes expressed at the preceding session, the Coordinating Committee's draft led to more controversy than unity.

It became clear at the third session of Copredal that a serious rift was developing among the Latin American nations, chiefly between Mexico and Brazil. The government of Brazilian President Humberto Castelo Branco was of the opinion that continental security would be affected unless Cuba could be subjected to international control and inspection. Backed by Venezuela and Argentina, Brazil declared that it would not take part in a nuclear free zone that did not include Cuba.

José Sette Câmara, the Brazilian representative, also argued that a denuclearization treaty would be worthless unless all the nuclear powers agreed to respect it. He said the treaty should require the signatures of all the nuclear powers, who should guarantee not to deploy nuclear weapons within the zone or to use nuclear weapons "against" any Latin American country.

Because Cuba had again refused to attend the Copredal session, and because France and the Soviet Union had refused to support the nuclear free zone as currently proposed (nothing had been heard from China), Brazil felt that further preliminary work was necessary. Sette Câmara, as one of the five members of the Coordinating Committee, had strenuously objected to the Committee's preparation of an actual draft treaty. He claimed that in so doing, the Committee had exceeded its authority to produce only a "working paper."

Mexico, on the other hand, strongly felt that a Latin American denuclearization treaty should not wait for Cuban participation or for guarantees from all the nuclear

powers. To do so, Mexico argued, would be effectively to kill all chances for any kind of treaty. Under the leadership of Garcia Robles, Mexico and the three other members of the Coordinating Committee (El Salvador, Haiti and Ecuador) had outvoted Brazil and gone ahead to produce the preliminary draft treaty.

The Brazilians countered by introducing a draft treaty of their own at the third Copredal Session. (A comparison of the Brazilian and Coordinating Committee draft treaties will be made below.) Debate was acrid, with Colombia, Argentina and Venezuela backing Brazil, and Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador and Haiti supporting Mexico.

The third session adjourned with the issuance of an Acta Final. This document contained the texts of the Brazilian and the Coordinating Committee drafts, along with several amendments proposed by other Latin American countries. The Acta Final is now being circulated among the governments of Latin America in hopes of arriving at points of agreement. A fourth session of Copredal was called for August 30 in Mexico City, at which time it is hoped a compromise can be worked out and some kind of draft treaty agreed upon.

IV. THE DRAFT TREATIES

The preliminary draft treaties proposed by the Coordinating Committee under the guidance of Mexico, and by Brazil are similar in almost all ways except for the process of entry into force. The key provisions that are common to both versions are as follows:

Article 1 commits the signatories to prevent in their respective territories "the testing, use, manufacture, or acquisition by any means" of nuclear weapons.

Article 2 defines "territory" to mean any "delimited space over which the State exercises sovereignty," including the territorial sea and air space.

Article 3 defines "nuclear weapons" in the commonly understood fashion, and declares that delivery vehicles, when separable from the weapon itself, are not subject to the prohibitions of the treaty. (This exclusion of delivery vehicles from the nuclear weapons ban represents a departure from the proposal originally made in the UN in 1962 and by the five presidents in April, 1963.)

Articles 4 through 7 set up the organizational machinery to supervise compliance with the treaty. The enforcement agency is tentatively called the Latin American Denuclearization Center, which consists of a General Conference (the supreme organ), an Executive Committee, and a Secretariat (with a Secretary General).

Articles 8 through 12 set up the control system. Two types of inspection are envisaged. Regular inspection of reactors to check against diversion of plutonium for military purposes will be carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency. (In the Coordinating Committee draft, the IAEA services are contracted for by the Center on behalf of all the treaty signatories; in the Brazilian version, the individual Latin American states make their own agreements with the IAEA.) In addition, special inspections of reactors or of "any suspicious event or circumstance" will be carried out by the Center upon the request of any party to the treaty. All parties are required to grant inspectors "free and full access" to whatever places and information they may require.

Article 13 permits the parties to explode nuclear devices for peaceful purposes such as digging a new inter-oceanic canal "including explosions that presuppose the use of devices similar to those used in nuclear armaments," provided that permission is obtained from the Center four months in advance. The article thus foresees the possibility that a Latin American country may wish to gain prestige by demonstrating

that it is capable of building an atomic bomb, without actually detonating a "military" device.

Article 15 provides that in the event the General Conference determines that a party has violated the treaty, the UN Security Council shall be notified immediately, inasmuch as violation of the treaty is "a matter that could endanger international peace and security." This is the only "sanction" spelled out in the treaty. Actual sanctions against violators would have to be applied by the members of the UN, individually or through the world organization. (Interestingly, the OAS is not mentioned as a possible applier of sanctions or as an organization to which violations will be reported.)

Article 20 declares that the treaty shall be open to signature of all the sovereign states, or states that come to be sovereign, situated in the Western Hemisphere south of the 30th parallel north latitude (which runs through New Orleans). The treaty is also open for signature to the nuclear powers and to those countries exercising de jure or de facto control over territories in the Western Hemisphere south of the 30th parallel.

Article 21 states that "no reservations may be made with respect to this treaty."

Article 24 provides an escape clause similar to that in the Moscow Test Ban Treaty. The treaty is permanent, but any party may denounce if it decides that "unusual circumstances . . . have endangered (its) highest interests." But three months' notice and an explanation of the "unusual circumstances" must be given to the Center and to the UN.

The chief divergence between the two draft treaties is found in Article 22. The Coordinating Committee version provides that the "treaty shall come into force between the states that have ratified or adhered to it" and that the Center shall "begin to perform its duties when five instruments of ratification or adherence" have been deposited. The Brazilian Article 22 calls for universal adherence before the treaty takes effect. It provides that the nuclear free zone will only enter into being after (a) all the Latin American states have joined; (b) all states controlling territory in the Western Hemisphere south of the 30th parallel have signed and ratified the Protocol of Additional Guarantees II which is annexed to the treaty; and (c) all the nuclear powers have signed and ratified the Protocol of Additional Guarantees I, in which they pledge to respect the denuclearized zone.

Corresponding to the differences in Article 22, the Brazilian version of Article 25 provides that authentic texts of the treaty must be written in Russian and Chinese, as well as in Spanish, Portuguese, English and French, as called for in Article 25 of the Coordinating Committee draft.

Effectively, what the differences boil down to is that under the Coordinating Committee version, a "nuclear free zone" would come into being even if only two countries ratified the treaty; whereas no such sub-regional "zone" could be established under the Brazilian draft.

Other amendments were offered by various countries to portions of the draft treaties where Brazil and Mexico were in accord. These amendments are to be considered, along with the two drafts, at the forthcoming session of Copredal.

Venezuela put forward two amendments, one regarding the right of transit and the other strengthening the role of the OAS. In the Mexican and Brazilian versions, each Latin American state may decide for itself whether or not to permit foreign-owned nuclear weapons to pass through its territorial air or waters; and in non-territorial sea or airspace there would be no prohibition of transit. One Venezuelan amendment would

¹⁵ Ibid., August 31, p. 14.

add to the treaty a clause banning the passage of all atomic weapons through the Latin American nuclear free zone. The second Venezuelan amendment would give greater responsibility for inspection and sanctions to the OAS, without entirely replacing the IAEA and the UN.

A Uruguayan amendment sought to reinforce the notion of a true atom free zone. In the Brazilian and Coordinating Committee texts, the denuclearization treaty would take force in the area made up of the sum of the territories of the signatory states. The Uruguayan proposal, applying a concept similar to that of the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, would establish a definite geographical zone, with the perimeter extending into the oceans, which all states, Latin American and extra-continental would be obliged to respect.

These different proposals envisage distinct concepts of what exactly is a nuclear free zone. Since Latin America is the first region of the world to attempt to establish such a zone, there are no precedents to go by.

V. PROSPECTS

The fourth session of the Preparatory Commission will probably determine whether the hopes expressed in the UN and in Latin America for the denuclearization of the continent can be realized in the face of the numerous obstacles and differences of opinion that have arisen.

Much depends on the fate of the Latin American effort. If it succeeds, it is possible that other regions of the world—such as Scandinavia and Africa—may be motivated to overcome the problems that lie in the way of denuclearizing their areas. The techniques of building and inspecting future nuclear free zones, if any, could well be influenced by the pattern established in Latin America.

Unfortunately, the prospects for rapid establishment of a nuclear free zone encompassing all of Latin America are not bright. In addition to the difficulties discussed above, there are new problems that are just beginning to be thought about by Latin Americans. One involves a possible conflict between a nuclear free zone and the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. What would happen, for example, if in the event of war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, the U.S. sought permission to base a Polaris submarine in Montevideo? Under the Rio Treaty, the Uruguayan government is bound to assist the U.S. in fighting the extra-continental enemy; yet a denuclearization treaty would prevent Uruguay from having Polaris submarines stationed in its territory. Which of the two treaties would take precedence?

Another consideration is the related question of whether a Latin American nuclear free zone would have any meaning except in peacetime. In the event of atomic war, the Panama Canal would certainly be one of the first targets hit—nuclear free zone or not. Thus, one of the purposes of a nuclear free zone—reducing the incentive of the nuclear powers to strike—is probably meaningless insofar as Panama is concerned. Moreover, in world war, no area of the earth would be free from hostile action between the combatants; and in the event of atomic war, the shifting clouds of radioactive fallout would spare few if any countries.

Even in peacetime, prohibition of transit, as proposed by Venezuela, would be effectively impossible to enforce due to the opposition of the nuclear powers. So too, it would seem, would be the type of geographically delimited zone advocated by Uruguay. The U.S. and Great Britain have shown no indication of willingness to surrender the traditional right of transit of their nuclear bombers, missiles or submarines across the high seas or through the Panama Canal. Moreover, it would be unrealistic to expect that Soviet submarines with Polaris-type

missiles would respect a Latin American "order" to keep out of a geographical zone which extended onto the high seas.

The somewhat more realistic Brazilian draft treaty, without the Venezuelan or Uruguayan amendments, would also seem to have slight chances of success at this time. The chief reason here is the impasse over Cuban, French, Soviet and probably Chinese participation. As long as President Charles de Gaulle continues to pursue his independent nuclear policy, there is scant likelihood that France will include its Western Hemisphere possessions in the treaty or guarantee to refrain from atomic testing. Nor is the regime of Fidel Castro about to rush into a treaty which would preclude the possibility of ever again wielding Soviet or Chinese nuclear arms. (It is to be noted that the Mexican argument with regard to Cuba is that the island is to all intents and purposes permanently denuclearized because the U.S. would never permit hostile missiles to be based 90 miles from its shores.) Castro has said he would sign a formal denuclearization treaty if the U.S. withdraws from Guantánamo and includes Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the Panama Canal Zone in the atom-free area. The U.S. position, expressed by the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, William C. Foster, is that "we do not wish to have included in the proposed nuclear free zone the Virgin Islands, since it is U.S. territory, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, because of its integral relationship with the U.S. In the case of both these areas, the U.S. must deal with disarmament policies affecting other powers. From the U.S. point of view, we would be agreeable to inclusion of the Panama Canal Zone, although of course the well-established transit rights would not be affected by the establishment of the proposed nuclear free zone. We could also agree to include Guantánamo if Cuba participates."²⁸

Thus, at the very least, adoption of the Brazilian position at the next session of Copredal would mean that a Latin American nuclear free zone would have to wait for (1) the departure of President De Gaulle; (2) a drastic change in U.S. policy; and/or (3) a change of government in Cuba.

Even if the Brazilian position does get a majority at the next session of the Preparatory Commission, the Mexicans appear to be determined to push ahead. The advantage of the Mexican treaty is that it permits some type of agreement—even if it is a very limited one—to go into force. Mexico could probably get the signatures of Chile, Ecuador, and some of the Caribbean and Central American republics. This would establish the Inter-American Denuclearization Center and leave the door open for future adherents. Mexican diplomats, who are on fairly good terms with Cuba, would attempt to persuade Castro to join. But without Cuba, and probably without Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela and Colombia (the four Latin American countries with reactors), the Mexican plan would hardly lead to a "Latin American" nuclear free zone. The "zone" might not even be contiguous geographically.

The question would then be, would this type of "nuclear free zone" be a success or a failure? The Brazilians, the U.S. and the other nuclear powers would probably pay little attention to a "baby" or non-contiguous Latin American nuclear free zone. And clearly, by itself, a denuclearization treaty between Mexico, Chile, Haiti, El Salvador and a few other small republics would not have much meaning. Yet, given the circumstances, it might be a good beginning.

The Moscow Treaty banning atmospheric tests was signed despite the fact that underground tests were not prohibited, and with-

out the adherence of two of the five nuclear powers. Thus, an arms control treaty need not be—in fact, most likely cannot be—perfect and universal when signed. Possibly diplomacy and the force of world opinion could be brought to bear on Brazil, Argentina and ultimately Cuba to join the denuclearization organization created by a Mexican-type treaty. At the very least, if a full-fledged nuclear free zone could not be set up, what might result would be a regional, verified non-proliferation treaty which would assure that Latin America's resources would not be wasted on a senseless atomic arms race.

JERRY FORD DELIVERS NOTABLE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY, OSHKOSH

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, at the recent commencement exercises of Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, my good friend JERRY FORD, of Michigan, delivered a notable and inspiring address to the assembled students.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, under unanimous consent, I ask that they be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The address referred to above follows:
WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, JUNE 3, 1966

I love your town and I am happy to be here. It is the kind of place that speaks to me of all America. What could be more American than a slogan like "Oshkosh, B'Gosh" or "We Cover the World." Some people call them coveralls; some, overalls. To me, either word says Oshkosh and the very best of America.

This is a great growing state university, and you are assembled here together for the last time. Not one of you knows for sure just where you will be a year from now at this very hour.

My comments may well be the last words you will hear at this fine institution. What everyone is most interested in, however, are *your* words and *your* thoughts and *your* goals as you leave and as you travel on.

My theme today is simple. In an age when so much is said of "togetherness," *apartness* deserves increasingly an emphasis of its own. No one can deny that "togetherness"—unity—is required for strength and survival, for that of individuals, the community, and the nation. The seemingly chaotic events erupting in the world about us make this particularly clear. But is it not true also, that *apartness* of the right kind, that is, placing an equal emphasis on the importance of the individual, is required for fulfillment and for progress?

The great problems are fundamentally individual problems. The great decisions must, therefore, initially be individual decisions. Sensitivity, appreciation and comprehension are always, in the first instance, qualities and functions of individual experience. The assembly lines of modern education, as well as those of modern industry,

²⁸ Letter from Foster to the President of Copredal, December 10, 1965.

and just conceivably those of modern politics, are quite capable of sweeping us past opportunities life offers us as individuals for making our own clear-headed, quiet decisions as to the course we wish to follow.

I hope that in this respect you will not automatically color me Republican, although I am proud to be one. Respect for and emphasis upon the importance of the individual is not a partisan nor even a political consideration. It has been the focus of attention and of emphasis by the greatest of the philosophers. It has been the intellectual requirement of the greatest of the teachers throughout the ages. It has been the recurrent theme and the preaching of members of the cloth of all faiths since the dawning of time—for we are indeed created in His sole and individual image and likeness.

Let me at this point reassure you that, perhaps in a departure from the tradition of commencement addresses, it is not my intention to deplore, to discourage, or to despair. I do not believe, despite the enormity of the problems we face, that they are insoluble. I do not for a single second believe that your generation is either incapable of finding the solutions to many of them or unwilling to face the necessity to do so. I cannot agree, I have never been able to agree, with those who periodically look about them and view this as the worst of all possible worlds. Nor am I willing to concede that my generation, and those which preceded mine, have done as bad a job of it as many dolefully proclaim.

For example, the health of our people has been immeasurably enhanced through the genius of medical pioneers in the laboratories and with the patient. Educational facilities and methods have been improved beyond all the expectations of fifty years ago, through the concerted action of educators, public administrators and enlightened holders of elected office. Working conditions and retirement and pension provisions have been improved tremendously through the close cooperation of management, labor and political leadership. Civil rights—and civil liberties—have, through vigorous bipartisan determination in the Congress and in our State legislatures, been multiplied and strengthened remarkably in the past fifteen years alone.

That much remains to be done is undeniable, but that great opportunities remain to be seized is crystal clear. To suggest or to maintain that, in this awesome nuclear age, there can be neither hope nor confidence is poppycock. Our days are no longer than those of our forefathers, our nights are no darker. And if there is an advantage that is ours it lies in the fact that they stood so tall before us, strode so confidently and maintained so well for us this Republic in which we live.

I must confess that I find myself in the position of the man who, after listening at length to some of the weightiest minds of his generation despair as to the future, remarked innocently, "I too am trying to be philosophical about this world of ours, but I guess I just don't know how. Cheerfulness keeps creeping in."

For me, cheerfulness keeps creeping in for many reasons:

Because of the young and vigorous strength and hope you here today represent.

Because of the infinite human, natural and industrial resources our nation possesses.

Because we are now, as we have always been, "involved in mankind."

We are determined to hold and justify our place of honor in the family of nations. Our place of strength and respect in the civilized history of man.

When I speak, however, of the opportunity before you for personal satisfaction, substantial achievement, and total fulfillment, I think with equal weight of an obligation that

is peculiarly and undeniably yours as members of a highly favored and greatly blessed segment of our society—that of the educated man and woman.

As a member of the Congress, to be sure, but equally as a husband and a father and a working citizen, I see your opportunity and obligation inextricably coupled in three specific areas of duty: *the duty to think, the duty to vote, the duty to act.*

Of these three, the most important and the most difficult is that of the duty to think. For, despite the academic and intellectual advantages that have been yours, the process of thinking as an individual, in total independence of outside influence and pressure, is perhaps the most demanding that any man or woman faces.

In the world of politics today, at a time when politics is and will evermore be everybody's business, you are charged as individuals by both conscience and circumstance with the *duty to think*. This is the duty to examine issues in the greatest possible detail, to question the obvious—both the obvious dogma and the obvious proclaimers of it—to ask yourself, quite by yourself, (1) whether this issue or that is a valid one, (2) whether this candidate or that is the preferable one, (3) whether this viewpoint or that is an acceptable one. I urge in this process to resist the pressure and the propaganda of prefabricated influence—just possibly even that of your closest associates and friends.

The importance of the individual is always dramatically illustrated by his use of the thinking-man's filter. Only by its individual and coolly (or warmly) intellectual use can you arrive at opinions and decisions that are worthy of an inquiring mind.

In tandem with this duty to think, there of course comes your *duty to vote*. This, especially now, is a duty which, if not fulfilled, can represent disaster for you and yours, but which, if exercised can represent not only satisfaction but, I dare to say it, *salvation*. Edmund Burke's dictum still vibrates with truth: "All that is required for the triumph of evil is that good men shall do nothing." There is also the appropriate quote from the great Italian poet, Dante, "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of great moral crisis do nothing."

Do you classify yourself as a liberal, a conservative, or as a moderate walker-down-the-middle-of-the-road? Will you ask yourself this in consideration of each of the political issues of our time, as you prepare to cast your votes on issues and for or against individuals? If a liberal, will you be prepared to share the vehement partisanship which characterizes some of those at that far-out fringe of the political spectrum? Will you, as a prideful moderate, be satisfied to walk delicately down the middle of the road, fearful of risk at either hand and hopeful that somehow your near-neutral position will, by itself, represent your best thought and your best vote?

There are many citizens and voters nowadays, as in decades past, who expect of their political representatives and leaders the vision to see things, the judgment to see through things, the faith to see things through—this is obviously an impossible idealism. At the very same time, they expect and demand infinitely less of themselves, fully content to think briefly, if at all, to vote quickly, if at all, and to expect miracles from the White House to the Court House.

Conversely, there are politicians and individuals, who down through the years look expectantly to the electorate alone for guidance and direction, quite unwilling to risk an individual opinion or conviction for fear of extinction at the polls.

It is required, you see, not alone of you but of our political leadership in all parties, that the importance of individual thought

and truly individual voting be paramount, ever dominating group and party and other pressure, whether of a political or intellectual or economic kind.

When, for example, there come before the Congress such issues of a complex and perplexing nature as foreign aid, federal aid to education, reapportionment of Congressional districts, unemployment insurance, appropriations measures amounting to billions upon billions of dollars that will affect the future of every family in the nation, there is required of each member of the Congress the most intent, the most independent, the best thought he can possibly bring to the measure. There is required equally therefore, the finest possible representation in the Congress that you, by your ballots, can produce.

Finally, let me suggest that you have the *duty to act* continually in extension and fulfillment of your thinking and in justification of your vote. Today's problems will be solved only by continuing thought and political, social, and economic action on the part of such as you. They will be solved only by those who, having used their God-given resources of the mind and their freedom-born gift of the vote, are willing to work with unflinching interest and zeal to realize their individual and collective dreams.

To the image of the thinking-man's filter, let me add that of the distillation of thought called wisdom, which must be its inevitable product. This requires of you, as it has required increasingly of each generation, that in one respect you be conservative and draw from the past the very best it has to offer for application to today's and tomorrow's needs. It requires of you similarly that you challenge both the obvious and the devious, be prepared to entertain new ideas as they prove to you to be true ideas, and to demand that both the proven and the promising be implemented effectively for the public good.

In this effort you will encounter areas and forces of momentary discouragement. There are still those among us in public life and in private life who are carrying on ardent love affairs with the past and who cannot be moved from looking backward when we must look forward. This is pure Bourbonism—not the kind you drink, but the kind you think.

The other principal factor and force in opposition to you is that of the radical, militant left, which believes that increased reliance upon government paternalism and the security it promises is not only the wave, but the magic wand of the future. Can a thinking man or woman rationally accept any such values, such philosophies, such panaceas? Let me remind you, a government big enough to give us everything we want is a government big enough to take from us everything we have.

I urge upon you, therefore, a quiet consideration of the position and the power of the genuine moderate in our society. This is a position and a power respected through the ages by those who think, by those who are quite willing to hear and to assess the arguments of those at either end of the political spectrum, but who then and only then, with a fierce individual pride of mind, determine for themselves what the next best move should be.

The duty to think, the duty to vote, the duty to act—these represent your opportunity and your obligation as graduates of this university and citizens in this society. Failure to seize this opportunity and to accept this obligation will result inevitably in your leaving nothing but your seat-prints on the sands of time. More importantly, it will contribute to the disintegration and destruction of all that has been given us of beauty and goodness by those who have walked before.

I am told by some that the alarms and fears of this awesome nuclear age (1) have discouraged countless of our young people,

(2) have caused their hopes and dreams to wilt, and (3) have left them despondent and cynical as to any fulfillment whatsoever in the years to come. I do not believe this for a moment, nor do you. If I did, I would have become despondent and cynical and would long since have ceased to labor in the political vineyard for those things in which I do so truly believe.

I am not in the least discouraged. I refuse to despair. And I say to you fondly, but flatly, that you have no reason to do so either. In Edna St. Vincent Millay's superb phrasing, "I know, but I do not approve and I am not resigned."

It was in the year 1785, we are told, that a remarkable meteorological phenomenon occurred which one day at high noon blacked out the sun over a large part of New England, leaving the area in a darkness as deep as that of midnight. So sudden and so unusual was the occurrence that chickens went to roost, bats began to fly and the populace in many places ran panic-stricken through the streets, believing the end of the world to be at hand.

In that hour in Hartford, Connecticut, the State legislature was in session and an immediate motion of adjournment was made, but there arose to challenge the motion one Abraham Davenport, a great Yankee citizen, an intimate friend of George Washington. Said Davenport, "Either the end of the world is here or it is not. If it is not, there is no need for adjournment. If it is, I choose to be found doing my duty. I wish, therefore, that candles may be brought."

Through the ages, the doing of one's duty has always seemed a formidable and harsh requirement. It can be this, of course. But, equally for you now, the doing of your duty as a thinking individual will not only assure the preservation of this nation and of freedom but will, I suggest, bring to you the greatest joy and fulfillment as a person that you are ever likely to know.

ACE OF SPADES PROVING EFFECTIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AMMUNITION IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7 I spoke in this House on the need to utilize psychological warfare against the enemy in the war in Vietnam. My remarks are found at page 2403 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Even before I spoke our colleague from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] arose to ridicule my ideas. Their remarks are found at pages 2291 and 2384, respectively, of the same day's RECORD.

Since that time certain events have transpired which seem to bear out, from the standpoint of practical experience, the recommendations which I made. Fighting men in Vietnam from their own experience know that the superstitions of the enemy can be used against him. On their own they could not finance and carry out some of the suggestions for spooking the Vietcong which I made, but one they could. That was to confront him as much as possible with the ace of

spades, a deadly bad luck symbol in that area of the world.

Noting a brief item in the Wall Street Journal that the U.S. Playing Card Co. had been furnishing thousands of these cards free to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam who requested them, I wrote the president of the company, Mr. Allison F. Stanley, and received the following letter together with several of its enclosures and enclosures to the enclosures as follows:

THE UNITED STATES PLAYING CARD CO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, June 7, 1966.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: I certainly appreciate your letter of June 2, which has to do with the small part we played in the psychological warfare in Vietnam by sending aces of spades from our Bicycle playing cards. Candidly, I wish that our organization could take credit for the original idea. We cannot. The only thing we did was to carry through on the idea and be of assistance to the men who are fighting the war in Vietnam.

With the fear of boring you, I am going to give you a picture of what has happened, to illustrate how the idea has stimulated the imagination of not only the soldiers but many, many citizens who read in the newspapers what was being done. I believe you pointed out the psychological angle of the use of the ace of spades in February. As I recall it, I read your talk in the local paper.

On February 28, as you probably have seen, Newsweek had quite a story on the ace of spades incident. We were interested but did not know what to do as it might have the tinge of a publicity campaign put on by this Company. That is far from fact, even though we had a great deal of favorable comment on what we have done.

On February 16, 1966, we received a letter written from Vietnam on February 12. This letter was signed by four Lieutenants. Enclosed is a photostatic copy of this letter which I think you will find interesting. From that point on I have dealt with Lieutenant Charles W. Brown, who seemed to be the one handling the matter.

We immediately sent one thousand aces of spades and received a fine letter of appreciation from him. He could not reply promptly because he had been out on the battlefields for a period of time and did not have access to facilities for writing and mailing an acknowledgment. Also, he sent me a copy of a newspaper clipping from Saigon. I had a typewritten copy made of this, as it was difficult to photostat, and also copy of Lieutenant Brown's letter of May 7.

Next I received a letter from Private First-class John M. Redmond, photostat of which I am also enclosing.

The wire service got hold of the ace of spades story and our local paper, The Cincinnati Enquirer, called me one night and asked me to verify it, which I did. Since then I believe it has been used in probably most of the leading newspapers in the country. As an example, I am enclosing a photostatic copy of clipping from The Florida Times-Union with copy of the letter from the shareholder of our Company who sent it to me. You will notice in the write-up that you were given proper credit.

The ace of spades story appeared in color on WLW-TV and the reporter who interviewed me on this incident suggested that the story be called our "Secret Weapon".

Since you are from the great State of California, I thought you would be interested in a letter I received from Mr. and Mrs. Henry Frese, 8441 Santa Margarita Lane, La Palma, California, 90620. I do not know this couple. I am enclosing a copy of Mr. and Mrs. Frese's letter, as you may wish to write them.

To show you to what extent parents will go to help their sons, I received a letter yesterday from another Californian—Mr. E. Dieckmann, Jr., 79 Rivo Alto Canal, Long Beach 3, California—telling me that his son was in the Marines at Da Nang, Hill 327, and asking if he could buy fifty-two of the aces of spades to send on to his son. He cannot buy them from us because we give them free, and his son's package is on its way. Also enclosed is a photostatic copy of Mr. Dieckmann's letter. I believe you will agree with me that such a letter from a father is really of human interest.

In addition to putting the aces of spades on the bodies of the enemy, I am told—and I cannot verify this—that the soldiers intend to stencil the ace of spades on their armaments. I presume this is done for good luck plus the fact that enemies capturing the equipment will be afraid to use it.

As you know, we are not making any charges for our service to the soldiers and we have no intention of doing so. Personally, I answer every letter I receive, whether it be from a soldier or an individual, telling them of our policy and our desire to be helpful.

Attached are several Bicycle aces of spades to give you some idea of what is being used.

Incidentally, your newsletter on the ace of spades was excellent and we appreciate the credit you gave our Company.

If I can give you any further information, please let me know and I will do my best. I hope I have not made this letter too long or that it will bore you. If so, just throw it away.

Thank you for your interest in the matter and good luck to you in your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

ALLISON F. STANLEY.

FEBRUARY 12, 1966.

DEAR SIRS: We, the officers of Company "C", 2d Battalion, 35th Infantry, 25th Infantry Division, are writing to ask a favor of the U.S. Playing Card Company.

We are stationed in Pleiko, South Vietnam and have been using your aces of spades as our calling cards for nearly two months. In Vietnam, the ace of spades and pictures of women are regarded as symbols of bad luck. Since your trade mark contains both of these, we have been leaving them in areas we have cleared of Viet Cong as a psychological weapon.

Our supply of cards is rapidly being depleted and we were wondering if you could supply us with approximately 1000 aces of spades. Your support would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lt. BARRIE E. ZAIS,
Lt. LEONARD D. DAVIS,
Lt. CHARLES W. BROWN,
Lt. THOMAS R. WISSINGER,

Officers of Co C 2d Bn 35th Inf; 3d Bde
25th Inf. Div., APO San Francisco
96225.

MAY 7, 1966.

Mr. ALLISON F. STANLEY,
President, The United States Playing Card
Co., Cincinnati, Ohio

DEAR Mr. STANLEY: This article was recently published in the "Tropic Lightning News," the official newspaper of the 25th Inf. Div. Another article has been written for the "Stars and Stripes." This is the newspaper that serves all Armed Forces personnel serving in the Pacific Theater of Operations.

I thought you might be interested in this article and want to pass it on to Mr. Powers. I'm sorry but they wouldn't mention the name of your company.

In the near future I may have to ask for more spades but at the present time we still have a couple of hundred left. We are trying to take some pictures to send you

but as you might guess it is difficult to carry a camera on some of our operations.

Thank you again for your cooperation. I hope to hear from you in the future.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. BROWN,
21st Infantry.

P.S.—Did Bob Considine use our story in his column? If so each of us would like to have a copy if you could obtain them. Thank you.

ACES HIGH—KNOCK VC LOW

(NOTE.—This article, published in "Tropic Lightning News", sent in by Lt. Charles W. Brown to Mr. Allison F. Stanley, The United States Playing Card Co.)

The officers of Company C, 2nd Battalion, 35th Infantry, have more than a mere ace up their sleeves. To be exact, they each carry 12 aces—all spades.

A newspaper column they read mentioned that the Viet Cong, normally superstitious, were especially leary of the ace of spades. The men quickly decided to launch their own campaign of psychological warfare.

Wherever the men hit, they leave behind them several aces of spades tacked up in a prominent place.

The company was quick to take to their new symbol. The only problem was where to get enough of the playing cards so each man would have an adequate supply. A letter sent to the president of a major playing card company in the States soon resulted in a shipment of a thousand black aces being hauled off to Vietnam.

Each man now wears an ace of spades on each side of his helmet and they are planning to have an ace of spades stencil made for the butts of their weapons.

No VC were available for comment on the company's new symbol. They were last seen headed away from a jungle trail of aces of spades.

DEAR SIR: My name is John M. Redmond. I am in the United States Army over in Vietnam. I read an article in the newspaper, about the Viet-Cong's being superstitious of the black ace of spade. My buddy's and I decided to go together and buy about a 1,000 ace of spade. Everytime we run into some Viet-Congs and kill them. We are going to place a couple of aces around the Viet-Congs. We would like for you to send the cards Cash On Delivery if possible. If you cannot send them C.O.D., just send us the price.

My address: P.F.C. John M. Redmond, Co "A" 4Bn. 23 Inf., 25 Div., 1st BDE, Task Forces, APO, San Francisco, Calif. # 96225. Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. REDMOND.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
June 4, 1966.

DEAR MR. STANLEY: Please find herewith the front page of the Florida Times Union (our morning paper) of June 3, 1966.

We were sorry to learn of your loss of a son in World War II.

We feel that regardless of reasons—your sending the aces of spades to Viet Nam is to the very best interests of all concerned. Sincerely,

Mrs. RUTH F. ULRICH.

[From the Florida Times Union, June 3, 1966]
PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAPON: ACE OF SPADES GOES TO WAR IN VIET NAM

WASHINGTON, June 2.—With the help of a businessman whose son was killed in World War II, American servicemen in Viet Nam are fighting the Viet Cong with a psychological weapon spurned by the Pentagon and ridiculed by some Congressmen.

The weapon is a playing card, the ace of spades, which American fighting men are spreading by the thousands through Viet

Cong-infested territory in their operation against the Reds.

The aces of spades, which the Vietnamese fear as an omen of death, are being supplied to the servicemen free of charge and unofficially by a playing card company in Cincinnati.

A spokesman for the company said that last Feb. 12, Allison F. Stanley, president of the firm, got a letter from four infantry lieutenants from the 25th Division operating in the Pleiku area explaining the psychological significance of the act of spades and asking for 1,000 cards "to leave in the areas we've cleared of the VC."

He said Stanley, who lost a son in World War II, ordered the cards sent free of charge.

The company, he continued, soon began to get other requests. One such request asked for the cards so that the servicemen could leave one on the body of each Viet Cong they killed and offered to pay for them. They were sent free.

The spokesman added that Stanley has since learned that soldiers in the 25th Division have begun wearing the cards on their helmets.

In all, several thousand of the cards have been sent to Viet Nam, the spokesman said.

The news that the men in Viet Nam were using the ace of spades against the enemy came as a pleasant surprise to Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California.

Last Feb. 7 he suggested on the floor of the House that the Pentagon adopt the ace of spades as a psychological weapon.

His suggestion was greeted by silence from the Pentagon and jeers from colleagues in the House, particularly Representative WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of New Jersey, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey.

"This indicates," Hosmer said today, "that at least the men in the field know what kind of ammunition they need and that part of that ammunition is psychological."

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,
June 6, 1966.

ALLISON F. STANLEY,
President, United States Playing Card Co.,
Cincinnati, Ohio

DEAR MR. STANLEY: After reading in Saturday's Los Angeles Times about your sending playing cards to our fighting men in Vietnam, I decided that the best way to show my thanks to you and your company was to support your company by purchasing cards made by you. I also mean to spread the word among my friends and card playing acquaintances.

In checking our local stores, I have found that they stock a multitude of playing cards under various brand names but I cannot find cards specifically marked United States Playing Card Company. I have asked that they stock them, but in thinking about it, it dawned on me that you might manufacture under a series of brand names which I know nothing about.

Might I receive a list of brand names which your company uses in distributing the cards? Also, do you manufacture plastic cards? I would like to arrive at bridge parties with full data regarding your products. I feel sure that some of those people present would feel as I do about your kind gesture and remember your brand names when they next purchased playing cards.

Again, my thanks to you and your company.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT E. JONES.
cc/Representative CRAIG HOSMER
My personal thanks to you too, Representative HOSMER—R.E.J.

LA PALMA, CALIF.,
June 6, 1966.

DEAR MR. STANLEY: Having at 9:00 a. m. just completed the reading of your "ace in

the hole" contribution to our boys, my husband and I wish to be counted among your supporters.

Thank you, from the bottom of our hearts. We feel very deeply about our boys needing support over there. Incidentally we are a couple in our late twenties so don't give up hope for our mixed up generation.

Again sincere thanks.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HANK FRESE.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,

June 4, 1966.

DEAR MR. STANLEY: Have just read of your distribution of the ace of spades in Vietnam. My son, P.F.C. Chris Dieckmann, is with the Marines at Da Nang, Hill 327.

Could you send me one pack of 52 cards—all the ace of spades?

Money order enclosed, return mail. Let me know how much.

Please send to me and I will then send to my son with the clipping from the newspaper as explanation, although he has probably heard of its use already.

This is a great thing—and shows that Communism no matter how brutal, cannot erase basic superstition from the minds of a people!

ED DIECKMANN, JR.

Mr. Speaker, the following letter to me, together with its enclosure of an item from the Kansas City Star, should also be of interest in connection with this subject:

CORONADO, CALIF.,
June 5, 1966.

DEAR SIR: This article seems to bear out exactly what you are advocating. For the life of me I can't understand why those who could help the war in this unconventional way don't "turn-to" and carry out your ideas. Chances are this particular incident was triggered by a reference to your beliefs. Damit, it is an unconventional war so why not treat it as such! Good luck in your fight!

Sincerely,

Mrs. JANICE BURNS.

[From the Kansas City Star, June 1, 1966]
"THE BULLET" FOREBODES EVIL TO RED GUERRILLAS

WICHITA.—To a poker player, the ace of spades is "the bullet." To a fortune teller it's bad luck. To the Viet Cong it's terror. A Wichita soldier serving in Vietnam has learned it pays to have an ace of spades up his sleeve, on his helmet, rifle or anywhere else when the Viet Cong are around.

Frankie Gene Willard, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Willard, Wichita, recently wrote his parents that he and some of his buddies have discovered the Viet Cong have an unexplained fear of the ace of spades.

Wherever Willard and the other members of Company C, 2nd Battalion, 35th Infantry hit, they leave several aces tacked to trees and buildings.

The company was quick to take to their new symbol, Willard said. The only problem was finding enough cards for each man to have an adequate supply.

A letter sent to the president of a major playing card company in the United States resulted in a shipment of 1,000 black aces.

Each man now wears an ace of spades on each side of his helmet and is having them stenciled on weapons and equipment.

Whether the black ace symbolizes death of a friend, emotional strain and bad dreams as well as bad luck, or some special Oriental horror to the Viet Cong is not known.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for those in the White House and in the Department of Defense who are assuming to tell the military how to run this war to

pay some attention to the matter of including psychological as well as explosive in our arsenal.

CONTE SEEKS VOTERS' VIEWS

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep myself fully informed of the views of those whom I represent in Congress, I recently circulated a questionnaire asking my constituents to express their opinions on 43 questions in 5 major areas of legislative concern. The results are in, and I would like to share them with my colleagues in the House.

Perhaps the most striking fact revealed by the questionnaire is a widespread uncertainty among the people concerning America's involvement in Vietnam. Although fewer of my constituents who responded favor withdrawal from Vietnam—22.6 percent—than favor escalation of bombing—44.7 percent—there is an unusually high per-

centage who recorded "no opinion" on these questions. Asked if they would favor a coalition government for South Vietnam, 42.9 percent, or close to half, had no opinion.

On the significant question of whether or not to maintain our present position in Vietnam, the response was 36.6 percent "yes," 31.5 percent "no," and 31.9 percent "no opinion."

The high percentage of "no opinion" answers to Vietnam questions did not carry over into other categories. On the question of continued U.S. opposition to the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, for example, only 8.1 percent of those who answered had no opinion, while 53.5 percent voted in favor of continued U.S. opposition.

In other categories dealing with current issues before the country, 60.4 percent voted against an expansion in the war on poverty, and 63.4 percent expressed dissatisfaction with President Johnson's handling of the poverty program.

On the labor front, 65.3 percent opposed repeal of the Taft-Hartley 14(b) right-to-work provision, and 73.3 percent expressed approval of Federal legislation to prevent strikes in essential industries.

My colleagues in the House will doubtless be pleased at the response to one question in particular. A majority of

62.2 percent of my constituents who answered favor a 4-year term for Congressmen, while only 20.3 percent disagree with this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased by the prompt response to my questionnaire and by the obviously careful consideration given to the questions I posed. The tabulated results are both helpful and encouraging. They have given me a reading of the feelings of my voters on a wide range of subjects, and on some of these I had not received a great deal of mail. And they have also given me assurance and support for votes I have cast in this Congress and favorable reactions to legislation I have introduced in the House in recent months.

The questionnaire was sent to more than 30,000 residents of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts; about 15 percent of those responded. I am told by the American Political Science Association that this is a well above average response. I am especially grateful to my friends at the University of Massachusetts who tabulated the individual responses for me. Because of the enormous demands on my regular staff, this helping hand was most welcome.

The complete questionnaire with percentage responses tabulated is shown below:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. In the light of our current position in South Vietnam, do you favor—			
(a) Gradual, complete withdrawal?.....	22.6	40.8	27.6
(b) Maintaining our present position, hoping to outlast our opposition?.....	36.6	31.5	31.9
(c) Blockading North Vietnamese ports?.....	55.9	15.3	28.8
(d) Bombing North Vietnam cities, including Hanoi, port of Haiphong, and main railroads leading to Red China?.....	44.7	25.8	29.5
(e) A coalition government in South Vietnam?.....	22.7	34.4	42.9
2. Do you favor allowing access to U.S. ports to ships of countries whose ships call at—			
(a) Red China?.....	25.8	62.5	11.7
(b) Cuba?.....	24.2	62.2	13.6
(c) North Vietnam?.....	19.8	66.9	13.3
3. Do you approve of continued U.S. opposition to the seating of Red China in the United Nations?.....	53.5	38.4	8.1
4. Do you favor a continuation of our present foreign aid program:			
(a) Economic?.....	55.3	32.7	11.0
(b) Military?.....	48.6	34.7	16.7
5. Should we spend our time and money trying to introduce some birth control methods in rapidly growing countries such as India and Brazil under our foreign aid program?.....	64.1	24.4	11.5
SOCIAL			
1. Do you favor the proposed administration bill for Federal regulation of firearms?.....	59.1	31.0	9.9
2. Do you favor a program of rental supplements to low-income families unable to obtain standard housing with their own income?.....	40.2	49.6	10.2
3. Do you favor the continuance of the broad scale of the Federal urban redevelopment program?.....	45.9	39.1	15.0
4. Do you approve of the way the Johnson administration is conducting the war on poverty?.....	20.4	63.4	16.1
5. Do you favor an expansion in the war on poverty?.....	25.9	60.4	13.7
6. Do you favor a cutback in the war on poverty?.....	47.2	35.0	17.8
7. Do you favor a large scale Federal-State program for construction of plants to take the salt out of sea water and make it drinkable?.....	62.5	22.7	14.8
8. Do you favor supervised hospital care of narcotic addicts instead of jail terms?.....	81.4	10.2	8.4
9. Do you favor a tax credit for firms which install antiwater pollution devices?.....	69.7	21.0	9.3
FISCAL			
1. Do you believe the Federal Government should provide money to large cities to help modernize their mass transit systems?.....	39.0	47.9	13.1
2. Do you favor greater executive and congressional control over the Federal Reserve activities than is now in effect?.....	23.9	47.3	28.8
3. Do you favor a program of returning to the States a percentage of the Federal taxes collected?.....	63.2	23.4	13.4
4. To meet the added costs of the war, do you favor—			
(a) Increased taxes, including excise taxes?.....	26.0	53.3	20.7
(b) Cutting back on domestic Great Society programs?.....	71.5	16.6	11.9
LABOR			
1. Should the Federal Government set standards for State compliance with the length and amount of benefit payments in unemployment compensation?.....	40.8	43.3	15.9
2. Should we repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which gives each State the right to determine its own position on "right-to-work" laws?.....	22.5	65.3	12.2
3. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour to—			
(a) \$1.35 an hour?.....	23.4	39.9	36.7
(b) \$1.50 an hour?.....	37.2	36.4	26.5
(c) \$1.75 an hour?.....	15.1	47.7	37.2
4. Do you favor extending such a minimum wage to—			
(a) Farm workers?.....	64.9	22.8	12.3
(b) Laundry employees?.....	67.9	18.0	14.1
(c) Tip employees?.....	35.6	45.5	18.5
5. Should Congress enact legislation curbing strikes in essential industries?.....	73.7	19.8	6.5
6. Should Congress enact legislation curbing strikes against State and local governments (i.e., New York transit strike)?.....	73.4	20.4	6.2

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
GENERAL			
1. Do you favor the Federal Government taking steps to withdraw gradually from farm price-support programs?.....	77.4	11.1	11.5
2. Should the space program be slowed down during periods of large budget deficits?.....	50.4	40.0	9.5
3. Do you favor a proposed 4-year term for Congressmen? (If yes, check (a) and/or (b)).....	62.2	20.3	17.5
(a) All elected during a presidential election year?.....	20.2	29.6	50.2
(b) ½ elected every 2 years?.....	54.6	9.2	36.2
4. Do you favor legislation allowing a State the right to apportion 1 house of its legislature on factors other than population?.....	36.6	36.5	27.0
5. Do you favor a National Teachers Corps to augment school facilities in impoverished areas?.....	62.0	25.0	13.0

CANADA'S PRIME MINISTER SPEAKS OUT

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Lester B. Pearson, Saturday night called on the United States to take the lead in refashioning the NATO alliance into an Atlantic Union and he warned against policies which might drive France still further into a position of isolation from other members of the Alliance.

He spoke in Springfield, Ill., under the sponsorship of Federal Union, Inc., a nonprofit nonpartisan membership group devoted to the Atlantic Union objective.

In his address he called upon the United States to provide long-needed leadership in strengthening the Alliance, and he warned:

France, and not only France, feels that Continental Europe is now strong enough, (in large part because of the generous assistance of the U.S.A.) to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the Alliance.

Here is the text of this timely, significant, and brilliant message:

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE L. B. PEARSON, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA, AT THE ATLANTIC UNION AWARD DINNER, SPRINGFIELD, ILL., JUNE 11, 1966

In conferring on me an Atlantic Union Pioneer award this afternoon, you have done me high honour for which I am very grateful. You have confirmed my admission into ranks of the Atlantic Pioneer Corps, and have chosen for the confirmation this historic setting of New Salem and Springfield, steeped in memories of one of the towering figures of history.

At the same time you have added to my feeling of grateful appreciation by coupling my name with those of Christian Herter and Adlai Stevenson, as recipients of the Atlantic award. I know, as you do, how much we owe to these two men. Not only the United States and Canada, not only the Atlantic community, but the whole world is in their debt.

Mr. Herter is an old and valued friend about whom I will say only that high ideals and constructive achievement have characterized everything he has done, in the service of his country and of free men. I wish he could have been with us this evening.

Adlai Stevenson was also my friend. When he died I tried, as many others did, to pay him tribute. We all tried and I think we all

failed, because it is still too soon to take the true measure of this man and his contribution to our times. He wore out more than his shoe leather in the persistent and patient search for peace and better relations between nations. In spite of all the difficulties, sometimes it seemed the impossibilities; in spite even of his own occasional doubts, he served with grace and distinction, with devotion and wisdom, the vision of what the world could be and what it must become. His was a more significant service than anything a man could do for himself or for his own political aspirations. Though he was denied the Presidency of his country in favour of others who shared his ideals, he gave an inspiring lead, especially at the United Nations, to his own people and to all people in the search for those ultimate and essential goals which we must reach or perish.

As I look back on the years through which we have passed since the second Great War of this century, I am struck by the fact that our destinies have depended so very much on the vision and leadership of a few men; on their understanding of what, at a particular moment, was the right way out of danger, and the right way to move ahead. These rare individuals had always before them an ideal of human brotherhood; of a world at peace and with freedom. They also had a firm and confident sense of direction in trying to achieve their ideal. Chris Herter and Adlai Stevenson are such men.

Clarence Streit is another who for many long years now has accepted the challenge of a great idea—the idea of a federal union of the peoples lying on both sides of the North Atlantic as a step to an even wider union of all men. That idea has not yet been realized. Indeed in some of the Atlantic countries it seems at the moment to be of little interest. But it is acting upon the societies of our two countries and I believe is doing the same, although perhaps less noticeably, in Europe. It has life and dynamism. Its impact on politics in North America has increased and this is bound to convey a reflection on the other side of the Atlantic.

NATO—the Atlantic alliance—is an encouraging, if imperfect, reflection of this ideal. It has served us well for the past sixteen years. NATO could hardly have achieved its political and its military expression, however, if the yeast of the Atlantic unity idea had not been at work before the Treaty of 1949 was signed.

When Clarence Streit published "Union Now", he was called a visionary, a dreamer. How could governments and peoples, long imbued with their own proud traditions of history, of nationalism, and of sovereignty—how could they give up some of their very substance, of their state freedom, to form a union with other nations; even for those national purposes which, the history of our century has shown, could no longer be achieved except by collective action? But they did.

If the lessons of history are depressing, it is because they seem never to be learned—at least until it is too late. Yet we can also take some comfort from this historical record, as we look at the scene around us and the road ahead.

If we tend to become too depressed over the troubles that face the world today, we should recall how things seemed in the Atlantic world in the Forties.

In 1948 it was our hope that Western Europe and North America working through co-operating national governments could provide a nucleus of military strength, economic prosperity and political stability, around which a global balance could be reestablished and the extension by force of aggressive communist imperialism be stopped. We did not know at that time whether this would be possible at all. We did not know, whether, if it were possible, it would take, five, ten, twenty or fifty years to accomplish. We certainly cannot even say today that it has been accomplished. But we have reached a kind of provisional framework—an equilibrium—in which we can live together, both we and the Communist states in Europe, with a hope for progress to something better than mere coexistence.

Indeed, some of our troubles today are the results of our successes in these recent years. In 1948 we were anxious and frightened—with cause—at the threatened extension westward of totalitarian communism, into those European countries which, while still free, were badly shaken in their political confidence and almost completely disrupted in their economic life. After the war our problems were of immediate, not ultimate survival. But today we are concerned with longer range problems of peace, of prosperity, of development. This is a measure of our progress.

Once the course of history has been changed, even a little, we are prone to look back and regard that change as inevitable. But in 1945, as we looked ahead, there seemed nothing inevitable or certain about the reconstruction of a democratic, prosperous, independent Western Europe that was to take place. There seemed nothing inevitable about a change in the old American habit of peacetime isolation, which had been dominant for 150 years. It was far from inevitable that countries, who had never in peacetime pooled any part of their sovereignty, would do so now and together organize a collective defense that, in the conditions of the modern world, might prove effective enough to deter another war. We were up against physical destruction, economic stagnation and political defeatism. Vast human and material resources had been blown away and destroyed in war. Out of this waste and weariness could we really construct something new that might help to meet and solve our problems?

Well—it was done. Gradually, hesitantly, painfully, but steadily, things were done. An alliance that was designed to be more than military was welded together in peacetime. Its members began to believe in the possibility of a secure peace—of a good life. Indeed, as the years went by, many even began to forget or ignore the continuing dangers of a yet more horrible war. So they became impatient with the structures and the processes that had made their own comfortable conclusions possible. They—some people and some governments—began to fall

back into those historic nationalist grooves which had been the source of so much of the bloodshed and conflict and chaos they had recently endured. With recovery came also impatience and doubt and some distrust.

We should have seen this happening in the Atlantic Alliance and countered it. In December '64, Canada proposed in NATO a re-assessment of the nature of the alliance in the light of these changing conditions. Little was done.

Unhappily, it is man's weakness to cling to the ideas, the institutions and the habits of the past—even the recent past—instead of adapting them to the needs of today and tomorrow. So it was with NATO. The weight of inertia and a vested interest in a new status quo, felt especially among the most powerful governments of the alliance, made it difficult to find anyone in a responsible position on either side of the Atlantic who was prepared to come forward and specify in any detail what should be changed. A lot of people were talking about the need for change but nobody—no government—in a position of power was really doing much about it. Then abrupt and unilateral action by France thrust change upon us. Crisis—as always—forced our hands.

We should have acted earlier and not under the compulsion of events. We should have tried to move forward together to a closer international association in order to remove the risk of sliding backwards. In these matters, there is no standing still. Surely the course that should have been taken—should still be taken—is clear.

Today, the facts, the compulsions, and the opportunities lead inexorably toward closer international association and away from the self-sufficient sovereignty of the nation state. The jet planes that fly, the rockets that range in outer space; the universal revolution of rising expectations, combined with the speed of technological change which make their realization possible, all these make it essential that we move ahead in the field of political and social organization in a way which is at least remotely comparable to our technological and scientific progress.

We can begin with the "like-minded" Atlantic nations, who have already acquired a sense of community and a habit of co-operation, but we must include ultimately all mankind. The world is too small for less, yet we continue to boggle even at the first careful steps.

If there is anything that has been made crystal clear by the grim experience of half a century, it is that neither peace nor security nor prosperity can be achieved or maintained by national action alone—or by national policy alone.

So this is no time to weaken in our support for the NATO alliance, because it is having difficulties. We must solve these difficulties. But we must not stop there. We must move forward with new resolve toward an international community with common political institutions, which covers more than a single continent, and spans the Atlantic.

It must also be more than a military alliance. Try as we might, we have never been able to make NATO much more than that. An alliance for defence only, however, is an anachronism in the world of 1966, especially when nuclear power is not shared, by possession or by control, among its members. As Professor Hans Morgenthau has put it: "It is no longer possible to rely completely on the promise of a nuclear ally to forfeit its very existence on behalf of another nation." A guarantee of nuclear support against aggression simply does not now have the credibility that would make it a fully effective deterrent and therefore a guarantee of security.

I repeat, we must develop common, unifying political institutions which would

provide for collective foreign and economic policies, as well as genuinely collective defence.

Nothing less will be adequate to meet today's challenge of jets and rockets and hydrogen bombs.

As a leader of a government, I am very conscious that politics is the art of the possible. Anyone with political responsibility must think in terms of what can be done at any given time; of what public opinion will accept. He must not allow the best to become the enemy of the good. Nevertheless, if we don't keep "the best" always before us as an eventual and essential objective, not only will we never reach it; we may even fail to reach the more immediate and good objectives. Nor should we always wait for a crisis to force us to act.

In 1940, Great Britain—only a few years before, cool and confident behind its channel—proposed full union with France. It was the moment when continental Europe was about to fall a victim to the Nazi aggressor. The offer was too late. Offers made under the imminence of defeat and collapse, for radical and immediate action to implement ideas which the day before yesterday were considered as visionary and unrealistic, such offers always are too late. Do we have to have panic before we can make progress?

At this moment, moreover, a feeling of discouragement is more likely to work in the wrong way; not in the transformation of NATO into something better, but in its reduction into something less. This is a very real danger. French policy has underlined it.

General de Gaulle has rejected Atlantic defence integration. He has ordered France's withdrawal from the North Atlantic Defence Organization. In doing so, his procedures have been brusque and his ideas understandably disturbing to France's friends and allies.

It would be foolish, however, to push the panic button over this. By doing so, we might merely push France, not only from the NATO military organization, but out of the Atlantic Alliance itself. And France does not want to leave the Alliance.

It would be short-sighted, also, not to realize that the attitude of Western Europe to American commitments in Europe is changing; just as the attitude of Eastern Europe toward Moscow is changing.

We should not try to throw all the blame on France and General de Gaulle for recent NATO developments. Some of General de Gaulle's decisions, I know, have been disconcerting and seem to indicate a return to a kind of nationalism from which France has suffered as much in the last 50 years as any country in the world. Before we condemn, however, we should try to understand what is behind France's recent actions. France is not, has not been, and will not be, satisfied with an Atlantic Organization, or an Atlantic Alliance of independent states, dominated by America. France, and not only France, feels that Continental Europe is now strong enough (in large part because of the generous assistance of the U.S.A.) to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the Alliance.

While France is not alone in this feeling, only de Gaulle has translated it into policy and action. If he has gone too far in that action, as I think he has; if he is on the wrong course, we should not drive him farther in the wrong direction, but to try to bring him back onto the right course by seriously re-examining the purposes and the organization of NATO in the light of 1966—not 1948. As I have said, we should have done it years ago. If the reason for General de Gaulle's action is his belief that the other allies will not consider any change to NATO to meet new conditions, let's take positive action about the necessary reforms. Surely it doesn't make sense any longer to take the position that NATO is sacrosanct and

mustn't be altered. Our reaction should be just the opposite.

In short, to rally at General de Gaulle, because he is demanding, for France, a position in the Atlantic Alliance equal to that of Great Britain and somewhat closer to that of the U.S.A., is to show a dangerous misunderstanding of the situation.

May I refer on this point to some observations in Max Frankel's penetrating article, "Our Friends, the French", in the April number of "Freedom and Union".

Mr. Frankel is somewhat critical of his own country's share in the responsibility for NATO, as he puts it, "becoming an anachronism whose defensive or military purposes were long ago overtaken by technological change and whose diplomatic purposes we have never managed to define or construct." He believes that not de Gaulle's stubbornness, but a long chain of events and conflicting governmental policies—including those of the United States—have caused the disarray.

I do not see the Atlantic nations going forward together to a secure and hopeful future without France. Therefore, we must find a way out of our present NATO difficulties so that France can fully participate in the march to greater, not less Atlantic unity.

We must not give up the ultimate vision of closer Atlantic unity just because some clouds are obscuring the immediate future of NATO.

Indeed, a new move forward to realize the greater vision may help remove some of the nearer clouds.

We must now look at the picture ahead of us with the courage and imagination we showed 17 years ago when the NATO pact was signed. Taking this same cradle area of the Atlantic nations, we must ask ourselves what sort of Atlantica would we like our children to inherit from us in five years, ten years, twenty years? What sort of vision of the future can we hold up as a rallying point—as an objective of policy; without pretending that it must turn out the way we wish but convinced in our own minds that, given good will, dedicated hard work, and a certain amount of good luck, it could be that way.

This forward march must be Atlantic, and not merely European or North American. But it must provide for more control by Europe of its direction and its character; a Europe, moreover, which would include Great Britain.

I realize that a united Europe, would, in its political, economic and military decisions, be more independent of Washington than is the case now. But what is wrong about this?

There are those who worry about the "separateness" of such a European development and who would therefore prefer to concentrate now on the federal union of all the Atlantic peoples, even at the expense of earlier European union. If we are realistic, however, we may have to accept at this time the more practical immediate objective of a united Europe; not as an obstacle to, but as a stage on the way to, Atlantic union.

If we cannot at present achieve a pattern of Atlantic federalism, it may be necessary to acknowledge the realities of the situation and, as North Americans, work with Europeans in the hope that, in the longer sweep of history, both European and North America will come to realize that their respective affairs can best be harmonized in a wider union. If an intervening European stage is necessary, however, it must be taken not in continental isolation but in close Atlantic cooperation and understanding.

As I try to grope my own way towards a concept that would make sense for North America, and for both western and even eastern Europe, I am convinced that we cannot insist on retaining NATO in its present form as the only foundation for building a more genuinely international structure more appropriate for the future. I am equally sure that continentalism either of the Euro-

pean or North American variety is not the answer.

Finally, I believe that only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity. Without her active participation and support, nothing can be done; at least on the broad front which is essential. Without her leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and for progress.

So we in other countries should be heartened by the fact that 111 senators and congressmen from thirty-four states, and from both parties, have co-sponsored or supported the Resolution on Atlantic unity; along with ex-Presidents, former Presidential candidates and Governors. The list includes two names that mean much to all free citizens throughout the world, President Truman and President Eisenhower.

With this kind of backing, with this kind of understanding and vision, who dares not take this initiative seriously?

Years ago, before the North Atlantic Treaty or the United Nations Charter, even before the United States or Canada had ever been heard of, when the Sioux and the Blood Indians hunted over the western prairies, their young men on coming of age would retire alone to some hill or mountain. There in solitude, fasting, watching, they would seek before entering on their adult years to look at themselves with the best that was in them; to purify their thought and their feeling; and to seek the guideposts they would try to live by as men. This solitary vigil they called "Crying for a Vision". Now, more than ever before, we need as individuals, as nations, to "cry for a vision"; and then, with devotion and persistence, to strive for its realization. It is a tribute to the peoples who live on both sides of the Atlantic that, at critical times in their history, they have always rallied to a great and challenging cause once they were convinced that this was the right and necessary thing to do.

Tonight I pay my humble tribute to those good and brave men—some are present here tonight—who have this conviction and who are working with single-minded dedication to lay the foundation of policy and action looking toward a union of peoples for peace and freedom.

What we seek is new and unprecedented. But so is our world. Abraham Lincoln once said: "As our case is new, so we must think and act anew".

Today, we must think anew and act anew.

PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I share the real and justified pride of my colleagues in the progress made by this Congress in the field of social security.

Yet, these great improvements, like other enactments of the past, seem to reveal greater than ever needs for improvements in social security to assist those facing the problems of elderly years and disability.

From the original enactment of social security up to the present, our improvements may have revealed only the problem more and more in its real proportions, rather than producing complete answers to it.

In some things, like scientific progress, we all understand that the further we push back the boundary of the known, the broader becomes the horizon of the unknown.

But, in a matter like social security—correcting a social injustice by economic programs and action—we should constantly approach solution of the problem, its elimination. Despite all the progress that has been made, the problem is still with us.

President Johnson in a recent speech to the National Council of Senior Citizens said that while he had signed into law the legislation passed by this 89th Congress increasing social security benefits more than \$1.5 billion, "too many of our older citizens are still struggling along on shoestring incomes, suffering real hardship and real need." He proposed a blanket increase in benefits for those on the rolls and those who will be in the future.

The President has directed that a study be made and such a program be prepared for presentation to the 90th Congress.

But the problem is not one alone of increased benefits. As Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, an administration stalwart in the fight for medicare, said following the 1965 amendments, the "war" for justice for the aged will not be won until they are allowed fully to participate in the life around them.

With the average elderly person commanding only one-third the money income of the average younger adult, those words of Mr. Cohen spell out a tremendous gulf to be bridged before we can boast real progress toward a just life in the retirement years for Americans. It constitutes an authoritative illustration of the need for action as new requirements become apparent.

There have been mighty efforts along some line of action on social security, but almost no progress on others.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2841 in this Congress—and a like bill in the previous Congress—embodying the Townsend plan, which launched into national prominence the whole social security issue in the 1930's. That credit is almost unanimously accorded the Townsend movement.

Originating in the Townsend plan have been the goals, the actual guidelines for the improvements made, Congress by Congress, in social security enactments.

Gradually, coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance has become virtually universal. Now, there simply exists no other direction for improvements to take, except toward this basic goal conceived and founded in public consciousness of the Townsend plan.

It is the same with other facets of the question. The age for retirement has given way from the arbitrary line of 65, lowering to age 62—first for women, then for men—then to age 60 for widows.

In disability it is the same process. First came adoption of disability insurance after age 55; then after age 18; then very marked liberalization of the definition of disability in the latest amendments.

In financing, the original idea of the old-age insurance reserve fund has become a pay-as-we-go operation, with the reserve fund used as a cushion to provide a consistent level of operation.

It is operated as a pay-as-we-go program despite the fact that it was adopted in opposition to the pay-as-we-go basic concept of the Townsend plan.

A lengthy list of points could be made on which we have been guided by the original proposal of the Townsend plan. However, it is enough to point out two specific provisions in which the virtual essence of the plan was adopted by Congress in recent social security amendments.

First, there is retirement test under title II. Beneficiaries may earn up to \$1,500 a year before losing any benefits. For earnings from employment or self-employment over \$1,500, they lose \$1 of benefit for each \$2 earned, up to \$2,700 total per year.

Mr. Speaker, that graduated, dollar-by-dollar leveling off of benefits by degree of retirement, measured by earnings from employment, has been a specific proposal originating in and spelled out in section 206 of H.R. 2841, the Townsend proposal. It is gratifying that Congress finally found it so correct and so just as to adopt it, virtually by the world and by the letter.

The second and profoundly revealing point is in the medicare phase of the 1965 amendments. Eligibility for benefits rests on attained age only; and the right to such benefits accrues to all persons aged 65, regardless of qualifying or not under any technical "coverage" provisions.

That universality of right to benefits, to exactly the same benefits, equal and complete, by all alike—that is 100 percent Townsendism.

Facing the problem of health insurance we have accorded the same benefit in medical treatment to all alike. To do otherwise would be self-evidently unjust.

But, we have not yet recognized the same self-evident justice of such equality in other requirements of life—healthful diet, decently respectable clothing and housing, ability to afford reasonably up-to-date participation in the social, cultural, recreational, political, and public life of society.

Now, in view of the recent pronouncements by the President and others, we are soon to come to grips with this question of how much benefits really ought to be.

In this country where dedication to equality of rights guides our thinking in all things—after we have overcome the various prejudices inherited from the past—I suspect we will find ourselves handing the Townsend plan another compliment of the kind that has been described as the "sincerest of all." That is the compliment of imitation.

When the study recently instituted by President Johnson's order, on how much benefits should be, has been carried out—reported to Congress and run the whole course of procedure, study and debate—we will come up with the same answers as others have after they had completely pursued the question.

For example, after about 20 years of constant concern and bargaining, the unions and managements of the massive auto industry last year got down to the

answer. Roughly, it amounts to a basic, national, old-age pension—or minimum social security benefit—comparable in amount to the up-to-date concept of the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has just been through the minimum wage question. Soon Congress is going to have to think in terms of financing human life after retirement, as well as before, in exactly the same light of minimum dollars and cents necessary. The answer is too obvious. It is the same answer in both cases.

That answer is very plainly stated in the statement of purpose of H.R. 2841; that is, "to assure full participation by the elderly in the benefits of our national economy and in the prevailing standards of living thereunder."

The sense of history repeating itself persists. In the Townsend plan, where in the past we found the guiding ideas for improving social security, I believe we will find the guidelines for its perfection, in the future.

Therefore, I am proud to have sponsored the Townsend plan bill and to continue to do so.

I am pleased to announce to Congress that the directors, trustees, various leaders, and active members of the Townsend Plan Organization will hold their 26th national conference, July 3 through July 6, in Lincoln, Nebr.

I am confident many Members will join me in expressing appreciation to those far-foreseeing crusaders for social justice as they meet in their annual national conference and our confidence that they will continue their work for not only improving the benefits to the elderly but for the improved operation of our economy and our system of government.

CURBING OF TERRORISTIC ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to punish, curb, and eliminate the reprehensible, terroristic activities of the Klan movement. Our committee hearings established beyond doubt that Klans make little or no distinction in their attitude toward Negroes and any other groups or individuals they dislike. They have passionate hatred for anyone who disagrees with or opposes them—whether Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, black or white.

Therefore, my bill is not slanted in favor of, or against, any particular race, creed, or group. It is intended to curb and punish all organized terroristic activities of the kind the Klans have used—and to punish them, no matter what organization attempts to use them.

What does the bill do?

First, it defines clandestine organizations in such a way that Klans and other furtive outfits created for evil purposes are included. It then defines a criminal conspiracy so as to embrace certain organized operations which Klans and other terroristic groups have used to further their aims.

Then, what does it do?

It makes it a crime for any member or agent of a clandestine organization, in promoting the organization's aims, to travel or use any facility in interstate commerce, or conspire with or solicit another person to do so, to commit or promote any crime of violence against another.

Penalty: \$10,000, 20 years, or life imprisonment if a killing results.

It makes it a crime for a member or agent of a clandestine organization, in promoting the organization's aims, to murder, kidnap, assault, or try to murder or kidnap, any person moving in interstate commerce.

Penalty, appropriate to each of these crimes: from 5 years and \$5,000, to life imprisonment or death if a killing takes place.

It makes it a crime for a member or agent of a clandestine organization, in promoting the organization's aims, to unlawfully obstruct, by force, threat, or intimidation, the free movement of any person in interstate commerce.

Penalty: \$1,000, or 2 years.

It makes it a crime to teach or advocate the duty or desirability of using force, violence, or any unlawful means, to advance the purposes of a clandestine organization doing business in interstate commerce, or to intimidate, punish, or injure any citizen.

It makes it a crime to teach, or demonstrate, the use of explosives or any device capable of injuring a person or property, with the purpose that it be used to further the objectives of a clandestine organization, or to intimidate, punish or injure any person.

Penalty for both these offenses: \$10,000, or 10 years.

It makes it a crime for a member or agent of a clandestine organization, in furthering its aims, to use radio, wireless or telephone to assist the commission or concealment of, or to prevent detection or arrest for, an offense against the United States.

Penalty: \$5,000, or 5 years.

It makes it a crime, in connection with the activities of a clandestine organization, to administer or take an oath to conceal an offense against the United States committed by another member of the organization.

Penalty: \$500, or 2 years.

It makes it a crime for an officer of a clandestine organization to embezzle the organization's funds.

Penalty: \$5,000, or 5 years.

It provides for the surrender to the Government of any vehicle used, in interstate commerce, with the knowledge and consent of the owner, to transport any person, weapon, or explosive, with the intent they will be used to commit a crime of violence against another person or his property.

It gives the Attorney General power to obtain a court injunction against any action planned by members of a clandestine organization to further its objectives by committing any offense against the United States or an act of violence, intimidation, or harassment against any citizen.

To make this provision effective, it gives the courts, with the approval of the

Attorney General, the power to grant immunity to witnesses, and also provides punishment—by a contempt proceeding—for any witness who, after being given immunity, refuses to testify or produce records. In any case of criminal contempt, it provides for trial by jury.

The bill also, of course, has a nonpreemption provision, so that no local statute is nullified by any of its provisions.

During my illness and recuperation, I gave long and prayerful thought to this bill. I believe it provides the medicine we need to cure the disease with which Klans would infect our society.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding, and I wish to commend him, our very distinguished chairman of the committee, on his statement and upon the legislative proposals which he has here outlined.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that this Nation undertake to protect the rights which we have secured by the Constitution and the laws of the United States to the citizens of our country.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the criminal provisions recommended by the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], should provide a strong measure of protection for those rights.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that equally, or more important, than the prosecution of crime is the prevention of crime. Thus, I am particularly pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities has urged the enactment of a clear civil procedure for injunction.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], that the idea, in fact, of an injunctive relief came out of the gentleman's mind, and I was very delighted to make that a part of my own bill, because it is as necessary to prevent as to punish after an act is committed.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities is quite generous. The inclusion in his bill of this measure is very important, and I am delighted to see such a procedure proposed, so that organizations which make a career of depriving citizens of the United States of the rights and privileges and immunities guaranteed them by the laws and the Constitution might be subject to the power of the Courts of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this will be an effective preventive of terror and misery that for the past century has been generated by the Ku Klux Klan. It will serve to prevent other criminal conspiracies, as the gentleman from Louisiana has pointed out. It will help to rid the South of an age-old evil, the Ku Klux Klan.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], that it has been a pleasure to have him as a tower of strength on the committee which I chair

and I wish to commend the gentleman as well as to commend my friend, the gentleman from Texas, whom I see on the floor, who was so patient with me during the hearings and who attended with such zeal and devotion to their duties during the long trying hearings which we have had.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to do, anyway, an objective and impartial job. And, by the way, may I say that my last act before I left this body to go to the hospital was to cite certain outstanding Klansmen for contempt of this body. I intend shortly—in order to have a balanced committee—to bring before this House citations for contempt arising out of our Chicago hearings in the field of subversive activities.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I need not assure the gentleman of the high esteem and regard in which he is held by the other members of this committee, and I would commend to all Members of the House of Representatives and to all who are interested the record compiled under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS]. It is a record of fairness and of equity, concerning some of the most difficult hearings, under most trying circumstances.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I might point out, finally, that since I have been chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities not a single action was taken, not a single vote cast in all instances without unanimity on the part of both the minority and the majority side of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to chair a committee where we have such wholehearted support, and I have an idea that we can make pretty short work of the legislative hearings upon my bill and should be able to report it back to the House of Representatives quite soon.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

THE CIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of current discussion concerning the Central Intelligence Agency. Much of it has taken place in the Senate.

The real issue at hand, which has been the subject of six special congressional and executive commissions, investigations, and task forces, is the extent to which the CIA is involved in the making of our foreign policy, and the proper role of Congress in surveillance of the CIA.

It is generally recognized that the United States needs an organization to collect, correlate, and interpret foreign intelligence information, in order to protect the national security, formulate foreign policy, and unify national power, purpose, and policy in this age of perpetual crisis.

There have been instances, most notably, the Bay of Pigs disaster of 1961, in

which the operations of the Agency had the tendency of propelling policy, of narrowing the area of choice and decision and of closing out options to our political leaders.

With cases such as these in mind, the essential question boils down to this: "Are there sufficient checks upon the CIA to assure both efficient CIA operation and democratic government?" More specifically, in regard to the Senate debate, the question could be phrased, "Is more congressional surveillance of the CIA needed, for example, a joint congressional committee or larger committees in both Houses?"

I have no categorical or systematic answer to this question. However, I do wish to make some observations.

Most importantly, the CIA is an executive agency under the authority of the President. The CIA is not an arm of the Congress. The President is constitutionally responsible for the conduct of foreign relations. Availability to the President of intelligence is obviously an essential element in the formulation of foreign policy and the conduct of foreign affairs. Accordingly, the CIA is the President's staff organization which evaluates information obtained from departments and agencies of the Government and keeps him abreast from day to day of activities abroad affecting the national interest.

There is presently substantial supervision of the CIA, both congressional and executive. Ever since the Agency was created in 1947 by the National Security Act, seven Senators from the Armed Services Committee and the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling the defense budget have constituted the group to which the Agency's Director has reported. On the House side, the Director has reported to two subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. In the executive branch, both the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office regulate CIA expenditures. The Bureau of the Budget has special review procedures and the General Accounting Office audits CIA funds. Further control is exercised by the Director and high officials of the CIA.

Congress in drafting the National Security Act of 1947 properly recognized that the CIA, to be effective, would have to be an executive agency responsible to the Chief Executive. By statute, Congress gave the President, the National Security Council, and the CIA which operates under the NSC, broad and largely undefined discretionary powers—with few specific restraints. The Congress voluntarily walled itself off from detailed information.

The question of reconciling the activities of a national spy network with democratic processes is not a simple matter. Perhaps there is, philosophically at least, an inevitable conflict between the ideals of an open society and the wielding of great power on the world scene.

I have no doubt that intelligence operations are important in protecting vital security interests, depending of course upon how one interprets these interests.

I do wish to point out that an essential element of any intelligence organization is its secrecy. Its day-to-day activities must be kept from the public eye, for revelation will destroy its ability to function effectively.

To what extent the Agency should be controlled, and by whom, is a question that affects its powers intimately and may have enormous repercussions. Individuals who are concerned with civil liberties, as I am, and who have occasion to gently rap the Agency for overstepping its bounds, must be aware that they are dealing with no ordinary institution.

Having said these things, I do believe, despite the potential for irresolution on many fundamental issues, that there is a line which delineates proper conduct in foreign intelligence from improper conduct. What I mean here is that I do not wish this silent interloper to involve itself in the private lives of American citizens at home.

In this connection there are two recent cases which come to mind. I am deeply disturbed about the implications of the lawsuit of Heine against Raus. Only those aspects of the case which relate to the role of the CIA are in question here.

The facts are that Juri Raus, an employee of the Bureau of Public Roads, was hired by the Central Intelligence Agency following his election as commander of the Legion of Estonian Liberation. Because of his unique position in this emigre community, Raus was hired to develop foreign intelligence information and sources.

Now, the legion is composed of American citizens. While the association may in fact maintain various contacts abroad, largely secret, it is in essence an American organization functioning on American soil.

This is the kind of operation to which I must object. It may be true that these groups are particularly rewarding sources of foreign intelligence; similarly, the Agency is not interested in the administrative or organizational activities of the emigré group per se, but rather in the data which the group may be in a position to furnish regarding events abroad. Hence, the CIA's motivating instinct is the collection of foreign intelligence.

However this may be, the fact is that an agent of this Agency penetrated an American organization in a clandestine effort to use its resources. I cannot believe that Mr. Raus' intentions were generally known to the legion's membership.

Raus was also ordered to warn his emigré friends about the Canadian citizen Erik Heine, who is said to be a KGB operative; unquestionably, the Agency was disturbed that the sources which the legion had available, and which it was using, would be endangered if Heine were granted access to this information.

I strongly question the propriety of this procedure. I do not think the CIA has the authority to covertly infiltrate domestic institutions and groups which may or may not maintain contacts behind the Iron Curtain. The real or potential assistance which these groups

provide in the collection of foreign intelligence matter is essentially irrelevant. Nor do I believe the security of this country is imperiled by any activity undertaken by these captive nations groups in America. If such be the case—and I am thinking of foreign spies—then I would defer to the FBI.

What business is it of the CIA if an alleged KGB agent is dispatched to spy on the operations of the Legion of Estonian Liberation? Is it the proper province of the CIA to combat his influence within this American emigré community? Certainly not. But this can be the unfortunate result if the Agency assumes the power of utilizing private, domestic concerns for its own clandestine purposes.

The second case deals with a recent article appearing in the current issue of "Foreign Affairs." This is a very influential and distinguished journal. I am told that its sway within the intellectual and leadership ranks of the nation is substantial. Among other things, it indoctrinates its potent readership in the classic anti-de Gaulle curriculum.

George A. Carver, Jr. wrote a piece entitled "The Faceless Vietcong." It is an admirable, scholarly presentation. Mr. Carver is described as a student of political theory and Asian affairs, with degrees from Yale and Oxford; former officer in the U.S. aid mission in Saigon; author of "Aesthetics and the Problem of Meaning."

He is obviously well schooled. One can believe that his brief history of the Vietnam business in this journal is reputable and articulate.

What else does Mr. Carver do?

Well, he is employed by the Central Intelligence Agency. I presume that his tenure with the aid mission in Saigon was for reasons other than rendering economic assistance.

The interesting thing is that Mr. Carver, whom I have not heard of previous to this, gets top billing, although he is merely a student of political theory and Asian affairs. Other less important figures, such as the President of Tanzania, Mr. Nyerere; Mr. David Rockefeller; the President of Tunisia; and the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, are relegated to less prominent positions in this roster of international heavyweights.

Of course, Mr. Carver's contribution concerns the most topical of all current affairs. Thus we may presume he has a right to the top spot.

Mr. Carver, on behalf of the U.S. Government, makes a conscious and determined effort to justify the official policy in Vietnam. I would not take exception to this procedure if Mr. Carver were, in fact, identified as an employee of my Government. But this is not the case; we are left in doubt about his present business.

Thus we have an unidentified operative of a secret intelligence society utilizing an influential forum to propagandize the American people. This seems to be a violation of what I would consider the legitimate reach of a democratic government.

I have cited these two recent developments because they point, disturbingly, toward the conclusion that our foreign intelligence mechanism is attending to associated interests on the domestic front.

Let me add, in connection with the second instance, that Congress has specifically prohibited our foreign propaganda instrument, the USIA, from turning its persuasive techniques on the American people. The reasons are self-evident.

My objection to Mr. Carver's appearance is not based on the content of his article, nor the very fact that he, as a Government employee, chose to write for Foreign Affairs. I think it is a good practice; the people must know what our higher bureaucrats are thinking about, and they have a right to know.

But I would like for these authorities to be identified. In the case of the CIA, this may be unwise, so I would suggest that it desist completely from public debate in the news and communications media.

In connection with Mr. Raus' present discomfort, we should look back upon the legislation which established the Agency. The organization was specifically denied internal security functions. The argument that the Agency may ignore the letter and spirit of this prohibition because the end in mind is to collect foreign intelligence is spurious and dangerous for the ban itself is aimed directly at the means which the Agency may employ in its pursuits.

Because the Agency is necessarily shielded from public exposure, the responsibility for proper supervision and discretion falls heavily upon the Director and senior officials. This responsibility must be exercised in a manner which does not excessively or repeatedly test the principal tenets of this free and open society.

INVASION OF PRIVACY

Mr. GALLAGHER. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of being chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Question of the Invasion of Privacy. This committee is a tribute to the able and distinguished chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM DAWSON, and his concern for his fellow men. For the past year this group, comprised of the gentlemen from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL and Mr. HORTON] and myself, have conducted an investigation into a number of invasion of privacy practices involving the activities of Federal agencies.

I am happy to report that substantial progress has been made to reassert the right to privacy, not only of Federal employees, but also of many Americans who take part in research projects financed with Federal funds. It has been our

hope that the Federal Government could set some guidelines that would help define the problem as it relates to private industry.

The subcommittee is now turning its attention to privacy matters involving proposals to establish Federal data centers, sometimes called "dossier banks."

The Federal Government now has about 15,000 computers at an approximate cost of \$6 billion. The present studies to centralize certain types of information call for a corollary study of this problem to protect the public interest and the rights of the individual citizen. Great technological progress has been made in the field of computers and data processing that can be of tremendous value to our future. It is, however, essential that human dignity and integrity are not subordinated in the interest of economy and efficiency as man moves into the computerized age.

There is no doubt that the computerized centralization of information from the records of the Federal Government will facilitate many governmental operations. However, the possibility that such a data center would become the depository for much personal information on millions of our citizens raises questions which have serious implications.

As time goes on, there will be great pressure to include more and more individual data in the computers. Theoretically, it would be possible to press a button and obtain an instant dossier on any one of millions of people. We must make certain that there are adequate safeguards to protect the right to privacy of Americans as the Government moves into the next stage of progress.

If the Government does set up a central file or "dossier bank" of personal data on our citizens, there will be a huge store of information at hand to feed it. That list includes tax returns, census responses, social security data, military records, security files, fingerprints, mortgage guarantees, research involving individuals, and, if State and local governments are tied into the system, such things as school records, police files, driving violations, and property holdings. Confidentiality is now protected in many cases by the law. Centralization will create the need for a new set of safeguards. It might even be possible to pump credit reports and bank accounts into the computer. It should be apparent to anyone the great power that would exist behind the Federal official who has the authority to push the button that would produce such a dossier instantly.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed establishment of a Federal data bank poses dangers to the privacy of our citizens which could dwarf anything stemming from electronic eavesdropping and other modern snooping devices. I am hopeful that the hearings we plan to hold will create a climate of concern in the Government on the problems relating to invasion of privacy inherent in the proposals to set up data service centers.

One problem is that computers never forgive and certainly never forget. The school dropouts of today may turn out

to be the computer rejects of tomorrow. We must remember, too, that many of our citizens give the Government personal information on a confidential basis and for a specific purpose. Tax returns and census questionnaire answers are examples. Americans deserve the assurance that this information will not be used for any other purpose. We should also consider the possibility of allowing every citizen the right to inspect his own dossier to make certain it is completely accurate. Without safeguards such as these, there is a possibility of great injustice.

Our Government should decide now just who will have the power to push what computer buttons under what conditions. We must consider, too, how confidentiality can be properly programed, and what information should be stored. The answer may be more important to liberty than the other big button we often worry about. The potential dangers of a U.S. citizen at the mercy of a computerized society are appalling. We cannot safely presume that all of this information will always be used by benevolent people for benevolent purposes. It is quite conceivable that a potential Big Brother could make excellent use of a big button on a dossier bank for his own purposes. This would strike at the very fundamentals of our governmental structure and society.

We must consider and consider now whether our laws and public opinion are keeping pace with our rapidly expanding technologies. The technology of computerization has raised new horizons of progress. It also brings with it inherent dangers. The greatest of these dangers is that we allow ourselves to drift into a course that will substitute a computer for man's free will. It is my hope that our hearing will shed some light on this problem—a problem that concerns every citizen.

I am hopeful that the scientific community who created this technology will bear an equal responsibility to protect our free democratic society from their awesome creations. I am sure they will. But, in the final analysis it is we, the elected officials of the Government, who must bear the responsibility that science and research continue to serve man and that the basic values of privacy and all that free man treasures are not sacrificed in the name of scientific achievement.

SAVINGS AND LOANS OVER THE NATION DEMAND END TO RATE WAR

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the rate war on savings deposits, started last December by the Federal Reserve Board, is having serious repercussions throughout the United States. In some areas, the situation is more serious than others.

The Far West has particular problems, but everywhere the thrift industry, home financing, and homebuilding are feeling a severe pinch as commercial banks are fast moving to the top rate of 5½ percent on small savings certificates.

With unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following letters received from Mr. Roy W. Curtis, of Athens Federal Savings and Loan Association, Athens, Ga., and Mr. Hugh E. Bigham, of Burke County Savings and Loan Association, Morganton, N.C., supporting efforts by members of your Banking and Currency Committee to restore sanity and soundness to our financial institutions.

I can assure these gentlemen that Congress will not fail in doing its constitutional duty concerning the Nation's financial and monetary affairs. I have called for an executive session on Monday, June 13, when it is hoped a bill will be reported favorably to remedy this serious situation.

ATHENS FEDERAL SAVINGS &
LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Athens, Ga., June 2, 1966.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency
Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: We commend you upon your efforts to get legislation passed setting the minimum amount at One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for which commercial banks can issue CDs. We have watched your career over the years and realize fully that you are a great friend of the savings and loan industry and we appreciate your efforts.

As you know, the situation has reached the point whereby the banks are practically all paying 5% or more on CDs and consequently funds are being diverted to them which, in the past, have gone through the savings and loan industry and have gone into long term home loans. With the situation as it is at present, we find that our savings have dwindled considerably and we, as well as a great many other savings and loan associations, find our funds inadequate to take care of the tremendous demand for home financing. Our Federal Home Loan Bank has proposed some regulations whereby we will probably be allowed to have time CDs designed to compete with the banks but it is our opinion that this will not solve the problem. Since the federal reserve has given the banks authority already to go all the way to 5½%, we feel that they will do so immediately should our proposed regulations become final.

We urge you to continue your fine efforts designed to correct this situation by fixing a larger amount for which banks could issue CDs thereby releasing the small consumer type investment funds which we hope would come to the savings and loan industry to cover much needed home loans.

We will deeply appreciate anything you can do to alleviate the present conditions.

Yours very truly,

ROY W. CURTIS,
Vice President and Secretary.

BURKE COUNTY SAVINGS &
LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Morganton, N.C., June 7, 1966.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency
Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Out of respect to your busy schedule, I will make this letter brief and to the point.

You, of course, are probably more familiar than anyone else with the problem savings

and loan associations are now facing because of the high rate, consumer-size commercial bank certificates of deposit being issued.

This letter is to advise you of the chaos being caused in the home building industry because of the lack of funds available for home mortgages.

Any action your committee can take to relieve this situation will be greatly appreciated.

We are extremely grateful to you for all the many things you have done to help this wonderful industry, and I am sure the record of the industry in helping the American homeowner is a great satisfaction to you. I wish there was some better way you could be repaid.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH E. BIGHAM,
Executive Vice President.

SAVINGS AND LOAN OFFICIAL CHARGES THAT ABA AND COMMERCIAL BANKING FOUNDATION INTEND TO DESTROY THE THRIFT INDUSTRY

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I will insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. James E. Mathis, executive vice president, Home Federal Savings & Loan Association, Gainesville, Ga. Mr. Mathis pleads for corrective measures to end the spreading rate war as a result of policies of the American Bankers Association against savings and loans. He also enclosed a copy of a newspaper advertisement by the Foundation for Commercial Banks, Philadelphia National Bank Building, Philadelphia, Pa., inviting banks to join in an effort to injure the thrift industry.

HOME FEDERAL
SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Gainesville, Ga., May 30, 1966.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Without going into great detail, it has become evident to me that some corrective measures need to be taken to stabilize the spreading rate war in the savings market as a result of the consumer sized commercial bank certificates of deposit.

It is regrettable that the commercial bankers have permitted the ABA to lead them into conflict with savings and loan associations when no such actions were necessary. In my opinion, it is short-sightedness on the part of the ABA because it can only lead to further deterioration in the relationship between financial institutions.

Should this action continue, I feel that pressure will be brought by the leaders of our industry for regulations which will permit us to become more and more like commercial banks.

I have talked to the commercial bankers in Gainesville, Georgia, and have told them that most savings and loan associations were satisfied as specialists and that we preferred to remain in the business of attracting personal savings and making home loans. However, I do not believe the aggressive managers of

this industry are going to sit quietly by and let the banks under the leadership of the ABA and the Commercial Banking Foundation continue such promotions as shown in the attached ad.

The attached advertisement I consider to be crude and certainly it does not lend itself to the dignity and high esteem with which we hold our friends in the commercial banking industry.

In my opinion the commercial banks and the savings and loan associations complement each other. Any action taken by the Congress, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board or any trade organization which leads to further dis-harmony between these institutions is most unwise.

The impact of the CD program on the personal savings market must surely have been overlooked by the Federal Reserve Board.

Your continued interest in these matters is deeply appreciated by the entire Board of Directors of our association.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MATHIS,
Executive Vice President.

WHO'S AFRAID OF THIS BIG COUPON? YOUR SAVINGS AND LOAN COMPETITORS . . . AND THEY HAVE A RIGHT TO BE

FOUNDATION FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS,
Philadelphia National Bank Building,
Philadelphia, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: I understand that your membership now numbers nearly 6000 banks . . . that your advertising budget now exceeds \$1,600,000 . . . that you tell the Full Service Banking story in five big national magazines.

I've heard that in a recent survey 88% of your member banks thought the Full Service theme was effective as an industry umbrella under which local bank advertising can be more productive. And 86% rated the advertising "excellent" or "good."

I also realize that with more members the Foundation's advertising effort is bound to be even more powerful. Therefore—

(Check one:)

Enroll me as a member and send a Full Service symbol for our bank's door by return mail. Here is my check for \$_____ based on the rate of \$10 per million of deposits.

Enroll me as a member and bill me. Send the Full Service symbol.

Send me complete information about the Foundation.

Name: _____
Title: _____
Bank: _____
Address: _____

WYOMING SAVINGS OFFICIAL CITES
"PRIMER ON MONEY" FOR
CLEARER UNDERSTANDING OF
OUR MONETARY SYSTEM AND
CITES RATE WAR AS SERIOUS
THREAT

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a letter I recently received from Mr. Robert G. Kimball, president of Provident Federal Savings & Loan Association, Casper, Wyo., Mr. Kimball gave his unqualified endorsement to the "Primer on Money" which in easy-to-read terms explains how the Nation's monetary system works.

Mr. Kimball, who also happens to be the Wyoming Director on the Federal Home Loan Bank of Spokane, warns that the current rate war between savings and loan institutions and banks requires immediate action before his industry is so crippled that Congress will be forced to subsidize it. Needless to say, the housing needs of this great Nation will simply go unsatisfied if thrift institutions, which are required to invest 90 percent of their assets in home loans, are denied adequate funds.

With unanimous consent, I will insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Kimball's letter:

PROVIDENT FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN
ASSOCIATION OF CASPER,

April 25, 1966.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PATMAN: First let me congratulate you on your "A Primer on Money." It has afforded me a ready reference and a much more clear understanding of our monetary system. I have enclosed a tear sheet of a bank ad run in our local paper advertising certificates of deposit in minimums of \$5,000.00 for one year at 5½% per annum. The President of the bank told me it was merely a tool to hold corporate investments, yet had no answer as to the low minimum balance of \$5,000.00.

Casper has a population of approximately 45,000 with 5 banks and 2 federal savings and loans. The savings and loans have been paying 4¼% per annum in dividends and the banks up to 4¾% per annum on certificates of deposit. Wyoming's economy is such that there is no immediate market for this priced money. The Security Bank and Trust could be responsible for forcing all the banks in Wyoming, causing a serious loss to the savings and loans. We are completely at their mercy. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington, D.C. will not allow us to put a maturity date or a rate on the variable rate certificates they have authorized us to issue, hence as a competitive tool said certificates are unusable. This is due to the fact that the people want to see the rate that we are willing to pay on the certificates and we don't want to be locked in on rate for an undeterminable length of time.

If in fact certificates of deposit are meant for corporate investors, the minimum balance should be \$25,000.00. This balance would leave money in savings for mortgage lending. Needless to say, banks paying 4½% to 5½% for money are not interested in real estate mortgages.

I am serving as the Wyoming Director on the Federal Home Loan Bank of Spokane and can speak for the 13 federally insured savings and loans in Wyoming when I say the Federal Reserve must take immediate action before our industry is so crippled that Congress will be forced to subsidize us. We are exceedingly proud of the fact that we as an industry are running our own shop without assistance—please help us keep it that way.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. KIMBALL,
President.

TIGHT MONEY HURTS THOSE WHO
CAN LEAST AFFORD IT, REPORTS
WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members of Congress, I am sure, have received mail from their constituents expressing concern and outlining their credit difficulties caused by the Federal Reserve tight money market.

Back in December, I warned Members of Congress that the Fed decision to raise the discount rate and regulation Q would cause the economy to go into a very tight and inflationary spiral. I do not like to gloat over the fact that I predicted the course of action, but the facts are evident to all, Mr. Speaker.

What has happened is that the Fed has caused interest rates to move up to an alltime high level and this action has not curbed the inflation that the Fed feared nor has it cooled off the boom in the economy. But it has almost wiped out the housing market, making mortgage rates prohibitively high, causing disastrous declines in the building industry. The thrift industry has suffered tremendous savings outflows and has witnessed new savings racing to large commercial banks to obtain the high-interest, short-maturity certificates of deposit. We know how important the thrift industry is to the housing market, but we also know that the new savings accounts obtained by commercial banks will not be invested in homebuilding and homeowning, but will be invested in high-yield, inflationary loans to stock market speculators and in corporate inventories. Commercial banks would rather push credit cards than finance homeowner-ship.

Mr. Speaker, Friday's Wall Street Journal contains an excellent and accurate account of the present credit situation; I call it to the attention of all Members:

CREDIT PARADOXES: TIGHT MONEY PINCHES DIFFERENT PEOPLE, FIRMS IN VERY UNEVEN FASHION—BANKS ARE SQUEEZED, BUT STILL PUSH CREDIT CARDS; STOCK SPECULATORS FEEL NO PAIN—PERSONAL LOAN FIRMS UNHURT

(By Lee Silberman)

If you're a would-be home buyer, you may not be able to get a mortgage loan, no matter how good your credit is. But if you're a veteran stock speculator, you shouldn't have much trouble borrowing money to buy more shares on margin—and you might get a relatively favorable interest rate.

If you're a small businessman, you will have little difficulty buying supplies on credit from a big manufacturer. But heaven help you if you're slow paying the bill; your supplier may cut you off from further deliveries.

If you're a consumer, personal finance companies will push loans at you as vigorously as ever, and some banks will urge you to sign up for one of their new credit-card plans so that you can charge anything from a round-the-world trip to the purchase of a screwdriver at the corner hardware store. But if you don't have a credit card, be sure to pay your bills quickly; otherwise your account will be turned over to a collection agency sooner than it would have been a year ago, and the agency will expect a bigger initial payment.

TIGHT AND LESS TIGHT

These are some of the contrasts fostered by the uneven impact of tight money conditions on the economy. Generally, supplies of lendable funds are low, in relation to the demand for them, and interest rates are high throughout the nation. But the pinch is being felt by different individuals and enterprises to extremely varying degrees, and sometimes in seemingly contradictory fashion.

The contradictions all have explanations—some simple, some growing out of an intricate web of financial relationships. Take the current situation of the nation's banks.

Major New York City banks currently are in the grip of their tightest squeeze in recent history. At present 74% of their total deposits are out on loan, up from 69.9% at the end of 1965 and 62% at the end of 1964. While the situation at banks in other cities is not quite that tight, the loans-to-deposits ratio of all large U.S. banks in financial centers is 69.7% now, considerably higher than usual and up from 63.1% at the end of last year.

Banks, of course, cannot loan out all their deposits. They must keep a specified percentage on reserve, and generally they seek to retain more to handle an unexpected rise in loan demand or a surge of withdrawals. Figures released by the New York Federal Reserve bank yesterday showed that the banking system currently is more severely cramped for reserves than in many years. (See stories on pages 4 and 5.)

DOLLARS FROM ABROAD

To get the cash to make new loans the banks have resorted to the painful step of selling off some of their holdings of bonds of Federal, State and local governments—at depressed prices. Some also have been urgently requesting their branches abroad to send home any dollars they can spare for short periods. "I never thought I'd live to see the day when the huge U.S. banking system would be carried in effect by the dollars we're able to bring out of the Old Country," says a New York banker.

The banks' squeeze, moreover, may get worse in the next few days. Some \$3.9 billion of the deposits U.S. banks hold consist of money paid by investors, mostly corporations, for "certificates of deposit" that mature this month—\$321 million today, and \$717 million next Wednesday, an important deadline for installment payments of Federal taxes on corporate profits. Certificates of deposit, or "CDs," are documents which evidence that a depositor has placed funds in the bank for a specified time.

Most large banks replaced huge batches of CDs maturing in March and April, around previous tax-deadline times, by raising the interest rates they pay on such instruments—on nine-month CDs, to 5½% from about 5¼% earlier, for instance. But they can't raise these rates again to replace the June CDs; the present 5½% is the maximum that Federal authorities permit them to pay. And a CD holder can get 5½%, or more, on various other types of short-term paper.

PUSHING CREDIT CARDS

Yet in the midst of this squeeze, more banks are pushing credit cards at their individual customers. It's all a matter of timing. The sums they pay out of sellers of various goods and services to cover the bills run up by card holders are relatively modest now, at least compared to the banks' business-loan volume. But the banks expect the credit-card business someday to be giant and profitable—and they are convinced they must develop it themselves, rather than let independent credit-card plans get a lock on the business.

Thus, even as the Monthly Economics Letter of New York's First National City Bank

warns that U.S. banks may have to curtail loans of all sorts, individuals going into a First National City branch find racks bulging with application forms for Carte Blanche credit cards, and huge placards imploring them to take one. The bank acquired the Carte Blanche business from a Hilton Hotels Corp. subsidiary early this year, and is continuing to operate it pending the outcome of an antitrust action against the acquisition.

California's giant Bank of America announced two weeks ago that it is negotiating with banks in six other states to license the distribution there of its BankAmericard credit cards, which have been in use in California since 1958. First National Bank of Seattle launched a Firstbank Card plan, allowing consumers to charge all sorts of purchases, throughout the state of Washington on June 1. Hartford National Bank and Trust Co. in Connecticut plans to get what it calls the Hartford National Charge Card in operation by August.

Major banks also appear, surprisingly, to be cutting back only slightly on loans to securities dealers, who relend the money to traders buying stock on margin. The banks consider loans to brokers an excellent temporary use for the funds they keep around to meet unexpected loan or deposit-withdrawal demand. Such loans are usually made on a one-day basis (though they are made every day) and they can be called immediately, if stock prices plunge sharply or if the bank needs its money.

With their bank borrowings, plus funds of their own that have been generated by this year's immense stock-trading volume, brokerage-firm members of the New York Stock Exchange between Jan. 1 and Apr. 1, the latest period for which figures are available, expanded their loans to stock buyers nearly 6%, to a total of over \$5.8 billion outstanding. In the like period of 1965, broker loans to customers declined, though only a fraction of 1%.

True, some stock buyers are paying fancy interest to make margin transactions (on such a transaction the buyer puts up in cash 70% of the value of the stock he purchases, and borrows the rest). A stock-market tyro borrowing money to buy his first few shares on margin will pay interest at an annual rate of 7% at some brokerage houses. But a veteran speculator borrowing to finance a huge margin trade will pay only 6% interest to some brokers.

If stock-market speculators have been relatively unaffected by tight money, home buyers have been hit harder than anyone else. The main reason: Individuals—including would-be home buyers—are saving much less money than a year ago, putting a pinch on the supply of money available for mortgages. This trend generally has been blamed on increased payroll withholding for Social Security and Federal income taxes, which has bit into workers' take-home pay.

In the first four months of 1966 net savings (new savings minus withdrawals) received by U.S. savings and loan associations plummeted to \$740 million, from nearly \$1.8 billion in the 1965 period. April saw a large outflow of savings, as withdrawals exceeded new savings.

S&L officials are certain savings they normally would get have been flowing into bank CDs, which are available in individuals as well as corporations, at rates up to 5½% (savings and loan associations aren't permitted to offer such high savings rates without losing their borrowing power at the Federal Home Loan Banks). But in total the drop in savings at banks has been more dramatic even than the drop at S&Ls.

Big commercial banks that report weekly to the Federal Reserve System by May 25 had increased their CDs outstanding by \$1.7 billion, or about 10%, from the start of the

year. But in the same period they suffered a \$2.2 billion drop in their outstanding totals of passbook savings, on which they are permitted to pay only 4% interest tops. So their totals of CDs and passbook savings went down a net of \$500 million.

The drop in savings has accentuated the squeeze on banks, and with corporate loan demand booming they have cut back on mortgage loans. The reaction at S&Ls, which make many more mortgage loans, has been more drastic. With money flowing out in April, some have stopped making mortgage loans entirely for the time being.

Nor will the home buyer find any relief at life insurance companies, which normally make many mortgage loans. The insurers' sales of policies have been expanding at a rapid clip. But the lendable funds that the policy sales supply have been snapped up by corporations that have been unable to borrow as much money as they would like at their banks. The corporations are lining up to arrange private sales of bonds to the insurance companies.

An official at Prudential's main office in Newark, N.J., says the company is short of funds for mortgage lending throughout its Eastern region, and that the cash is being conserved mainly to satisfy the demands of builders and developers who regularly do business with Prudential.

Frustrated home buyers might console themselves by buying something else—plush furniture for the old quarters, perhaps. If the increased withholding tax rates leave too little cash in their paychecks for the purchase, personal finance companies will lend them the money gladly.

Personal-loan companies, like some other non-bank lenders and some corporations, raise money by selling "commercial paper" (essentially a form of IOU) to investors. The rates they have had to pay on the paper to attract funds have risen sharply; they now range from 5½% to 5¾% on 90-day to six month notes. But the small-loan companies have no qualms about paying such rates, since they can lend the money to consumers at interest rates ranging as high as 20% annually.

"NO SLOWDOWN HERE"

Buoyed by high interest rates, the market for commercial paper has been strong. The total outstanding rose 4% just in April, to a record \$11.6 billion outstanding; that was 20% greater than a year earlier. So the finance companies have plenty of money to lend.

"There's no tendency for a slowdown in lending by personal loan companies," says DeWitt Paul, chairman of Beneficial Finance Co., one of the largest of these concerns. "We want to get good customers while the stream is flowing, and have been continuing to do all the things we always do to promote our business."

Some non-bank lenders that concentrate on loans to businesses, and also raise their funds by selling commercial paper, take the same line. Example: Factoring concerns, which lend money to companies in return for the right to collect the bills that customers owe to those companies.

The basic factoring loan rate now ranges from 7.2% to 8.4%, up from 6% to 7.2% in late 1965. But the rise has not hurt volume. The factors are getting a heavy demand from businessmen who have been turned away from banks where they had sought loans.

Mill Factors Corp. in New York expects to expand its new-loan volume to \$400 million this year, from \$390 million in 1965. "We don't have to compete for new accounts today; they come to us," says Walter D. Yankauer, president, Mill Factors, he says, long has concentrated on loans to textile and soft-goods manufacturers, but now is making loans to such new customers as steel distributors.

CORPORATION CASH SQUEEZE

An expansion of lending on the modest scale Mill Factors talks of, however, hardly will meet the credit demands of business. As a group, U.S. corporations, like the banks from which they are trying to get loans, are in a tight cash squeeze.

To finance day-to-day operations and expansion plans, corporations ordinarily rely largely on internally generated funds—chiefly retained profits and sums charged off by the company as depreciation but kept in the treasury. During 1965, however, corporations as a group turned nearly none of these funds into cash or Government securities. At the end of the year holdings of cash and Governments by U.S. non-financial corporations totaled \$64.1 billion—exactly the same as at the end of 1964.

Some apparent reasons: Corporations chose to put much of their internally generated funds to use financing higher inventories. Inventories held by non-financial corporations expanded to \$126.6 billion at the end of 1965, from \$114.3 billion at the end of 1964, a rise of nearly 11%.

Companies also apparently made many more of their sales on credit. While the cash and Government security holdings of nonfinancial corporations didn't rise at all during 1965, the National Association of Credit Management figures that by March 31 this year U.S. manufacturers' holdings of accounts receivable—bills owed to them by customers—jumped to a record \$54.7 billion, up almost 12% from \$49 billion a year earlier.

Whatever the reason, since U.S. corporations' debts grew while their cash holdings didn't, non-financial companies finished 1965 with cash and Government securities equal to only 27% of their current liabilities—a record low ratio. At the end of 1964 the ratio was 30%; as recently as the end of 1962 it was 34%. This ratio is an important measure of corporate "liquidity"—the ability of businesses to meet unforeseen expenses.

With less cash on hand, in relation to their debts, corporations also are less able to meet those well-foreseen expenditures, spending for new plant and equipment. Their need to do so is much greater, though; according to the most recent Government survey, corporations plan capital spending of \$60.8 billion this year, up 17% from 1965.

PAY UP QUICK

In 1965, for the first time in the current boom, corporations' capital spending exceeded the funds they got from "cash flow" (profits plus depreciation), notes Eli Shapiro, Harvard University finance professor. The same thing is expected to happen in 1966.

What to do? Besides besieging banks for loans, and trying to sell bonds privately to insurance companies, cash-pinched corporations have been selling many stock and bond issues to the public. Also, while extending credit liberally to customers, they have been demanding that the customers pay up faster.

At the end of March, according to the National Association of Credit Management, 85.7% of the bills owed to manufacturers were being paid on time and only 2.5% were over 90 days past due. A year earlier, only 84.3% of manufacturers' accounts receivable were classed as "current" and 2.8% were 90 days or more delinquent.

"We can invest our idle money and get a return of better than 5% nowadays, but when the money is tied up in old unpaid accounts it's dead," says Peter McLaughlin, comptroller of Union Camp Corp., a leading maker of paper products. So, he says, his company has begun a stricter collection program, with some success. The average period of Union Camp's unpaid bills has been cut to 29 days, from 31 days a year earlier, he says.

Some companies have gone even further. In the aluminum industry, which is

swamped with defense orders, one major fabricator is simply refusing to sell any more goods to some of its slower-paying customers. Union Camp, too, is becoming more selective about whom it sells to, says Mr. McLaughlin.

DUNNING CONSUMERS

As big companies dun smaller ones to pay their bills faster, smaller companies are similarly dunning consumers. The American Collectors Association says both the number of bills referred to collection agencies and the size of the original bill that becomes delinquent, have risen in the past year.

In the first quarter of 1966, a spokesman says, the number of accounts held by the average collection agency increased to 1,333, up 4% from 1,278 in the 1965 period. The average size of the individual account referred for collection rose to \$62.14 from \$51.31.

A bright note: If the American consumer is unable or unwilling to save as much as a year ago, and unable to prevent more of his bills from being turned over to collection agencies, he is at least both able and willing to make bigger payments to the collection agencies. The American Collectors Association says the average initial payment to an agency on a bill turned over for collection rose to \$17.18 in the first quarter, from \$15.97 a year earlier.

DEFENSE INDUSTRIES SHOULD BE PREPARED FOR PRODUCTION OF THE TOOLS OF PEACE

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in my first speech before this distinguished body on January 28, 1965, I urged a full-scale Federal effort to assist the transition of defense industries to civilian production.

The need for full attention to the dangers of too great a dependence upon defense contracts by industry, large and small, cannot be overemphasized.

I therefore think it proper to consider the subject of conversion from defense work to civilian production even as we take up legislation authorizing the expenditure of billions more for defense industries. For, even though such massive expenditures for military hardware have been a major factor in our economy in most years since World War II, these expenditures are purely a function of the international political situation, a situation which is presently experiencing great and far-reaching readjustments which, hopefully, will eventually result in a lessening of the need for massive spending for the weapons of war, and give us time to produce for peace.

Therefore, I would like once again to emphasize the need for industries to prepare for a future wherein Department of Defense contracts do not provide their economic lifeblood.

In the interest of our economy in general, and the continuing prosperity of areas like Long Island which I have the honor to represent, we must prepare for the future—for peace.

I must say that many of our firms have grown soft because of one big customer—Uncle Sam—who has depended upon their skill and productivity in the past.

The hard fact is that he may not need them in the future. Uncle Sam's largesse could be gone overnight.

Mr. Speaker, the market for consumer goods and civilian industrial goods is a much more enduring market than production of the weapons of war because, hopefully, peace will ultimately become more characteristic of our times than war. Peace is the goal toward which we are working, and our industry should be prepared for a smooth transition to peacetime production when that time comes. This conversion can be part of the move toward peace.

Many of our business leaders have accepted the reality of preparing for peace and are currently charting a course that will enable them to meet the challenges of the private sector.

I respectfully urge all industrial leaders to carefully review the extent of their dependence upon production of the machines of war, and begin to plan for production of the tools of peace.

May that happy transition be close at hand.

SOVIET DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES IN 1940-41

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the Second World War spelled tragedy to all peoples of Europe. They all suffered, endured privations, and faced indescribable hardships throughout the war. But some peoples suffered more than others, and some are still suffering even today from its tragic consequences. The Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were among the first victims of the war, and unfortunately their suffering is not over yet.

These brave and virtuous people, ever proud of their national traditions and distinct individuality, and always struggling for their freedom, had regained their independence at the end of the First World War and were enjoying their well-earned freedom in their historic homelands under their own forms of democratic governments. In the course of two decades, during the interwar years, they had succeeded in making their respective countries model democracies, and were enjoying a relatively prosperous peace. But the Second World War brought on military invasion and misfortune which has become part of their miserable lot for more than 25 years.

Early in the war the Kremlin took full advantage of the helplessness of the peoples of these countries and imposed its iron will upon them. First the governments of these countries were forced to sign mutual assistance pacts with the Soviet Union; then they were compelled to allow Russian garrisons be stationed in certain strategic places of these countries; and finally, in June of 1940, the

Red army overran and occupied these countries.

These Baltic peoples were thus robbed of their freedom and enslaved by the Red army. In the meantime Soviet agents had instituted a veritable reign of terror throughout these countries. Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were arrested by the tens of thousands, imprisoned and then deported to Asiatic parts of the Soviet Union. The terror and arrests continued until the Red army was forced out of these countries by the Nazis in late June of 1941. In mid-June of that year, just before their eviction, however, Soviet authorities had intensified their reign of terror, and in one night alone, on June 13 and 14, many tens of thousands of innocent people were arrested and deported. All told, during the first year of their occupation, Soviet authorities had deported several hundred thousand Baltic peoples to distant and forbidding parts of Asiatic Russia.

It is sad and tragic that while we solemnly observe the anniversary of this terrible event, the fate of its victims is not definitely known, while the survivors of that tragedy still suffer in their homelands under Soviet totalitarian tyranny. In paying homage to the memory of the dead, we pray for the well-being and freedom of those unhappy survivors.

BOTTLENECK IN MORTGAGE MONEY

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill, H.R. 15608. This is to perfect the wording of my previous bill, H.R. 15364. Both bills are aimed at the elimination of unsound competition for funds and to provide for the liquidity of the commercial banking system. Purpose of the bills is to eliminate the bottleneck in mortgage money that is slowly bringing the building industry to a near halt in some parts of the country.

The amendment represented by H.R. 15608 occurs in section 2 of the bill. It is intended to conform the ceiling of a 4½-percent interest rate on time deposits and savings deposits under the Federal Reserve Act with the same ceiling designated in section 3 of the bill, where a 4½-percent rate is established under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act for insured nonmember banks.

THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the American flag over the years has become the supreme and beloved symbol of our Nation, its freedoms, its ideals, its triumphs.

On this day set aside to celebrate the birthday of Old Glory, it is appropriate that I remind my colleagues of a bill pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary to prohibit desecration of the American flag.

On April 6, I introduced a bill, H.R. 14330, to make it an equally serious offense to desecrate the American flag as it is to destroy a draft card. The response from the American public has been gratifying with widespread support from Kalamazoo, Mich., to Miami, Fla., and from Allentown, Pa., to Honolulu, Hawaii.

I feel very strongly about the need to obtain passage of such legislation during the current session of Congress. There have been several recent, unfortunate incidents which resulted in the deliberate desecration of our flag; yet, there is no Federal law prohibiting such action outside the District of Columbia.

Although each of the 50 States has a law protecting the American flag, there is a wide variance in the penalties provided. The maximum penalty for the first offense of desecration of the American flag in the State of Indiana is a fine not to exceed \$10. The State of Texas, on the other hand, provides a maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment for the same offense.

While I often question Federal legislation which infringes on States rights, I feel it is an obligation of the Congress to provide uniform protection for the very soul of our Nation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the American flag is the soul of this Nation reflecting its proud heritage, traditions, and freedoms.

Some may consider my patriotism a bit old fashioned, but I like to think of the American flag as a symbol of hope to our fighting men on a lonely battlefield thousands of miles from home, the emblem of liberty to the patriots of 1776, and the standard of strength and unity against the aggression of our enemies.

At this time in history, we can ill afford to allow acts of anti-Americanism within our own country to go unchecked. A bill to prohibit desecration of our flag is a step in the right direction. I urge prompt and favorable consideration of H.R. 14330.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's sound proposals for revisions in the laws on campaign funds have received support from the Baltimore Sun.

The newspaper says in an editorial that the President has provided the outline of badly needed changes in the rules

and calls for action as soon as possible. It makes this comment:

No one who looks at our present laws can argue that they do not need thorough revision and improvement.

A study by the Citizens' Research Foundation of Princeton estimates the national campaigns of the major parties cost \$29.2 million in 1964. The Sun cites this estimate as an indication that the present laws and their limitations are ineffective.

The newspaper speaks favorably of specific proposals made by the President. I would like to make its opinions available to my colleagues by inserting the editorial in the RECORD:

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Federal laws applying to political campaign funds are such a tangle of outmoded, ineffective rules that it may be difficult for the present session of Congress, with many of its own members already engaged in reelection efforts, to tackle the job of reforming and modernizing them, as President Johnson recommended in a special message last week. But if new rules could not be applied in the midst of present campaigns, they could be drafted to go into effect next year. At the least a start should be made as soon as possible, and the President has provided the outline of changes which are badly needed.

A few facts about present laws show how ineffective they are. A national committee can raise and spend no more than \$3 million a year, according to the law. Yet a recent study, by the Citizens' Research Foundation of Princeton, estimates that the national campaigns of the Republicans and Democrats in 1964 cost \$29.2 million. The \$3 million limitation is bypassed through a multiplicity of committees. Present law limits an individual contributor to \$5,000, but he can make contributions of that amount to any number of committees. Primary elections are not covered by present Federal regulations, yet they are an essential part of our political system; in some instances more important than the general elections.

The President recommended that the \$3 million ceiling be removed, but that every candidate, including candidates for President and Vice President, and every committee that supports a candidate be required to report in detail on every contribution and expense item over \$100. He would extend the Federal law to primaries. These two proposals would make available to the public a complete financial picture of a national campaign, for example, which our present laws simply do not provide.

In the same vein, the President recommended that members of Congress be required to report annually all gifts of over \$100 received for themselves or their families. Individual contributors would not be permitted to give more than \$5,000 to the campaign of any candidate. Both proposals are excellent.

To facilitate widespread participation by the public in the financing of political campaigns—an objective which would be in the interest of sound political parties as well as in the interest of the public—the President recommended that individual taxpayers be allowed an income tax deduction of up to \$100 for contributions to any candidate or organization supporting a candidate, in primary, Federal, state or local elections. Some question may be raised as to the suggestion that this should be in addition to the standard deduction for taxpayers who do not itemize their returns, but the principle of thus encouraging a greater number of small contributions is sound. So is the proposal to allow fund-raisers to sell souvenirs at up to \$5 each, but to forbid committees to raise

money by selling advertising space in campaign books.

No one who looks at our present laws can argue that they do not need thorough revision and improvement. Congress should be encouraged to take the President's message, along with suggestions made by other authorities, and go to work.

U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY: CLASS OF 1966 GRADUATION ADDRESS

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Navy-Marine Corps Memorial Stadium at Annapolis, Md., on Wednesday, June 8, 1966, was the scene of the impressive graduation exercises for the class of 1966 of the U.S. Naval Academy of which institution I am a member of the Board of Visitors.

The graduating class had 868 members, of which 763 were commissioned as ensigns in the Navy and 79 as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. It included some from foreign countries, who were not commissioned in the U.S. Armed Forces. All graduates were awarded the degree of bachelor of science.

Rear Adm. Draper L. Kauffman, Superintendent of the Naval Academy, presided and Adm. David L. McDonald, the Chief of Naval Operations, made the graduation address.

In order that Admiral McDonald's address may have a wider circulation, I quote it as part of my remarks today.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY ADMIRAL DAVID L. McDONALD, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, AT THE 1966 U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATION CEREMONIES, ANNAPOLIS, MD., JUNE 8, 1966
Thank you Admiral Kauffman.

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and more specifically, members of the graduating class.

Today really belongs to you of this graduating class of 1966—and to me! For the last four years—in some ways perhaps a very long four years—you have looked forward to this day with eager anticipation. It is the culmination of your desire to become commissioned officers in the United States Navy. But gentlemen, I have been waiting for over 40 years for such an occasion as this and please believe me when I say to you that my happiness in being afforded the distinguished honor of making this graduation address equals the happiness that you enjoy.

In seeking subject matter for this talk, I have reviewed graduation addresses given here from the time of the first one I myself heard. That was in 1925; the speaker was the then President Coolidge and his theme was peace—and how we should strive to attain it.

Others speaking here have predicted the future; many have dealt with the present—sometimes glorying in the advances of the Navy, and other times bemoaning the lack of appreciation of our needs. But in almost every address reference has been made to certain basic principles that seemingly never change.

Today—I would like to outline briefly for you a few of these basic facts which seem-

ingly never change; things which I think will be important and helpful to you as you proceed along your chosen career. I might say, at this point, that my remarks will be equally applicable to those of you who have elected to be commissioned in other than the Navy. And gentlemen—when I say that I propose to outline these few basic facts briefly, I mean briefly. Although I, as the Chief of Naval Operations, do issue quite a few orders, I still take orders also—including some from my wife. She has made it very plain to me that those of you who are anxiously waiting for diplomas and for commissions simply aren't in the mood to listen to a long-winded speaker, and thus, I should keep my remarks brief. I shall.

In a very few minutes your four years of labors here will find their fruition in two pieces of parchment which will be delivered to you—your diploma, which formally certifies what you have done, and your commission, which is an indication of what you are expected to do.

If perchance you feel that you are hazarding much in surrendering something of your liberty to the demands of your unknown profession, consider the hazards to the nation which may arise because it is placing its destiny in no small degree in your hands. Have you really done anything which justifies the Government in this expression of its great confidence? In congratulating you then, upon the completion of your course, I wish to emphasize not so much your own personal accomplishment in your work at the Naval Academy—as the opportunity that your Government now places before you as a result of your successful work here.

I wonder if you really realize the tremendous faith which your Government has in you? The commission which will be offered to you today states that in you is reposed special trust and confidence in your patriotism, valour, fidelity and abilities. Acceptance of this commission offers to you an entire career in your chosen profession without the need to be re-elected, or even re-appointed. This is an honor and a confidence that few in this world ever have an opportunity to enjoy. But here I emphasize the word "opportunity," because the path you are about to embark upon is literally strewn with rocks and shoals upon which it is all too easy for your career to founder. Taking advantage of this great opportunity which is now yours means preparing yourself in every possible way for the effective discharge of the many and varied responsibilities which will be placed upon you by virtue of this special trust and confidence which is soon to be placed in you.

During your course here you have been largely run through the same mold. It is this common denominator found in the graduates of this Academy which makes it possible for us better to cultivate and develop experience in a variety of situations and commands. Here within these walls there exists a sense of timelessness—a thing we call tradition—the tradition of the sea and of ships; the tradition of valour and of service which forms so large a part of any naval training worth its salt. Naval history and the traditions and experiences arising therefrom are facts and cannot be changed or disputed. Many of these experiences and traditions have not only been carried down by word of mouth, but they have also been embodied in laws and rules and regulations. To a considerable degree, it is because of these experiences and the fact that they have been put into tangible, concrete form that it is possible for officers to relieve one another and to carry on the work so easily without a break or letdown in efficiency. Many of these experiences you will find to be your bedrock foundation in the decision-making process when the chips are down and there is no time for a study or an analytical

review before an enemy may have rendered you impotent.

However, do not let yourself be stifled by custom or tradition and do not hesitate to expand from this pattern to which you have been molded whenever you consider it wise so to do.

Always remember that upon graduation from the Naval Academy your education has only begun. Now—somewhat in contrast to the regimentation which I believe is so desirable here at the Naval Academy, you will have ample material and opportunities upon which to expend your best mental efforts; opportunities—ample opportunities—for the exercise of all your faculties. This will not only be done by the ordinary operations of the Navy itself, but by the special advanced and postgraduate courses which are open to you in scientific lines and in the several war college courses in the national problems of strategy and tactics.

There probably have been days when the officers of the Navy might have thought that they were in danger of mental and spiritual deterioration in peacetime because there was not enough active work to occupy the splendid mental equipment with which they entered the service. Such is certainly not the present situation.

Less than 10 per cent of the officers entering the Navy today are graduates of this Academy. Many of the other 90 percent have never intended to make the Navy a career. They have always had other objectives in life. However, they have agreed to spend a certain number of years in the Navy because they feel it is not only their duty, but also because they know that by so doing, they will better prepare themselves for the discharge of their responsibilities should it become necessary at some future time for them to be called to the colors. On the other hand, I must assume that you who have come to the Naval Academy have done so because you wanted to become naval officers. Thus, you have chosen the life of a naval officer as your profession. You are, therefore, about to become a professional fighting man. Never forget it. As such you must know and keep ever in mind the ultimate objective of the Navy—the real reason for a Navy—and that is victory at sea—when-ever it becomes necessary. And victories at sea are won only by men who know how to fight ships and planes at sea. With this in mind you should realize that this profession upon which you are about to embark is difficult and demanding beyond measure because failures become very permanent in defeat. There can be no meaningful second prize, also-rans, or even honorable mention awards after military actions.

Some of you won't command units at sea because you have already decided to become specialists in our Navy. Others will undoubtedly make a similar decision later. Let there be no doubt in your minds concerning our needs in these areas either. Today—perhaps more than ever before in the history of our Navy—we need highly trained technicians, efficiency experts, managers and the like. Although victories cannot be won by incompetent commanders, it is equally essential that competent commanders be provided with adequate material means. Officers with individual specialized qualifications are absolutely essential in this day of highly sophisticated and very expensive weapons systems. And even those of you who do not become specialists in the true sense of the word will, by virtue of your future operational assignments—and formal studies—become at least semi-experts in one or more particular fields.

But whether we be operators, technicians, managers, or whatever, let's always remember that the Navy is in many respects unique. We conceive, design, develop, construct and operate various types of units—which taken all together—constitute the equivalent of a

vast industrial empire. Yet, ours is not a business in the narrow sense of the word. It is a profession, and for you—a career. Even though we must assuredly embrace, whenever and wherever practical, those managerial actions which will best ensure maximum efficiency, don't forget the need to keep in mind certain unique features of our establishment. We cannot hire and fire as is done in many businesses. For instance we cannot acquire a better expert in uniform from another similar business because there is no similar business—our country has only one Navy. We cannot summarily dismiss our adequate but less competent performers—willy-nilly—because there is no pool of proper talent from which to fill the void that would be thus created.

This means that you and I must not only strive for superior competence ourselves, but we must lead and guide and teach in order better to provide our Navy with the competence it requires. It means also that we must have patience and understanding so that we may help our less outstanding personnel to give at least all they are capable of giving even if it is less than what might be desired.

Throughout your career, remember that the one thing a successful military commander must always be capable of exercising is leadership. In spite of the great progress which we've made in the technological arena, men are still required to fight our ships and our planes, and gentlemen, in time of conflict when the guns are firing, you don't manage men, you lead them or else you lose.

Although I've talked almost entirely about your role as military men, keep in mind that the real profession of every American is citizenship. Thus, you have a common bond with those outside the military and I urge you to develop the closest possible relationships with the civilian community wherever you may be. You, as a public servant, are their employee and you—better than anyone else—can convince them of the correctness of their investment.

Just one final thought. As you grow older and acquire increased rank, you will sometimes be referred to as either the brass or as brass hats. But remember, it's not brass that's on your sleeves or on your shoulder boards—it's gold—and it is meaningful—extremely meaningful. You and I are vouchsafed the most important national trust which it is within our country's power to give and we both—you and I—came to this Academy to learn how to discharge that trust. Few in Government can claim such a distinction. But you in turn must adhere—listen to this—you must adhere to the highest code of moral ethics, to personal integrity which knows no bounds, to compassion for those less fortunate, to leadership by example, to loyalty and to a love of country which will never take second place to individual desires. I wish you smooth sailing gentlemen as you embark upon what is unquestionably one of the most necessary careers in our country and one which can be one of the most satisfying.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is through the lives of great men that the accomplishments of our times are vividly portrayed. One of these great men

is the late Senator from Rhode Island, Theodore Francis Green.

This extraordinary man, whose voice was heard in the Congress for nearly a quarter of a century, dedicated his entire adult life to public service and the betterment of mankind.

The exemplary accomplishments embodied in the life of this great man serve as an inspiration and guiding light for all of us and I think it important that we memorialize these accomplishments in as many ways as possible for our own benefit and that of future generations.

One of the many accomplishments of Senator Green was the establishment of a veterans' hospital in Rhode Island. This came as a result of over 10 years of persistent effort on the Senator's part.

This project was one of the first undertaken by Senator Green after taking office in 1937. After noting that Rhode Island was one of two States which did not have a veterans' hospital, the Senator introduced a bill to obtain a veterans' hospital for Rhode Island.

His efforts met with considerable opposition from the Veterans' Administration in Boston due to regional aspects of the Administration's policy.

In 1941, an announcement was made by the Veterans' Administration that a veterans' hospital would be built in West Roxbury, Mass. The close proximity of this hospital and the availability of the hospital at the Newport Naval Station served to meet the demands of veterans in Rhode Island, it was argued.

Realizing that his sole efforts were inadequate in persuading the Veterans' Administration of the need of a veterans' hospital in Rhode Island, the Senator sought and gained the assistance of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who used his direct influence with the Veterans' Administration in 1944 to turn a more receptive ear to the Senator from Rhode Island. In August of that same year, 1944, Senator Green received word that a veterans' hospital would be established in Rhode Island.

Thus in 1948, 11 years after Senator Green began his lonely and courageous fight, a veterans' hospital was opened at Davis Park on land given to the Federal Government by the city of Providence.

When this hospital was dedicated on September 2, 1949, it should rightfully have been named after Theodore Francis Green, whose perseverance made it all possible. However, as we so often do in the rush of life, we failed to render due recognition at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time in an effort to gain recognition for the vital contributions made by the late Senator Green in the establishment of this hospital and to further memorialize the accomplishments of this great man. Therefore, I would at this time like to introduce a bill to designate the veterans' hospital in Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital."

THE BALTIC STATES: A TRIBUTE

Mr. HICKS. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in this day when we can plainly see many, many peoples enduring severe privations and sacrificing their very lives in the struggle to establish their national independence for the first time, we must sometimes pause to remind ourselves of those nations who never appear in the forums of the world. For the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, freedom is not only a dream for the future, it is a memory from their past. They have tasted the liberty that we in America enjoy so fully—and they have lost it. Today, as for the past 26 years, these proud peoples hover in the shadow world of anonymity imposed upon them by their ruthless Soviet conquerors.

It was not always that way. Once these fertile territories belonged to their rightful owners, the people who were born to them and worked on them. Back in 1918, they proclaimed their independence from the Russian czar and eventually took their places alongside all the other independent nations of the world. This position, which we in America cherish above all things, was not to be easily defensible, however, for countries of modest size compared to the neighboring giants of Germany and Russia. As World War II approached, they formed secret agreements which sectioned off the Baltics as part of the Soviet sphere of influence. By 1939, Russia had imposed the unwanted restrictions of pacts of mutual assistance upon the falling countries.

In the fall of 1940 all pretenses of respect for their declared neutrality were dropped, and Soviet troops invaded their borders.

Murders and deportations—attempts to purge the national spirit from these people—were accompanied by the transplanting of thousands of loyal Soviets onto Baltic soil. Those who escaped to freedom were the few; the many were denied their cultural heritage and their hard-won liberty and were forced to bend under the iron hand of communism.

But deportations will not take the homeland from the hearts of a people, and murders will only stoke the fires of hatred for their oppressors. To those of the Baltic States, who labor far from their homes in misery and fear, we must reaffirm our ties as fellow lovers of liberty. Their spirit and their hope must remain alive so that one day they will again have the independence they once enjoyed.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAMMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, to men around the world the name "America" has often been invoked as a source of inspiration for those who aspire to the right to live as freemen directing their own destiny. Freedom is a revolutionary idea—one which Americans cherish as part of their heritage. But to those who would speak of revolution alone, freedom is incompatible because it strikes fear in their hearts of what they dare not give credence to in their thoughts.

America, throughout its history, has had many friends and followers. Men have pointed to this land and its accomplishments as an example of what freemen can do because they refuse to be subdued by tyranny. Such a man, such a friend, was Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet and friend of freedom—1814-63.

Shevchenko was a romantic who glorified the lost freedom and statehood of the Ukraine after it was brought under the sphere of Russian domination. Through his works, he fostered revolutionary ideas against Russian political and social dominance. The price he paid for acting as a freeman was 10 years of forced military service under orders of Emperor Tsar Nicholas I. Between 1847 and 1857, he was forbidden to write. He was released, after that period, a broken man soon to die, by Alexander II. But his ideas lived and continue to live, because they spoke the truth.

In June 1964, a statue honoring the Ukrainian poet and authorized by the 86th Congress, was dedicated here in Washington.

As further recognition of Taras Shevchenko's contribution to man's right to live in freedom and social justice and for the friendship he openly displayed for America, I introduce a joint resolution to provide for a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp.

TRIBUTE TO HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in paying tribute to a great man, Representative, and chairman, Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS. I have known from long experience that no problem of any fellow Member is too small to arouse his fulsome and careful consideration. We in the city of New York have been indebted to him over a long period of time for his cooperation in the vital matters of national defense that have affected the interests of the city and State of New York and of the country. I join with his many devoted friends in wishing him many years of continued useful and constructive legislative service.

RECOGNITION OF EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH AS A MAJOR FAITH

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would provide formal recognition by the U.S. Government of the Eastern Orthodox Church as a major religious faith.

The Federal Government automatically refers to "the 3 great religious faiths"—Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Yet according to the 1965 Yearbook of American Churches, there are today in the United States more than 3 million members of the Orthodox Church. And since most Orthodox churches count as members only adults who are heads of households, it can be safely assumed that—with women and children included—the total is probably well over 6 million.

According to this same Yearbook, there are 5,585,000 members of the Jewish community, 44,874,371 Roman Catholics, and 66,854,200 Protestants in the United States.

The U.S. Armed Forces now use the letters "EO" on dog tags to identify the Eastern Orthodox Christians. A representative of the Eastern Orthodox faith has been invited to participate in recent Presidential inauguration ceremonies. And the legislatures of at least half of the States have enacted resolutions officially recognizing Orthodoxy as a fourth major faith.

The resolution which I have introduced will require that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths include the Eastern Orthodox Church. I urge the House of Representatives to act immediately to give full and proper recognition to the Orthodox Christians of the United States, who are already in fact—if not in form—a major faith in our Nation.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 14, I was present on the floor of the House while S. 2950, the Defense Procurement Act of 1966, was being debated.

However, due to extremely important business in my home district, I had to leave before a vote was taken on this matter.

I heartily support the Defense Procurement Act of 1966.

If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege ever since I have been a Member of the Congress to sponsor an essay contest for the high school seniors in the 10th District of Ohio and to designate a winner from each county to be my guest for a week in the Nation's Capital.

During this week, 11 outstanding high school graduates of my district are here in Washington to learn more about the activities of their Congressman, see the working of the Federal Government at close range, visit the historic sights in and around Washington, meet distinguished leaders in Government, and in general gain a deeper appreciation of the privileges and responsibilities of American citizenship.

I am proud of these young men and women, and am pleased to submit their winning essays for the RECORD. They were asked to write on the theme: "Is Patriotism Out of Date?" Their answers speak mightily for themselves. I commend them to your reading. They give us all much encouragement for the future welfare of our country.

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By Greg Prakas, Athens County, Athens High School)

Patriotism . . . a word which, when spoken, possesses a quality all its own; when written, flows freely; a word that has meant so much to so many for so long.

How old is this force, patriotism? Did it originate with the "shot heard 'round the world in 1776"? Did the English claim its origin when they defeated the Spanish Armada after banding together? Or did it begin with the caveman as he protected the small groups in which he lived? The origin of the word is not so important as its meaning to us.

What is patriotism? A third-grader once answered, "It's that 'funny feeling' that comes up my back when they play that song at a football game." And who could have given a better answer to this question? That "funny feeling" . . . that song . . . the Liberty Bell . . . the voice of the late President Kennedy . . . these are true examples of patriotism.

But oftentimes today, we shy away from showing our patriotism. We do love our country, yet we dare not sing the National Anthem too loudly—if at all—in a crowd. And, of course, we realize what a wonderful institution democracy is, but we hesitate to display our flag on Independence Day because "no one else does it."

The manner in which Americans behave today causes many to ask the question: "Is patriotism out of date?" Has patriotism gone out of style like long skirts, the jitterbug and double-breasted suits?

Would Patrick Henry be "in vogue" to stand up today and cry, "Give me liberty or give me death"?

Would Nathan Hale be ridiculed for saying, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country"?

Was John Kennedy labeled "out of date" when he suggested, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country"?

Patriotism is the guiding light which has led countless Americans to die in defense of their fatherland and its ideals. Who would dare to call these dead soldiers "out of date"?

No. Patriotism is *not* out of date. As long as Americans defend freedom in the name of these United States, as long as "Old Glory" flutters in the wind, as long as that "funny feeling" climbs up our backs, patriotism will live.

"I hope to find my country in the right; however, I will stand by her, right or wrong."
—John Crittenden

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By Linda Graybill, Fairfield County, Lancaster High School)

Carol has a red hat that she doesn't wear anymore. This hat is just like new and has a basic design that is always in style, but because her friends all have new hats this season, Carol has left hers on her closet shelf, forgotten and collecting dust.

In our society the things which no longer have any degree of utility we regard as out of date. They may be in excellent condition, but because of trends and of social pressure, we ignore or discard them. So it is with patriotism. Looking objectively at many American citizens, one might say that their failure to vote regularly, their ignorance of the candidates for office, along with a noticeable lack of interest in civic and community affairs show that they have put patriotism on a shelf to gather dust. These same people, when faced with the communist threat, sit back in their comfortable, secure homes and think that communism will never conquer them. If this feeling of false security ever prevails, the day could come when the United States would stand alone to face a communist world.

In contrast to this apathetic group, we have the active dissenters, who, in the name of patriotism, burn their draft cards and picket the Capitol with anti-government slogans. Following closely in their footsteps are the misinformed college students who riot and demonstrate for the constitutional rights of communists and for the rights of other groups who are subversive to the government of the United States of America. It is difficult to say which creates the greater problem, complacency or radicalism.

These people, however, are not the majority of the Americans. Many other citizens in this country are rising to meet the demands of patriotism. Many serve in the fields of law, politics, and social work. By joining the Peace Corps, young people show their earnest desire to serve the United States by helping less fortunate countries. Vast numbers of young men are enlisting in the armed services, knowing that they may have to give their lives to stop the spread of communism. Through the medium of television, millions of Americans watch the feats of our astronauts and feel a surge of pride in our nation's accomplishments. These people realize that patriotism never becomes "old hat". They love their country and are willing to preserve, protect, and defend it. These people may not wave flags avidly or shout slogans patriotically, but because of their great sense of pride in and loyalty to their country, they would be the first to join Sir Walter Scott who said, "Breathes there the man, with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said, This is my own, my native land!"

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By Danny Gilmore, Gallia County, Gallia Academy High School)

Is patriotism out of date? This is a question many Americans have been asking themselves, especially in the last few months. We have seen protest marches on college campuses all over the country. Marches protesting our government Vietnam policy, marches protesting racial segregation, marches protesting the increased draft quota, and marches protesting anything and everything our government does. It is true that some of these protests are justified, but for the most part these protests are just trying to get the government to do away with something these minority groups are against.

If a person from a foreign country were to come to the United States and hear of these protest marches and demonstrations, his first impression would be that all Americans are hypocrites and that patriotism in the United States is a thing of the past.

On the other hand, if this same visitor to our country were to sit in on a session of Congress and become a part of the lively debates and discussions, if he could attend a meeting of the Supreme Court and see the care and long hours of work which go into interpreting and explaining the laws which are passed by Congress, or even if he could visit a traffic court in a small town in the United States, he would readily see that his first impression was wrong. He would see that the unpatriotic Americans represent only a small percentage of our population. He would see that most Americans are patriotic and show their patriotism by trying to preserve the rights of every American citizen.

Many times we Americans are apt to become apathetic or indifferent to the problem of patriotism. We seem to get the complacent attitude that nothing will happen to the United States. If someone is unpatriotic or does something to show his aversive feeling toward his country, we seem to think it is not our responsibility to do something about it or report it to the proper authorities. We must come to understand that if democracy is to survive, we must stand firm and show through our actions that patriotism in the United States is not out of date.

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By Beverly Ellinger, Hocking County, Logan High School)

It is easy to love one's country, and thereby, according to Daniel Webster, to be a patriot. It is easy to be proud of one's national heritage. But it is difficult today to demonstrate that love and to exhibit such pride. The difficulty lies in the lack of opportunity for any expression of one's individual patriotism. We are not asked today to buy Liberty Bonds, we do not display gold stars in our windows to honor our dead, we do not erect—"crosses, row on row," in a Flanders Field. Yet patriotism is not out of date. It is, on the contrary, the last binding force of these great United States.

There are still a few occasions when we can be vocally and visibly patriotic: we can pledge allegiance to our flag; we can display the Stars and Stripes on Flag Day, Veterans' Day, the Fourth of July; we can march in parades; we can fly our colors high above federal buildings, schools, and private business concerns. But, unless we are the right age to join some branch of the armed forces, how can we be *actively* patriotic?

It is not always the vocal, visible, and active kind of patriotism that is the true, abiding kind. We do not always recognize the real patriot, for he carries his allegiance within his heart and his banner within his soul. He shows his love for, and devotion to, his country in his daily living by guiding its young, by bettering its social conditions, by alleviating its suffering, by supporting its churches, by voting responsibly for its lead-

ers, and by obeying its laws. All of these actions profess that he is not only a good citizen but also a loyal one. Good citizenship is patriotism.

Unfortunately, it is not the steadfast patriots who are publicized. It is, instead, the misguided and combative self-styled "patriots" who reach the headlines. When one of this kind physically attacked the late Ambassador Adlai Stevenson with a heavy placard, and when another spat in the face of the then Vice-President Johnson, their nefarious acts were front page headlines. Relegated to the inside pages of the same newspapers were, doubtless, accounts—unspecular but consequential—of 'business-as-usual' at the White House and in the United Nations. It is from such imbalance of merited publicity that Americans are getting the erroneous idea that their countrymen have lost their patriotism. The combative 'patriot' is no more representative of the average American citizen than a juvenile delinquent is representative of the average young American. Neither are the motives of a draft-card-burner representative of the feeling of hundreds of thousands of other young draftees.

Just as we must turn to the inner pages to find the import of the news, so must we turn to the inner man to discover the genuine patriot.

In a Flag Day speech Woodrow Wilson once gave his audience of American citizens a sound and lasting directive for patriotism. He said, "I am sorry that you do not wear a little flag of the Union every day instead of only some days. I can only ask you, if you lose the physical emblem, to be sure that you wear it in your heart, and the heart of America shall interpret the heart of the world."

IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?

(By Julia Pittenger, Jackson County, Jackson High School)

Democracy means a great way of life which affords an even greater responsibility—patriotism. It is a way of looking at humanity in society and a manner of behaving toward one's fellow men. True patriotism is the recognition of human dignity and mutual respect.

Unfortunately, our patriotism like our democracy is not perfect. Since love of country is actually a privilege, there are certain factions which will quite naturally choose to dissent. However, actions of these who apparently seem to oppose united national spirit only serve as stimulus for my own optimistic outlook. In a psychological sense, patriotism is the direct opposite of pessimism.

Many have bled and paid the highest prices of reputation, position, fortune, and even life itself in an effort to preserve this seemingly simple thing called democracy. But, in a deeper sense, patriotism is intangible. It is not all bloody battle nor is it seven red stripes and six white with fifty stars on a blue field, but rather it is the durable courage behind the blood and cloth with union of vigilance and purpose. As I ponder the stars and stripes, I must feel *humbly* proud that I am doing my part. Democracy *expects* everyone to perform his duty of citizenship.

Learning thoroughly the principles of this democracy and practicing its doctrines is patriotism. At the same time, so is investigating and understanding theories and teachings of other forms of government in order to be qualified to make intelligent decisions and exercise effective leadership. Surveying the world realistically and assessing allies in building a better world is necessary for future America.

However, I believe the greatest single patriotic contribution one can make to society is living democratically everyday of one's life in one's own home, schools, city, state, and country. Patriotism is clinging to

convictions and ideals remembering yesterday, using today, and trusting tomorrow, for "where there is no vision, the people perish."

As Woodrow Wilson once said, "America lives in the heart of every man everywhere who wishes to find a region where he will be free to work out his own destiny as he chooses." I believe as long as there is patriotism there will be an America—and as long as there is a United States of America there *must* be patriotism.

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By David J. Crance, Lawrence County, St. Joseph High School)

The love the American citizen feels for his country is as much alive today as it was when it burned with uncontrollable patriotism during the fight for freedom 190 years ago. Our country has grown, strengthened and matured over the years and we Americans living today inherit the greatest, most highly developed and most conscientious civilization in the history of the world.

It is this love of country that gives us the incentive to continue to improve instead of contenting ourselves with our present accomplishments. Therefore, we cannot afford to let patriotism become out of date. It is only when we become apathetic in our attitudes that our country is in danger of sabotage from within.

In this world of treaties, alliances and commitments it is becoming more and more difficult for the average person to keep abreast of the latest events and to follow them through to their conclusions. We try. We all read newspapers, watch television and listen to the radio. We all hear the issues, but I feel that many of us do not fully understand them. Still it is very important that we do understand these problems because they have a direct effect on each of us today. At this moment we are fighting communism all over the world and most obviously in Viet Nam. We are fighting not just to protect that little area from socialism, but to try to save the entire world from a form of government which would completely eliminate any love of country and which would destroy all hope of life in a society which would give man the dignity he deserves.

The best definition of patriotism was given by President Kennedy in his inaugural address when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." We should understand that his underlying thought was that *what we have given* our government through hard work and sacrifice at home and through death on the battlefields while fighting for democracy in America and in Europe, is what has made our country great. This is true patriotism and it is *not* out of date.

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By Jane Lucas, Meigs County, Rutland High School)

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America . . ."

I believe that every person who has ever lived in the United States, has either heard these words or said them at one time or another.

We have pledged allegiance, loyalty, and devotion to our flag, our country, and our God. We have also pledged allegiance, loyalty, and patriotism to our country of freedom.

But how much does patriotism mean to people anymore? To me, it means a great deal. I can't imagine how our country would be, if it were in the hands of the communists. We would have no more liberty of doing or saying what we feel. We would no longer be able to worship as we please.

But I feel that today, some people are thinking less and less of patriotism.

Take the racial discrimination. Although many people are not rebelling against our

country, aren't they rebelling against the rights and liberty of men?

Their freedom is just as precious to them as ours is to us.

The Viet Nam War. There are thousands of young Americans, fighting today, for a country which has asked for the help of the United States. But there are also thousands of young men and women who are demonstrating and rioting against America's actions in Viet Nam.

Why are these events occurring? Is it because of a "downfall" in our patriotism? I don't believe so. For I feel that the groups who are causing these demonstrations and riots, are small in number compared to those who love their country and respect the rights of others.

In today's world there are hundreds of thousands who take our liberty for granted. But does that mean that they are also taking "loyalty" for granted?

I feel that this is what people of foreign countries are believing.

The newspapers play up a big part of all the "wrong-doings" in this country but seldom the "right-doings."

What else may foreigners think?

Have they been shown that even though Americans do take their liberty for granted they still would fight again and again for it?

The best way my feelings can be summarized is to quote from "This is my Country":

"This is my country, land of my birth.

This is my country, grandest on earth.

I pledge Thee my allegiance:

America the bold.

For this is my country to have and to hold."

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By William Young, Morgan County, Malta-McConnellsville High School)

Patriotism can never be considered out of date as long as anyone with a mind and a country still lives. Patriotism is a common feeling held by the average person for his country. The simpler acts of patriotism are common and often go unnoticed in the news services. Many thousands of people say the pledge of allegiance to the flag each day and no one takes notice. On the other hand, let one or two extremists burn their draft cards or mistreat the flag and they make the front page of every newspaper in the United States. For each of the "protestors" there are thousands of young people that are willing to fight and die for their country.

Love of one's own country is one definition of patriotism. Each individual can love his country and still disagree with other patriots on what is best for the country. If every person agreed on the best course for the United States to follow, then our system of government would be unnecessary.

The history of the United States shows that from the very beginning, starting with our founding fathers who would have been "traitors" if they had lost the Revolutionary War, the United States has been guided by unselfish and self-sacrificing patriots who had only their idea of "what was best for their country." When we look to history, we can see that patriotism is growing stronger as the fact becomes more evident that the country we love is The United States of America.

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By Steve Howdyshell, Perry County, New Lexington High School)

Is patriotism out of date? I say "No"! Some people might not say this, but if they take an honest look at the people of the United States, they will see that patriotism is very much *in* date. People often look only at the misfits of society who carry signs to protest everything from civil rights to war.

Now take a look at the average person in the United States. Look at the factory worker, the farmer, the high school and college student, and everyone who helps make up this great Nation. Do you see them out carrying posters protesting our involvement in war or participating in a race riot? No! They have their views, but do not try to force them upon others. They may not always agree with the decisions made by the President or Congress, but they are Americans, and they will support their country. This is what patriotism is! The love and loyalty to your country and being ready to fight and to die for it and its principles show that the spirit of patriotism is alive today. The average person does not want war, but if it is necessary, he will fight. He believes in freedom and equality for all people and wants to see this brought about, not by riots and death, but by the love of people for one another.

The people who criticize Americans for not being patriotic are not sensible enough to recognize the fact that they are behaving exactly as the forces against freedom want them to behave. If these people truly take a good look at the American people and still believe they are not patriotic, they should take a good look at themselves.

Most citizens of today are just as patriotic as the founders of our country, and they are better informed than many of the people of that day. Since today's citizen is patriotic and knows what is happening in our country and the world, he cannot be unpatriotic. He will rear his children in a patriotic way and insure patriotism and freedom for the future. Patriotism is *in* date and always will be.

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By Mary Lynn Metz, Vinton County, Wilton High School)

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own my native land;"

These lines of poetry were written by Sir Walter Scott out of love for his homeland. For he knew without love for his country life has no meaning.

You may not be able to write a poem as beautiful as Scott did about his native land, but you can show love for your country in other ways.

Patriotism is not out of date. Some may think it is silly to show how proud you are of your country, but we live in a land where everyone is free—from the farmer who tills the soil to the multi-millionaire—we were all born free.

Our ancestors fought for this land and believed that every human being has the right to express his own opinion, to worship as he pleases and to be able to have a part in a government that is for the people and by the people.

What if there had been no great patriots such as Patrick Henry, Nathan Hale, Daniel Webster, Thomas Jefferson, and many, many others? These are men who believed in America and showed how proud they were of their land.

Can you say, "I am a patriot; I am proud of my ancestors who fought and died to preserve this land"? If you are proud, do you show it? Do you stand when our national anthem is played or put your hand on your heart when the pledge of allegiance is said? Do you have a feeling of pride when a stirring patriotic song is sung? Have you ever said to yourself, "This is my country, my land, and I'm proud to be a part of what it stands for"? These feelings toward our country make us true patriots. We are able to tell the world that this is our country, our land and we are going to preserve our heritage not only for ourselves but for those who will live after us.

If you have no feeling of pride, allegiance, or love toward your country then you, as Sir Walter Scott tells us, "shall go down, to the vile dust, from whence you sprung, unwept, unhonored, and unsung."

"IS PATRIOTISM OUT OF DATE?"

(By James Modecki, Washington County, St. Mary Central High School)

Love of country today seems to be declining, but actually it is only undergoing a change. Love or respect for one's country, better known as patriotism, is still here, only in a different form from colonial days.

In the time of the revolution, patriots were those who fought for the freedom of their new country and otherwise openly supported it. Today, patriots still fight for their country and do many other things to show their interest in their homeland. However, their vehemence in support of the country is more studied and critical. The phrase, "My country, right or wrong" does not now fit the needs of the modern day patriot. His cry should now be "My country, bettering itself."

Whether they want war in Viet Nam or not, those people who have enough interest to voice their views about pertinent subjects are showing patriotism. Those who take part in demonstrations for or against United States policy are taking an active part in the makings of their country.

Those people in the government service are very good examples of patriots, for they work for their country, or their country's leaders. If they didn't have some respect for their country, they surely would not work for it.

Many other people not in government service express their patriotism by writing their Congressmen and other government officials on subjects of importance. Those citizens who do these things certainly must have some love of country to their credit.

Actually, patriotism is not dead; in fact, it is growing and prospering more than ever before, but it has changed to fit the great century we live in.

JOSEPH V. BOMBA: VALEDICTORIAN, CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the commencement exercises of the Capitol Page School took place in the House Ways and Means Committee Room yesterday at 8 p.m. There were 26 young men who received their diplomas. Young men who served us well in the House, Senate, and Supreme Court, but who sacrificed their leisure hours to study and achieve the honors of graduating. They are all a credit to the Congress, their community, but most of all to their parents, who proudly witness the ceremonies.

Joseph Victor Bomba, of Chicago, was valedictorian of the class of 1966. He is indeed an outstanding young man. We in the House of Representatives know Joe well for he was always eager to serve us in every way. To rank highest in his class, earn a membership on the National Honor Society, and be awarded scholarships to Haverford College in Pennsylvania and Northwestern Univer-

sity in Illinois are indeed accomplishments deserving of every recognition.

With permission, at this point in the RECORD, I would like printed the valedictory address that was delivered by Joseph Victor Bomba at the commencement exercises:

VALEDICTORY

(By Joseph V. Bomba)

Senator KENNEDY, Dr. Williams, Dr. Davis, Dr. Dakeyer, fellow graduates, relatives and friends.

350 years ago, John Donne, an English poet and minister, in an essay entitled "Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions," wrote "No Man is an Island, Entire unto Himself". The Wisdom of Donne's words can be seen more readily today than ever before. It is impossible to be separated from your fellow men.

In the last few centuries, great changes have come to society. Technology—the application of science to industry—has contributed greatly to a changing world. First came the steam engine, making the manufacture of many products easier and less expensive. Shortly afterward the use of interchangeable parts was introduced. This eventually led to mass production, making it possible to turn out a large number of goods at a low cost to the consumer. Yesterday's luxuries became today's necessities.

Today, great systems of computers have organized production and the worker to maximum efficiency, but the progress of science has not been limited to industry alone. Transportation has also been greatly effected.

The first voyage around the world, beginning in 1519, took three years to complete. Jules Verne astounded many people just before the turn of the century when he wrote of a voyage around the world lasting 80 days. Fiction? Well, recently a friend remarked that it took him three hours to complete 18 holes of golf. In that short time, two astronauts had circled the globe twice. It is, indeed, a small world.

Communication is another field in which great progress has been made. At the middle of the 19th Century, it took more than a week for news to cross the ocean, and but little less to cross the continent.

Then came the Trans-atlantic Cable, and shortly thereafter Marconi's Wireless Telegraph. Today there is Early Bird, which makes instantaneous world-wide images possible in our very own living room.

But science and technology have also created the thermonuclear bomb, and the guided missile. It is the responsibility of our generation to see that such developments are turned to uses beneficial to mankind.

These advances in transportation, technology, and communication have brought the world's problems to us in a more immediate and realistic manner. Events move swiftly—more swiftly than ever before.

The emergence of independent African Nations, crisis in the Middle East, or turmoil in Latin America, affect us almost to the same degree as does a riot in Los Angeles, a Governor's race in New York, or a hurricane battering it's way Northward along the Atlantic Coast.

Consequently, isolationism can and must be only a remembrance of things past. For never before has it been so plain that you and I are part of a World Community.

This World Community is highly complex. Advances in medicine have increased the life span of the individual and decreased infant mortality rates. These factors have contributed greatly to the overwhelming population of the World Community. There are many millions without enough to eat. "Getting away from it all by taking a trip to the mountains" is an impossibility, for one would find thousands there, all with the same idea.

Likewise, no Nation can be independent of all others. The resulting interdependence may be seen in a number of ways. For example, many products require materials which are not available in this country. They must be imported. We must not only recognize economic interdependence, however, but also human interdependence. We cannot stand idly by as millions die of malnutrition. Our government has recognized this to a limited extent, with the "Food for Peace" Program. For the future, though, we must go further.

The point is that we need, in this day and age, a heightened sense of community. The interests of others must become as important to us as our own. We must feel that we are wedded to a larger whole. In order to do this, we must develop a sense of international concern.

Now some might think that a concern for the world community is all well and good, but that there are other things in life. This is undeniably true. Nevertheless, all must have a feeling for the international concern to preserve these other things in life.

We, the 1966 graduating class of Capitol Page School, have been most fortunate. We have had the advantages of a small student-teacher ratio and have been able to discuss questions of concern. Moreover, in our capacities in the House, Senate, and Supreme Court, we have had the opportunity to observe first-hand the members of these great deliberating bodies as they strive to formulate solutions to the problems facing our world today.

What this has done is to make us more aware of the fact that we are a part of this world community of which I speak. In the future, we must continue this awareness. Changes come about rapidly, and in some cases abruptly. It is difficult to adjust to many of these changes, but in the past, we always have. Today it is more difficult than ever to keep pace, but we must. In this way only can we preserve the goals and ideals we seek today.

Thank you.

THE FREE PRESS VERSUS GOVERNMENT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last January 8, Publisher Eugene C. Pulliam was presented the John Peter Zenger Award for distinguished service to freedom of the press and the people's right to know.

For his outstanding contributions to society through his dedication to honest and courageous journalism over the years, Mr. Pulliam was obviously an excellent choice for the honor, yet after reading his acceptance speech, I must observe that this masterful address would in itself be sufficient to merit highest recognition in journalism, political science, sociology, or any number of other disciplines whose effectiveness is dependent upon freedom from government control and intimidation.

In pointing out that today the power of government over the lives and fortunes of the people is greater than at any time in our history, Mr. Pulliam cites a situation whose implications are not generally recognized but which poses

a terrible threat to the very life of government by the people and of the people. For today big government hovers over every individual in every field of activity.

Centralized government not only determines in various degrees—through a multiplicity of agreements, orders, and controls—the basic supply and price structures of much of our food and clothing; it has become such a voracious consumer that it assumes by concealed threat the power to decide prices of materials to construct your homes, your automobiles, and your schools.

But big government has arrogated to itself considerably more supervision than the mere cost of building a school. It has come to occupy a front seat in the classroom, and unless the public—enlightened by the Nation's press—takes steps to expel this unwelcome bully, America's children will learn only what bureaucrats in Washington decide is enough for them.

The Nation is indebted to Mr. Pulliam and other newspaper publishers who are so resolute as to remain defiant of bureaucratic terror in calling attention to the dangers that prevail. His address should be read and reread by every Member of Congress, and it should be kept in every editor's desk for frequent review, with particular notice given to the admonition:

Bureaucratic regulation and even outright Federal takeover of the press is not beyond the range of possibility. It has happened in other countries and we blindly deceive ourselves if we think it cannot happen here.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Pulliam's address in the RECORD:

THE FREE PRESS VERSUS GOVERNMENT

(An address by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette, in accepting the University of Arizona's John Peter Zenger Award for Distinguished Service to Freedom of the Press and the People's Right to Know. The award was presented by Dean Francis Roy, dean of the School of Liberal Arts; delivered before the annual meeting of the Arizona Newspapers Association, Phoenix, Ariz., Jan. 8, 1966)

On the occasion of the presentation of the John Peter Zenger Award to Eugene C. Pulliam, President Lyndon B. Johnson sent the following telegram:

"RICHARD A. HARVILL,
President, University of Arizona,
Tucson, Ariz.:

"Two centuries ago Andrew Hamilton said to the Zenger Jury: 'It is not the cause of a poor printer which you are trying. . . it is the cause of liberty.' Today you celebrate that cause by honoring Eugene Pulliam. By his courage and conviction he has enlarged the freedom of the American press and the American people. This nation joins me in appreciation and congratulation.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

President Cameron, Chairman Miller, Dr. Harvill, President Paul Miller, members of the Arizona Newspapers Association, ladies and gentlemen and fellow taxpayers:

I don't think I need to tell this audience of newspaper people that I consider it a special privilege to be here in any capacity, but I am doubly honored and humbly grateful to be here to receive the John Peter Zenger Award because of what that award represents. I especially cherish this award because it was voted to me by my own colleagues, and because this award was established to give continuing recognition to the

efforts and determination of American newspapermen to keep as the basic right of the free press the inviolable right to tell the truth.

I should like, first of all, to say a word about John Peter Zenger and also about his very remarkable and courageous wife, Anna Zenger. It is surprising how many Americans have never heard of the Zengers. I have received many congratulations on this award, but at least one out of five of the people who congratulated me has said, "But who was Peter Zenger?"

Well, let me tell you who he was and let me tell you about his wife. Peter Zenger was a New York printer who in 1735 was faced with the same problems and the same dangers that American newspapermen face today. Peter Zenger was just a little printer in New York, but he believed in printing the truth. He was hounded by British authorities. He was harassed by the governor. He was finally accused of criminal libel and jailed. He stayed in jail for many, many months . . . all because he insisted on printing the truth. His lawyers were disbarred by the judge, who was a puppet of the British governor. He was left almost defenseless. Finally, Andrew Hamilton, a famous Philadelphia lawyer, came to New York to aid Zenger. Hamilton presented a brilliant and powerful argument that persuaded the jury to find Zenger not guilty by arguing that Zenger had printed the truth and that the truth is not libelous.

While being held for trial Zenger could communicate only with his wife, and she had to speak to him through the prisoner's keyhole. And it was Anna Zenger who kept their newspaper going, week after week after week. She missed only one edition. She kept the people of New York aroused. Her inspiration, her dedication, her brilliant mind, her unbelievable understanding of the importance of this trial made her the real "hero" of this dramatic story. The late Kent Cooper, the former great general manager of the Associated Press, called Anna Zenger "The Mother of American Liberty."

What did the Zenger trial do for liberty? First, it established the right of a jury to decide what is libelous and what is truth and not leave it to a judge who might be biased by some consideration or some pressure. Also it established the principle that truth is a complete defense against libel and therefore a newspaper has the right to print the truth.

I wonder how many American newspapermen and women today would go through the trials and tribulations and heartaches that Peter and Anna Zenger suffered in order to print the truth.

Zenger's trial is as important today in 1966 as it was in 1735, because the issue of freedom of the press and of the people to criticize their government is today, as it was then, the central issue of human liberty.

Then, for the first time, the people, through a jury and the press, successfully asserted their power to preserve free speech and a free press against the tyrannical power of both the government and any judge of the court.

Freedom of the press and freedom of speech in the United States are in greater danger today than they were in the time of Peter Zenger. For today the power of government over the lives and fortunes of the people is greater than at any time in our history, and that power is being used in many different ways to subvert and destroy the freedom of the people to examine the acts of their government, to criticize the policies of their government and to expose the failures of their government.

What do we mean when we talk about freedom of the press? Well, to me freedom of the press means freedom of the public to look behind the curtain of secrecy which governments erect to hide their activities;

freedom to read about politicians who want to carry on corrupt and shady deals out of public view; freedom to learn of businessmen whose successes have depended as much on kick-backs and influence-peddling as on their ability to compete in the economic market place; and freedom to criticize labor bosses who employ tactics of coercion and intimidation.

In short, freedom of the press means the freedom of the public—the people—to be informed, to know the precise nature and character of the political and economic forces which control their destinies.

Thomas Jefferson said, ". . . were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

James Madison said, "Nothing could be more irrational than to give the people power and to withhold from them information without which power is abused. A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with power which knowledge gives them."

If the press does not shine the spotlight of publicity on malefactors of the public trust, who will? Who but the press can act as the public's watchdog in the nation's interest? Who else is on the firing line day after day, fighting for the right of everyone to have access to the facts? Only the newspapers have the resources, the time and the manpower.

What I am saying here is that it is the responsibility of newspapers to do for the public what it hasn't the time or the facilities to do for itself—gather information, select that which is important and present it to the reader. But there are powerful forces aligned against the press, and therefore against the public. They are working to frustrate the free flow of information. It has been said many times, and newspapermen should never forget it—government is always the tyrant of a people, never its friend. Government is the natural enemy of the newspaper. Government understandably wants to conduct the nation's business—your business and mine—in secrecy. Government's relationship with the press has changed and deteriorated drastically in recent years. It is no longer enough for administrations to refuse to cooperate with the press. Now they consider it their duty to mislead and deceive us. I could cite you instance after instance where government officials have defended their policy of actually lying to the public.

Another factor working against the unfettered flow of information is the death of strong competitive newspapers.

It is undeniable that each time a legitimate newspaper folds, our nation comes that much closer to surrendering its prerogatives to centralized government. Each time a newspaper writes "30" to its existence, one more community watchdog disappears.

So I say to you as newspapermen that our responsibility to the public was never more important. It is quite obvious to me that the bureaucrats in Washington find nothing to worry about when a newspaper folds. With taxation and other forms of government intervention, weak newspapers have found it impossible to survive. Washington bureaucracy apparently wants to see to it that all cities of America become one-newspaper towns.

Washington bureaucrats care not for law or constitutional rights. They strive only to make the federal government all-powerful and all-inclusive over the lives and businesses of American citizens. With only one paper in a town, the bureaucrats would have fairly easy sledding in a Congress dominated by a strong chief executive. Newspapers would be brought under government regulation just as radio and television are now regulated.

With federal regulation of the press, government officials would be free to intimidate the press with decrees and orders which would be enforced with the effect of law. Bureaucratic regulation and even outright federal takeover of the press is not beyond the range of possibility. It has happened in other countries and we blindly deceive ourselves if we think it cannot happen here. The multitudinous restrictions of individual freedom under which we live today would, twenty-five years ago, have been unthinkable.

It is easy enough to find scapegoats for the unprecedented conditions and problems facing newspapers today, but it seems to me the blame must be shared by the following:

1. Unions which prevent the introduction of labor-saving and cost-cutting machinery.
2. The continually increased taxation for every conceivable type of social security and welfare, above and beyond the needs of even a "Great Society."
3. The dogged policy of the antitrust division which today makes it almost impossible for a newspaper publisher even to speak to a weak competitor, much less help him keep his paper going.
4. The public, which seems often to care more for entertainment than for knowledge and enlightenment.
5. And, finally, the newspapers themselves for their aloofness and their resistance to change.

Let me give you an example of publisher oversight, aloofness and stupidity for which there is no justification. Some weeks ago the heads of the various printing trades unions and the labor relations committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association held a joint meeting here in Phoenix. Nina and I had a dinner party in our home for the union officers and the publishers' labor committee, together with their wives. In the course of the evening the president of a union, which is represented in the majority of the newspapers throughout this country, told me this was the first time in his life he had been invited to a publisher's home!

Here was a man with the same feelings and ambitions as other men, a man who has reached the top of his chosen profession, yet never before had a publisher thought to invite him to his home. Was this inexcusable oversight deliberate? I don't think so. My personal opinion is that too many publishers fall into the human error of thinking in terms of friends and foes, rather than in terms of human beings.

Instead of constantly fighting each other, I believe the printing trades unions and the publishers should get together on a program of mutual advancement and self-protection. Thousands of mechanical jobs may be at stake if the federal government ever brings the newspapers under federal regulation. The unions and the publishers have so much in common that I cannot help but believe that tolerance and common sense and a willingness on each side to see the other's viewpoint will solve almost any problem confronting us. And we need a united front—the printing unions and the publishers—in this fight to head off federal domination of newspapers, for ours is a common cause versus government.

Also, I think publishers have been very negligent in their efforts to recruit bright young men and women for the newspaper industry. We should do everything we can to convince young people that the newspaper profession is a calling just as fascinating and as useful and as rewarding as the ministry, medicine or the law.

The final area where the public's right to know is being curtailed is in that twilight zone where the First and Sixth Amendments clash head-on—where the constitutional guarantee of a free press runs head-long into the equally explicit constitutional guarantee of a fair trial by an impartial jury. In spite of

everything everybody has said—judges, lawyers and columnists—it is very obvious that if the legal profession succeeds in shutting off the flow of pre-trial news on the pretext of assuring an impartial trial, other professions, armed with equally convincing-sounding arguments, will agitate to reduce the newspaper profession to re-writing hand-outs and routine releases.

There isn't an honest newspaperman in this country who wouldn't fight for the right of any man to have a fair trial. But our job is to protect the public and to make sure the public is informed about what goes on. And we can't do it if the legal profession is going continually to harass us with new regulations and new proceedings which give judges almost a mandate to muzzle the press. It is a fight that affects every newspaper in every city in America.

I don't for one minute condone trial by newspapers. But let's get one thing clear, let's get this straight: no civil right, including the right of a fair trial, is worth a tinker's dam unless it is protected by the right of free expression. If an accused man can't say his piece in court, cannot have lawyers and friends plead his case, what good is his so-called "civil right" to a fair trial? Without the right of free expression, justice would deteriorate into a tragic comedy. When these two amendments clash—and it seems they clash only when publicity-seeking lawyers stage the collision—the First Amendment must take precedence over the Sixth Amendment, because without the First Amendment, the Sixth Amendment would become a mockery of justice.

Thank God we have in America hundreds of judges in the high courts and in the lower courts, many of them in this state, who realize that freedom of expression is the fundamental right of all liberty.

The world of 1966, like Peter Zenger's world of 1735, is still engaged in mortal combat with those who would be free and those who would deny freedom to others; those who believe people should have access to the facts and those who are convinced they know what is best for you and for me. So long as the forces of freedom exist, we who are privileged to be part of those forces must resist arbitrary power and secrecy wherever and whenever it appears. We must take our stand on behalf of the people, all the people. It is the only choice for those who cherish freedom and justice. Liberty can be destroyed by tyrannical government and tyrannical courts if the people can be threatened or persuaded to abandon free speech and a free press. Newspapers defend the right of individuals against the entrenched power of arrogant abuse by public officials. They fight to bring the truth to light; to support justice and oppose injustice; to make certain that every individual is treated equally before the law; to make certain that every American can speak his piece without fear or favor. Today the United States is the last great bastion of liberty in the world, and a free press in America is the last great bastion of the people against complete domination by government.

If newspapers will recognize their responsibility, as well as their opportunity, to print the truth; refuse to be intimidated; refuse to bow to government bureaucracy; then they will serve the highest cause of civilization, which is individual freedom, the freedom of choice and the right of free expression. As partners in freedom, the people and the press in America can save liberty.

Without the right of freedom for the individual, without the right of free expression for everyone, there can be no lasting or satisfying progress for us in America. This is the freedom we must cherish, this is the freedom we must fight for, this is the freedom—if necessary—we must go to jail to preserve. We must cherish it and hold it the dearest

thing in life, because if America maintains its freedom, then sometime, somehow, America, being free, will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. This I believe, my friends, is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world.

And because it is our special mission we should remind ourselves every morning that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

In closing, I want to salute the University of Arizona for its vision and wisdom in recognizing the great contribution Peter Zenger and his wife Anna made to the cause of freedom. And again a thousand grateful thanks for this award.

Good luck and God bless all of you.

LACK OF CHECKS AND RESTRAINTS ON PROFITEERING IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following interesting report with respect to the conflict in Vietnam:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 8, 1966]

CONGRESSMEN SEE U.S. AID DOLLARS STRAYING IN VIETNAM (By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—Few businessmen in the world are hauling in as much profit as those in Saigon.

Business there is booming. But Congress is beginning to wonder if it should be quite so good.

In fact, members of a special congressional delegation just returned from Vietnam are raising serious questions about the lack of checks and restraints on profiteering carried out by Vietnamese businessmen at the direct expense of American taxpayers.

The basic problem stems from the vast American aid program.

Since 1955, the United States has pumped some \$1.7 billion worth of consumer goods into Vietnam under its commodity import program (CIP). This amounts to 80 percent of all nonmilitary aid sent to that country in that period.

FINAL USE QUESTIONED

This program allows Saigon businessmen on license by the South Vietnamese Government to contract for goods with American businessmen, import the goods to Vietnam, then pay for them in piasters, the local currency. American aid dollars are used to reimburse the American businesses, and the piasters used to pay for the goods go into a joint United States-Vietnamese account.

The aim of the program is to stem inflation while promoting economic stability in the country.

But members of the House foreign operations and government information subcommittee found that CIP money is virtually subsidizing some 40 to 50 big businessmen in Saigon. Furthermore, there is practically no control over the final use of the goods. Subcommittee members believe that some of these goods are being resold to the Viet Cong, the North Vietnamese, and even the Chinese Communists. Unfortunately, restraints are so slack, there is no way of knowing for sure.

BUSINESSMEN PROFIT

Here are some of the findings which deeply disturb some individual members of the subcommittee:

The exchange rate set for the CIP program is 60 piasters to the dollar. The official rate is 118 to the dollar and the black market rate is 190 to 200.

This means United States taxpayers are getting about 30 cents of real value out of every dollar spent. Saigon businessmen pocket the difference. It also means these businessmen can resell the goods for terrific profits—for dollars or even gold.

There is no check on the appropriate amount of a specific item imported into Vietnam, and there is no way of checking what it will be used for—there is no "end use audit" procedure. Here are two recent blatant examples of what this can mean:

Subcommittee members learned that about 15 times the amount of silver nitrate which South Vietnam could possibly use went into that country last year.

SHIPMENTS HALTED

Likewise, about 10 times the amount of another chemical, unicef, which could possibly be used in their country was sold to Saigon businessmen.

Both these chemicals can be broken into ingredients for high explosives. And the silver can be extracted from silver nitrate for hoarding. Shipments of these two chemicals have been halted now, according to officials of the Agency for International Development (AID). Congressmen suspect much of these chemicals ended up in Viet Cong hands.

The United States and South Vietnam Governments knew practically nothing about the Vietnamese businessmen who hold the CIP licenses. United States officials lack basic knowledge, for example, of whether they are Chinese or Vietnamese in background or what their business connections are.

SUGGESTIONS VETOED

Goods originally ordered by businessmen can be turned down on arrival and not paid for. South Vietnam officials then confiscate them, auction them off at "a very reduced rate"—and the money then goes into the South Vietnam coffers, not into the joint United States-Vietnamese account. One subcommittee member pointed out that the Viet Cong could be buying these goods at auction—because there is no check on who buys them.

The joint United States-Vietnamese account, into which Vietnamese businessmen pay piasters for the goods, was intended to be used for United States civil-aid projects. Also, an agreed amount supports the South Vietnamese governmental budget. But, in effect, the government of South Vietnam exercises a veto over the use of these funds so completely that the aims of the civil-aid projects are seriously frustrated.

Recent examples of projects the United States Embassy was pushing but which failed to gain approval of the South Vietnamese Government include: use of the funds to pay for garbage collection in Saigon, to build police barracks, and to establish a fund from which to pay Vietnamese claims against the United States.

One subcommittee member called the failure of United States controls over this program a "windfall" for Saigon businessmen.

REPORTS WITHHELD

Another member of the delegation, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, now Republican Senator from Michigan, was blunt in his observations. "What we saw over there is a situation where Saigon businessmen have a vested interest in the prolongation of the war," he charged in an interview.

The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Rep. JOHN E. MOSS (D) of California, is preparing a report on its findings. No one can say what its final shape will take since it has not been completed. But it will probably place strong blame for the slack program on both AID officials and on the General Accounting Office (GAO), charged with the responsibility to double-check the administration of government programs all over the world.

STAFF INCREASED

One subcommittee member charged that AID administrators in Washington "simply couldn't answer basic questions about their programs. That's why we went to Vietnam." He said they found that AID officials in Vietnam were simply holding onto the audit reports to update them. "They were never sent to Washington." No wonder Washington officials couldn't answer questions, he observed.

Subcommittee members are especially disturbed about what they see as dangerous understaffing of the CIP program, especially in accounting and auditing.

In the 10-month period between June, 1965, and April, 1966, the number of AID personnel increased from 630 to 1,900. But until the past few months, only two of these employees were principally concerned with the CIP. A year ago, only one American was in charge. Now, after the subcommittee began investigations seven or eight months ago, the number has increased to seven.

Yet, this year \$370 million out of a total AID commitment of \$630 million, went to the CIP.

The only formal report issued by the GAO on governmental programs in Vietnam in the past seven years came in 1964. Then the GAO, which is an independent arm of the Congress, set up in 1921 to ride herd on the administration, charged that AID was operating under completely inadequate procedures—that nonessential commodities were being admitted into the CIP, that profiteering and overpricing were being allowed.

"Yet, in spite of this report, AID conducted no audit until we got there," said one delegation member.

INADEQUACY CHARGED

Rutherford M. Poats, director of AID for the Far East, says the procedures are still "not adequate."

He said they have steadily expanded the AID auditing staff to 17. He conceded, however, that seven of those were trainees.

He said AID had increased the authorized positions to 26, but that since Vietnam is such a dangerous place, it is very hard to get auditors to go there. AID now is "ordering them from other AID missions around the world by forced draft to go to Vietnam."

Another problem is getting local Vietnamese for the staff. "We can't pay more than the local wages. We've lost some key people to private business which can pay much more."

Still there is no "end use" auditing procedure.

GAO officials admit that after the 1964 report they had "no one physically in Vietnam," until "a team of four people" went there briefly this spring. One congressional source said of the GAO: "They have been conspicuously absent in Vietnam."

Subcommittee members tend to excuse the GAO on the grounds that it has "no continuing responsibility" in any special area. Its investigations are made at the discretion of the comptroller general, and at the request of Congress.

PERMANENCY STUDIED

Yet, GAO officials themselves say that with the size of the program and the "tremendous expenditure," it might be useful to establish a permanent office there.

"The salutary effect of our presence could be a factor of some consequence," said an official. But there are no plans to do this at present.

"We were aware that we had not covered anything there in a number of years," he said explaining the decision to investigate in 1964.

"But we have some reservations in deciding what practically can be accomplished in sending our people to Vietnam under war-

time conditions. It might be a better idea to go other places where we could accomplish more," said an official of the GAO international operations division.

STAFF DIFFICULTIES

He also cited the difficulty in getting a staff overseas.

The total worldwide staff of GAO is about 2,000. The Far East headquarters in Hawaii has a staff of about 35. But GAO presently has no one in Vietnam, which has the largest United States AID program in the world.

Apparently, the subcommittee's investigation has set the ball rolling.

Since it started, the State Department's inspector general of foreign assistance and the AID comptroller have been to Vietnam. Also the director of foreign service personnel was scheduled to go.

But a more basic problem is pointed out by subcommittee member Rep. DONALD RUMSFELD (R) of Illinois: "As I look at it, I feel we lack leverage with the Government of South Vietnam."

He says he believes American officials are afraid to demand more controls.

Another subcommittee member agrees. Says Rep. DAVID S. KING (D) of Utah, "In theory, we can't go in to run the show."

But he asserts that this idea has been "used as a cloak to cover up a rather shoddy and unsatisfactory performance by the South Vietnamese Government."

Adds Mr. GRIFFIN: "My greatest criticism is that the very expensive CIP, so obviously susceptible to corruption and abuses, has been almost completely left in the hands of the Saigon government. We are justified in taking a stronger hand."

Whatever the final recommendations of the subcommittee will be, there are sure to be some strong recommendations for a greater United States role in overseeing the use of United States taxpayer's money. From what these congressmen say, such supervision barely exists at all today.

Total economic aid for fiscal 1967: 71% to South Vietnam; 29% to all others.

U.S. economic aid to South Vietnam [In millions]

Fiscal 1963	\$143.6
1964	165.7
1965	224.9
1966	541.1
1967	550.0

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARNUM (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for June 13, on account of illness.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia), for Tuesday, June 14, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. KREBS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. McEWEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for balance of week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WILLIS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 15 minutes, June 15; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 30 minutes, June 20; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 15 minutes, June 15; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. HICKS), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HÉBERT and to include pertinent material on debate during H.R. 2950.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina to include a statement by General Westmoreland at the beginning of his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. GRABOWSKI in four instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HICKS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. DANIELS.

SENATE BILLS AND 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. 777. An act for the relief of Julian Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1522. An act to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2529. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Hurtado Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2640. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2647. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Guillermo Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Kumar Poddar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2702. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Montero-Novoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2751. An act for the relief of David R. Slemom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2761. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Sanguily, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2771. An act for the relief of Hazel Louise Schuman Strunk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2796. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Anrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2800. An act for the relief of George Joseph Saad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2838. An act for the relief of Irene Snyder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2853. An act for the relief of Abraham Presser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2854. An act for the relief of Dr. Gottfried E. Kaestner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2865. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Enrique Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2884. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Zuniga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2945. An act for the relief of Dr. Jaime E. Condom Valera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2946. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario V. Machado Espinosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2957. An act for the relief of Wing Yuen Wong, also known as Wing Yuen Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3249. An act to consent to the interstate compact defining the boundary between the States of Arizona and California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of April 1967, as "Federal Land Bank Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 1233. An act for the relief of Lee Chung Woo;

H.R. 2290. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schulz;

H.R. 3692. An act for the relief of William F. Kuhlman;

H.R. 3774. An act for the relief of Wanda Olszowa;

H.R. 5003. An act for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis;

H.R. 5533. An act for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer;

H.R. 8219. An act for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee;

H.R. 8833. An act for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona;

H.R. 9643. An act for the relief of Haider Raza and his wife, Irene Raza, and their children, Afzal Anthony and Haider Raymond Raza;

H.R. 10133. An act for the relief of Fritz A. Frerichs;

H.R. 10838. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Post Office Department at Eau Gallie, Fla.; and

H.R. 12396. An act for the relief of Elton P. Johnson.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning June 13, 1966, and ending June 19, 1966, as "Gas Industry Week"; and

S.J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June 1966 as Father's Day.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 13, 1966:

H.R. 15151. An act to permit the planting of alternate crops on acreage which is unplanted because of a natural disaster.

On June 14, 1966:

H.R. 3177. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases;

H.R. 3957. An act to authorize establishment of Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes;

H.R. 5984. An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain lands granted to the States;

H.R. 6646. An act to amend the Recreation and Public Purposes Act pertaining to the leasing of public lands to States and their political subdivisions;

H.R. 9961. An act to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran receiving pension under this chapter disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to the wife and children;

H.R. 10431. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H.R. 11748. An act to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care;

H.R. 12676. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty;

H.R. 13366. An act to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13768. An act to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13769. An act to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13770. An act to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) from the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13773. An act to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 15, 1966, 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:

2490. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2491. A letter from the General Counsel, Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the Corporation's report of audit for the period January 1 to December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-449; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2492. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a request for the withdrawal and return of a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; 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. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1495. An act to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEED: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14266, an act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 15656. A bill to provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 15657. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15658. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a special educational training and physical rehabilitation program for persons with educational or physical deficiencies to enable them to serve effectively in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 15659. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Badlands National Monument in the State of South Dakota, to authorize exchanges of land mutually beneficial to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the United States,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15660. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. for inclusion in the Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 15661. A bill to provide assistance to first processors of agricultural commodities who have suffered substantial losses because of the economic impact of commodity programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15662. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 15663. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15664. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to protect the right to vote in Federal, State, and local elections of U.S. citizens who have successfully completed the sixth primary grade or equivalent educational level in any public or private school within or outside the United States in which the predominant classroom language was other than English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 15665. A bill to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 15666. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include prescribed drugs among the items and services covered under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15667. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 15668. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 15669. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 15670. A bill to amend the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (33 U.S.C. 1001-1015), to implement the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15671. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and certain education, training, and research programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15672. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 15673. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 15674. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 15675. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15676. A bill to provide for the protection, conservation, and development of the natural coastal wetlands of Hempstead-South Oyster Bay, Long Island, for fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15677. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 15678. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 15679. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 15680. A bill to designate the reservoir formed by Carters Dam on the Coosawattie River in the State of Georgia as "Lake Richard B. Russell"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15681. A bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949 and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15682. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15683. A bill to promote and coordinate historic preservation activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, other public bodies, and private organizations and individuals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 15684. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that employees who terminate their railroad employment before completing 10 years of railroad service may apply for and receive a refund of the railroad retirement taxes which they have paid; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 15685. A bill to designate the reservoir formed by Carters Dam on the Coosawattie River in the State of Georgia as "Lake Richard B. Russell"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 15686. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 15687. A bill to provide grants to State educational agencies for the purpose of supporting the growth and expansion of local school systems by relieving aged low-income property owners of increases in real property taxes caused by such growth and expansion; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 15688. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act in order to permit the construction of classrooms under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 15689. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 1168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to declare any provision of law unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 1169. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 1170. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 764. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Con. Res. 765. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS:

H. Con. Res. 766. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H. Con. Res. 767. Concurrent resolution favoring free elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H. Con. Res. 768. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the holding of elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 769. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H. Con. Res. 770. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DYAL:

H. Con. Res. 771. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Con. Res. 772. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H. Con. Res. 773. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 774. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Con. Res. 775. Concurrent resolution favoring a United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Res. 887. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1539 by the Committee on Education and Labor on the International Education Act of 1966; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CULVER:

H. Res. 888. Resolution declaring the Eastern Orthodox Church to be a major faith in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 15690. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Kajrys, his wife Stanislawka Kajrys, and their minor daughters, Teresa Kajrys and Lucyna Kajrys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15691. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe (Joseph) Gagliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 15692. A bill for the relief of Emil William Aceto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 15693. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 15694. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Shea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 15695. A bill for the relief of Bahram Ravan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 15696. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mohamad Ali Rajaei and wife, Mrs. Parvin (Ghaziaskar) Rajaei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 15697. A bill for the relief of Woo Yeoung Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 15698. A bill for the relief of Enrique E. Bertot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

399. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to repairs to the west portico of the U.S. Capitol Building, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today Americans throughout the world are observing Flag Day in commemoration of the adoption by the Continental Congress of the original Stars and Stripes on June 14, 1777.

It has been 189 years since that great day and our flag has stood the test of time. Today millions of Americans are flying their flags because it is the symbol of strength, freedom, and hope. As much as ever, we need a symbol to remind us that we do have cause to be patriotic.

Although we do not all agree to the exact procedures by which our system of government should operate, we do have to acknowledge the fact that we have a great Nation—a nation where we have the opportunity to worship the Almighty, to pray, to work, to save, to invest, to own, to vote, to travel, to learn, to teach, to preach, to agree, to disagree,

to praise, to condemn, to serve, to think, to create, to write, to speak, to play, to love, to sleep, to rest, to be humble, and to be proud.

We have much to be thankful for and to be proud of and our flag with its stars and stripes, is ever a reminder of this.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day in the United States. It is a special day on which every American can show his "colors," particularly in this period of conflict and sacrifice for the principles the American flag represents.

Flag Day has somehow lost its meaning in recent years, and it is the duty of every citizen to combat the greatest dangers in a democracy—apathy and indifference.

The American flag has flown on battlefields around the world, it has been the

symbol of our way of life in remote corners of the world, and it has become the one great source of courage and strength in the building of our Nation.

Today is a time for renewing our faith in the system the flag represents and for rededication to the spirit and soul of America which the American flag embodies.

Anniversary of Deportation of Citizens of Baltic Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the sad anniversary of the beginning of the mass deportation of citizens of the three Baltic nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, to remote parts of the Soviet slave empire. Twenty-five years ago today, on June 14, 1941, 60,000 citizens of these unhappy nations were arrested and taken from their homes and loved ones.

In the last quarter century, the Soviet Union has done all in its power to destroy the national identity of the Baltic peoples. Every effort has been made to Russify the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and to extinguish their ancient cultures.

Mr. Speaker, on this 25th anniversary it is well for all Members of this House to rededicate themselves to the policy that we shall never rest until the people of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other nations incorporated into the Soviet system are once again free to shape their own destinies.

Good Samaritans of Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to salute those "Good Samaritans of Song," the Riverside Area Chapters of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., who presented their fifth annual "Harmony Under the Stars" at the Watergate Theater Monday evening. National Capital Region-National Parks Services cooperated with the Riverside Area Chapters, including the District of Columbia, Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax, and Fredericksburg, Va., Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, and St. Marys, Md.

"We Sing That They Shall Speak" was adopted in 1964 as the community service motto of the SPEBSQSA, which has some 30,000 members affiliated with 700 chapters in the United States and Canada. The Institute of Logopedics at Wichita, Kans., has been adopted as the society's international service project. Since 1934, the center for speech and hearing therapy has treated over 25,000 persons, mostly children, burdened with afflictions which inhibit normal speech and hearing. Also it has trained over 250 students who later became therapists in these fields.

Opening and closing the Watergate concert was the Chorus of the Potomac, around 250 male voices, being made up of six separate and distinctively costumed choruses, all of which performed by themselves. The audience of thousands of music lovers heard the Singing Capital Chorus from the District of Columbia, under Director Lew Sims; the Jubil-Aires of Fairfax, led by Jed Casey; the Arlingtones of Arlington, under Ed Roberson; St. Mary's, under Bing Gardner; Alexandria Harmonizers, led by Scott Werner; Montgomery Counts, with Orville Luedtke directing. Art Moore was master of ceremonies and Henry Brown, producer. Featured quartets were the Flibusters, Scale Tippers, Potomachords, and Nightcaps.

Next big harmony event to be held in Washington will be the annual Harvest of Harmony of the District of Columbia chapter, scheduled Saturday, November 5, in Constitution Hall.

Disclosures of the Week—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, never in my 14 years of service in Congress have I observed, as recently, so many critical statements and evidence pointing up maladministration of public affairs both foreign and domestic. Here are a few examples of what I mean:

CASE I

An Associated Press dispatch of June 11 from Providence, R.I., quoted former Ambassador to India, John K. Galbraith, as saying of Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, that he was "terribly misinformed" in estimates of support for the administration's foreign policy.

It is difficult to find anything, either abroad or at home—

He said—that remotely resembles the understanding, respect and support which the Secretary perceives.

CASE II

Secretary of Defense McNamara has consistently denied that shortages beset our forces in Vietnam. Last Sunday's New York Times on the contrary in an article by Benjamin Welles quotes Marine Corps officials as conceding widespread shortages in Vietnam of clothing, combat boots, insect repellent and other similar items.

CASE III

In a speech last Sunday at the University of Minnesota ROTC graduation Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, referring to Vietnam, said that the United States has been perhaps "overhesitant."

CASE IV

The June 6 issue of U.S. News & World Report contained the following statement about casualties in Vietnam:

Saigon-American casualties have set a record high for one week in the Vietnam war. They reached two-thirds of the weekly average for the first year of fighting in Korea.

CASE V

The June 12 New York Times contains an article saying that last year the U.S. Public Health Service destroyed \$19 million worth of medical supplies. This was part of the civil defense stockpile which deteriorated before it was used to relieve human suffering.

CASE VI

Henry Wallich in the June 13 issue of Newsweek has this to say about our economic picture:

Bad news comes once more from the balance of payments front. The gap between

international receipts and expenditures again is widening. Official hopes of curing the payments deficit by year-end, proclaimed optimistically half a year ago, have proved a total illusion. The Country's gold reserve continues to dwindle.

CASE VII

Total debt—public and private—according to a Department of Commerce report, rose \$93 billion last year to a record \$1.3 trillion. Debts of individuals were up \$40.5 billion to \$460.

CASE VIII

Writing in the Los Angeles Times, Harry Thimborn reveals that phony philanthropists are using art as a tax dodge that costs the Treasury millions in lost revenue. This is done by using inflated appraisals on art works donated to museums and other institutions.

CASE IX

A New Hampshire Congressman charged last week that each Job Corps graduate has cost the taxpayers about \$50,000. He said the Job Corps in 2 years of existence has cost \$252 million. As of June 6, he said 5,090 trainees have completed courses.

Outstanding Employee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure this week of meeting with Mr. Rene P. Hinojosa, and his wife, constituents of mine from San Antonio. Mr. Hinojosa has been selected from among 315 employees of the San Antonio field office of the Army Map Service, Corps of Engineers, to be "Employee of the Year" for the calendar year 1965.

Mr. Hinojosa is here in Washington for participation in special Engineer Day ceremonies scheduled for June 16, at the Army Map Service Headquarters at which Col. Ward Van Atta, commanding officer of the Army Map Service, will preside over the ceremonies honoring the employees of the year selected from each of the four AMS field offices located in Kansas City, Providence, R.I., Louisville, Ky., and San Antonio.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been proud of the fine record of achievement of the Army Map Service in my district and of Mr. Hinojosa, who has distinguished himself by consistently exceeding the quality and quantity standards for his position as civilian transportation agent for the San Antonio field office.

Mr. Hinojosa has total responsibility for shipment of all maps and materials for all parts of the world.

Mr. Hinojosa was born September 30, 1935, in San Diego, Tex., and was graduated from San Diego High School in 1954. Soon after graduating he volunteered for the U.S. Army and was assigned to the 525th Military Intelligence Group,

Counter Intelligence Corps, at Fort Bragg, N.C. After completion of CIC training, Mr. Hinojosa was assigned to an interior guard unit in Mannheim, Germany.

He was discharged from the U.S. Army in 1956 and returned to San Antonio where he started his Government career with the U.S. Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base. He was employed by the Army Map Service in 1962. He and Mrs. Hinojosa have two children.

I commend this fine young man's record to your attention and salute the Army Map Service of San Antonio for its outstanding history of service.

Baltic States Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the rape of the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—was launched by the Soviet Union. Within 72 hours tens of thousands of citizens of those countries found themselves on the way to an unknown fate within the Soviet Union. Thousands of others, not so "lucky," were murdered on the spot. The true character of the Russian leaders, pretty well defined by their dealings with Nazi Germany and plunder of an almost prone Poland, was now once again spelled out for the world to see.

But in those days the world was too busy. The United States, herself just 6 months away from war with the Axis nations and shocked by the Nazi conquests in Europe, could do little more than file a diplomatic protest. The world was in chaos and the Baltic States were just another unfortunate bit of flotsam sucked into the maelstrom. Awaking from two decades of isolationist dozing, we here in the United States could only briefly pause and then continue in our efforts to prepare our defense machinery.

Following the war, this country, through the United Nations, tried time and time again to have the Soviets release their bloody hold on the three Baltic nations. We failed. We had assumed that the Soviets, although not coming to the U.N. with clean hands by any means, were at least coming as an honorable ally and that negotiation was possible. How naive we must have seemed to the Communists.

It could be assumed, Mr. Speaker, that after a quarter of a century of oppression, murder, pillage, and plunder that the people of the Baltic States would bend to what to them might seem to be the inevitable. But they have not, and neither have their relatives and friends who were fortunate enough to make their way to these shores.

Just last November I had the privilege of addressing a gathering of more than

15,000 which filled Madison Square Garden in New York for the Baltic States Freedom Rally. I said at that time:

I am proud not only that my country has continuously condemned the atrocious act of the Russians in their illegal annexation of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States, but that the United States has been steadfast in refusing to recognize any Soviet interests in those states.

For 25 years your kinsmen and your friends have suffered at the hands of their Communist slave masters. But in spite of the loss of self determination, the people of Lithuania, the people of Estonia and Latvia, with your help and encouragement, have preserved any undying desire to live as free men. They have nourished and kept vibrantly alive a national spirit predicated on the dignity of man. But they need encouragement to carry on. They need the help of the free and independent countries of the world to help them preserve the ideals which they hold dear and to preserve for posterity the culture and traditions which you and they value as much as life itself.

Mr. Speaker, the people that filled Madison Square Garden last November had every right to despair and self pity. Yet this was not their mood. There were tears, to be sure, but there was also a spirit and faith that really has to be seen to be believed. We must continue to support these fine people in their unceasing effort to make their homeland free once again. We must provide more radio programs to the captive nations in their own tongue so that truth and factual information can offset the effects of a Communist-controlled press; we must strive to keep open the channels for delivery of food, medicine, and clothing parcels and above all we must strive, as fruitless as it may seem sometimes, to force Russia to her senses.

Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and the other captive states will not always be slave states. They will in time, God willing, join the community of free nations. When that proud and happy day comes, Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the United States by her actions will merit a "thank you."

VFW Post in Claxton, Evans County, Ga., Promotes U.S. Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Flag Day, I want to take this occasion to apprise my colleagues of an inspiring event which I attended on Memorial Day in Claxton, Ga.

When I accepted an invitation from the Claxton-Evans County VFW Post to participate in its Memorial Day program, little did I realize what an outstanding job this post was performing to encourage patriotism and respect for our national flag.

When I arrived in Claxton, I was pleasantly surprised to discover Ameri-

can flags flying everywhere. In asking who was responsible for this wonderful act of patriotism, I was advised that it was the result of a special project of the Claxton-Evans County VFW Post.

The post has purchased a number of American flags to be rented to local business houses, displayed on national holidays and properly stored when not in use for an annual cost of \$12 to each merchant. The post is also displaying the flag at prominent public buildings on a daily basis.

The Post Commander, D. B. Plyler, describes the project as follows:

This is not a money-making project, but is planned to display our National flag and help tell the American story to coming generations. Our flag represents free America, and all the things for which men have fought and died. We hope to help emphasize its importance in our Community.

When other civic and service clubs around the country are looking for project ideas, I heartily recommend that they follow the example being set by the Claxton-Evans County VFW Post. What better project can any club adopt than one which will encourage patriotism and respect for the American flag?

The 53d National Foreign Trade Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an announcement of plans for the 53d National Foreign Trade Convention, which will be held October 31, November 1 and 2, at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. This is one of the world's outstanding forums on international trade and investment, attracting leaders of government, industry, and business, as well as interested participants from educational institutions and the press.

Theme of the 1966 convention will be "World Progress Through Trade and Investment." Rudolph A. Peterson, president of the Bank of America, San Francisco, will serve as chairman of the convention, and will deliver the keynote address at the first general session of the convention.

In announcing plans for the convention, Robert M. Morris, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, the sponsoring organization, stated:

The convention will broadly examine whether world trade and investment is having its full impact on world progress, and will emphasize the proven capabilities of private enterprise and the requirements for achieving the fullest measure of world economic advancement.

Robert J. Dixon, vice chairman, Johnson & Johnson International, New

Brunswick, N.J., will be chairman of the declaration committee, which will propose policy recommendations for adoption by the convention.

Special sessions have been scheduled on business operations in Europe, Latin America, Pacific-Asia, and Africa, as well as on subjects of such importance as trade expansion, taxation, industrial relations, and international finance.

Convention chairman Peterson, chief executive officer of the world's largest nongovernment bank, with resources of more than \$16.6 billion, will have eight regional vice chairmen assisting him on the convention committee.

Great Plains Program Tremendous Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly remarkable achievements in American agriculture in our time is the new look in the vast region of the Great Plains.

The change, in terms of greater agricultural stability, reduced soil erosion, development of water for agricultural and recreational uses, and a more beautiful landscape, has come about as a result of an enlightened partnership between people and their government, between scientist and landowners.

It has come about largely through the Great Plains conservation program, a tool that has been greatly sharpened and strengthened in the last 6 years under leadership that recognizes the fundamental role land resources plays in the well-being of an entire region.

What has happened in the Great Plains is more than simple recovery from years of drought and dust storms which, for a time, gave it the unhappy label of "The Dust Bowl."

Droughts will recur, for this is the nature of the climatic pattern of the Great Plains. Wind will blow, as it always has, across the rolling prairies.

But the farmer and rancher who has reserves of grass and water, who has tied down with grass his soils that are unsuited for cultivation, will not become the dispossessed migrant of the thirties.

These are the primary goals of the Great Plains conservation program—a program that has been expanded by 60 percent since 1960, to serve a larger number of landowners in the region each year.

"Wheat Will Win the War" was a battle cry during World War I, and the wheatlands of the Great Plains responded with heavy output. The plow-up was costly, however, for much of the newly cultivated land was extremely susceptible to the winds of the dry years that followed. The term "dust bowl" came out of the disaster.

The research scientist and the farmer have formed an effective partnership in solving the problems of the Great Plains. Techniques developed in times of drought and privation are the solid basis now for a far more stable agriculture in the plains. The survey of soils, classifying them as to their capability in conservation use, has provided unmistakable lines of guidance in adapting the lands of the Great Plains to agricultural production.

The technical help afforded by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, its effectiveness intensified by the forming of landowner-managed, State-sponsored soil conservation districts, became a useful tool for use by farmers and ranchers of the region in correcting errors of the past and in bringing their resources into fuller stability. In addition, Federal funds have been made available to defray part of the cost of land-use shifts and to step up the rate of conversion.

The program was authorized by Congress during the drought of the 1950's. It was conceived as a pilot program, a testing of principles developed for a particular region. It was accepted at first by a relatively few landowners, and from 1957 through 1960, received Federal cost-sharing appropriations of \$10 million each year. Beginning in 1961, however, the appropriation has been increased gradually to the current level of \$16 million and in recent years about 5,000 farmers and ranchers have entered the program each year.

Approximately 23,000 landowners have entered the program. Thousands have completed their work and have been enjoying the benefits of complete conservation treatment and sounder use of their resources. The size of the units range from small to large—an average of 1,900 acres.

The conversion of unsuitable cropland to permanent vegetative use was, at the outset, a principal objective. The results have been dramatic. More than 1,400,000 acres of these less stable lands have been returned to the protection of grass, or are in the process of being converted. This represents more than 1 acre in every 5 cropland acres involved in the 23,000 Great Plains contracts. Wheat produced on these acres was, in recent times, not only surplus to our needs but was produced at the cost of damage to the land resource—a damage we cannot afford.

Grass and water are the earmarks of the new agriculture in the Great Plains. The Great Plains conservation program is enabling the landowners of the plains to have them—grass as productive as his land and skill in management can produce, and water enough to see him through the years of drought that he wisely presumes to be ahead. With grass and water in abundance, the producer no longer must dispose of livestock on a market glutted by the offerings of owners in the same distress.

The new agriculture in the Great Plains is built upon the conservation of soil and water resources, an approach that was born in times of land disaster

and human hardship. The drought of the 1950's was less damaging than the one of the 1930's that aroused the Nation to action—less damaging because of conservation progress and know-how already moving into use across the plains. Because of work now being done by the region's landowners, much of it prompted and facilitated by agricultural programs supported by the Federal Government, less damage will occur in the plains' next drought. Whatever the future holds for plains agriculture, the farmers and ranchers of the region are in far better condition to cope with emergencies as they come.

SPEBSQSA Sponsors Watergate Concert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to inform my colleagues who enjoy harmony singing at its best that the traditional Watergate concert of the barbershop singers will take place Monday evening, June 27, starting at 8:30. Washington's "Singingest Night of the Year" is sponsored by the Riverside Area of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America. The society today boasts 700 chapters and 30,000 members throughout the United States and Canada.

Listening to the ringing chords of 250 male voices in the Chorus of the Potomac at the Watergate concert under the stars is an unforgettable experience, and the audiences of 10,000 to 12,000 music lovers attest. This ensemble is composed of several chapter choruses, including Washington's Singing Capital Chorus, past international champions; Fairfax's Jubilaires, past international medalists; Alexandria's Harmonizers, the Arlingtones from Arlington, and the Montgomery County Counts. Each chapter chorus, attired in its own distinctive uniform, will be heard by itself. Barbershoppers from the Prince Georges County, St. Mary's County, and Frederickburg chapters also are expected.

The Singing Capital Chorus will tune up for the Watergate concert on next Thursday evening, June 23, at the Serotoma International Convention at the Sheraton Park. Arthur Sabin, former employee of the Congressional Library, is the District of Columbia chapter president.

A Washington quartet, the Filibusters, will sing at the Watergate along with the Nova Chords, southern regional champions from Alexandria, the Night Caps, and the Potomac Chords.

On stage will be Wilbur Sparks, the Mid-Atlantic district president, who is a Senate employee, to welcome the recep-

tive audience. Henry Brown of Alexandria chapter is the producer for this great night for singing.

Housing Authority Speaks on Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has before it proposals of far-reaching significance in the form of a so-called new Civil Rights Act. Many of us are attorneys and have expressed strong exceptions and reservations to the proposals. The distinguished Senator from Alabama, JOHN J. SPARKMAN, one of the most staunch advocates in the Congress for adequate housing for all people and one of the foremost authorities anywhere on housing problems and solutions to those problems, presented a clear-cut analysis of the dangers in the proposed legislation in testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. I want to submit his remarks for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TESTIMONY PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR JOHN J. SPARKMAN, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, JUNE 10, 1966

Mr. Chairman, for 30 years I have worked to provide safe, decent, and sanitary housing for America's citizens. Legislation which I have sponsored and legislation which I have supported has made it possible for millions of Americans to own their own homes.

I think I may say that I know something about housing.

And that is why I am dismayed by the housing provisions of the legislation you are considering today.

As a lawyer, I am disheartened by the provisions of the proposals which would limit state power of law enforcement and which would further erode the principle of Federalism.

And as an American, I am hopeful that this bill will not become law.

My first objection to the housing provision is that it clearly violates the right to the free use and disposal of property.

Throughout the history of Anglo-American law, the distinguishing feature between types of ownership has been the degree to which an individual could use and dispose of his property.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, if adopted, would irrevocably destroy that right. The private owner would no longer have a free choice in selecting his buyer. He would no longer have a free choice of sales price or conditions of sale. The landlord could not exercise his own free will in selecting the tenants who will share his home with him.

Let me emphasize that this bill applies to every room for rent in every home in America, every apartment and every house. There are no exceptions.

The legal significance of the property right was recognized by the eminent jurist Blackstone when he observed:

"There is nothing which so generally strikes the imagination, and engages the affections of mankind, as the right of property; or that

sole . . . dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual in the universe."

Now, Mr. Chairman, things have changed since Blackstone. The property right is no longer an absolute right. But in those areas where it has been limited, there has been a tangible real harm from which the society had to be protected. And there has been a strong legal basis for the protective action.

Where is the legal base for this action?

This invasion of rights applies equally to homes which in no legal or logical manner are connected with interstate commerce.

This invasion of rights applies equally to property transactions which create no threat to the peace, security, health or safety of a community and hence provide no legal basis for the proper exercise of state police power.

This invasion of rights cannot be said to rest upon the "due process" clause of the 14th Amendment. Interpretation of that right has uniformly been that it applies only to action by state agencies, and not to those of individuals.

Where is the legal basis for such repugnant Federal action?

The answer, Mr. Chairman, is that there is none.

It is an arrogation of power, unprecedented, unjustified, and unwise.

But strong voices have been raised in support of this bill.

We are told that this bill is the ultimate action to solve all social problems. We are told that this bill is a panacea, a cure-all for our nation's social ills.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have heard that argument before. With the introduction of every so called civil rights bill in the past, advocates of each bill have told us, "This is the last one. This is the answer."

What has been the result? There have been street demonstrations, and disorders with the passage of each new bill.

There has developed a malignant theory that if a group has a gripe in our society, it takes to the streets to solve it.

The results of each and every piece of so called civil rights legislation in the past should be proof enough that the Congress cannot legislate solutions to problems of human relations. Social engineering by legislative edict has been proved grossly ineffective.

We are also told that this bill is addressed to the controversy between property rights and so called "human rights". And we are asked to believe that somehow the former are unworthy and the latter are an ultimate good.

The first answer to that argument is that the ownership of property is a human right.

The second answer is given by no less a liberal spokesman for human rights than Walter Lippmann when he said:

"It has been the fashion to speak of the conflict between human rights and property rights, and from this it has come to be widely believed that the cause of private property is tainted with evil and should not be espoused by rational and civilized men. In so far as these ideas refer to . . . great impersonal corporate properties, they make sense. . . . But the issue between the giant corporation and the public should not be allowed to obscure the truth that the only dependable foundation of personal liberty is the personal economic security of private property."

Mr. Lippmann went on to draw the conclusion "Private property was the original source of freedom. It is still its main bulwark."

Now Mr. Chairman, those of us who support this point of view are always the subject of attack. We are pictured as supporting the greedy landlord who stands in the doorway turning away the poor, but deserv-

ing applicants. We are labeled "bigots", and we are told that we are biased, reactionary, ignorant and prejudiced.

These labels are but semantic substitutions for thinking which cannot obscure the fact that this proposal simply means a Federal official can tell me to whom and under what circumstances I can sell my home.

This proposal simply means that my freedom of choice and freedom of association must be sacrificed for no legal reason and for no rational basis.

I think also, Mr. Chairman, that this bill if passed, will have results not anticipated by its supporters. Consider the following hypothetical example: A church group which had purchased property for construction of a home for its elderly could not legally build such a home for the exclusive use of members of its faith. This example is but one of many that show the danger of such sweeping delegation of power.

That leads me to the final objection I have to this part of the bill.

The whole process of democracy is one designed to draw legal, rational limits between the rights of various citizens. No right is an absolute right.

We all know that the right to free speech does not extend to shouting "fire" in a crowded theater. It has been said that my right to swing my fist ends at my neighbor's jaw.

In like manner, this bill is an attempt to choose between two national policies. The right of the property owner to sell, rent or lease his property is a right supported by many centuries of Anglo-American law.

The right of a buyer to buy any house anywhere is a right never before established.

I believe that it is at this point that we must support the established right. The fundamental difference between our free enterprise system and totalitarianism is the right of free property.

This bill infringes on that right.

But the weaknesses of this bill are not confined to any one section. Other sections of the bill attack the traditional Federal-State relationships in state law enforcement matters and the selection of state juries.

Congress has no legal right to destroy the division that has always existed between the Federal and State legal systems. This action is nothing but a naked encroachment on the valid legal power of the state.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the erosion of the principle of Federalism is a phenomenon so often occurring that I fear it is beginning to lose its impact. No greater indictment could be made of our performance as national legislators than that we failed to understand the significance of that erosion.

During my thirty years in Congress, I have witnessed more and more attempts by various groups to resolve all their problems at the federal level without even considering that there might be a workable solution found at the local level. I for one, am a firm believer in the abilities and aptitudes of the many fine people responsible for our local governments.

Many problems call for a special solution which can best be determined by local initiative. I submit that the federal government does not always have the last word in problem solving. True, situations arise in our complex society which call for assistance from the federal government and this cannot be ignored.

But as legislators, we should allow the states and the local communities to meet the challenge of resolving their own difficulties before running to Washington to seek a solution.

Mr. Chairman, I have confidence in the people at the grass roots level.

No greater attack could be made on any bill than that it furthers the destruction of Federalism.

The ignominious proposal to put the federal government in the business of selecting state juries deals a lethal blow to our dual system of government.

The right to trial by jury is one of the oldest and most cherished rights of man. It was Thomas Jefferson who, in his first inaugural address said that:

"Trial by juries form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. . . . should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

For centuries the right to trial by jury has been one of the bulwarks against tyranny. The jury trial is one of a citizen's oldest protections against the power of the sovereign.

This bill destroys that protection because the sovereign is now involved in choosing the jury.

The jury system is worth protecting. It is the best trial system ever devised by free men. It should not be tampered with.

Federal jury packing is not the answer to any problems of our society.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this bill is an ill advised attempt to subvert the rights of states and the rights of peoples to the arbitrary commands of the federal government.

This bill rests on no legal basis and its passage would be a serious blow to basic American philosophy and American law.

It must be rejected.

Sixth District Questionnaire on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in March, I sent out some 120,000 questionnaires on U.S. policy in Vietnam to the citizens of the Sixth District. I am immensely pleased that more than 13,000 persons took the time to answer the questions and return the cards to me. Several hundred people wrote accompanying letters elaborating upon and explaining the reasons for their answers. I think it clearly reflects that the citizens of the Sixth Congressional District feel deeply the burdens and responsibilities of the conflict in Vietnam.

The questions asked were:

1. Do you agree with our present policy in Vietnam?
2. If you were President of the United States, would you—
 - A. Continue our present Vietnam policy?
 - B. Intensify our military efforts in Vietnam?
 - C. Pull our troops out of Vietnam?
 - D. Negotiate a settlement?
 - E. Follow another course?

The results of the poll were as follows:

Question No. 1: President Johnson's present policy in Vietnam won a 2-to-1 approval.

Question No. 2A: On the question of continuing our present policy in Vietnam, the endorsement was again 2 to 1.

Question No. 2B: This question produced the sharpest reaction and the

heaviest response. Those voting in the poll voted 4 to 1 to intensify the military effort in Vietnam.

Question No. 2C: The response was 3 to 1 against pulling our troops out of Vietnam.

Question No. 2D: However, those responding to the poll gave 3-to-1 support for a negotiated settlement.

Question No. 2E: Alternative courses of action were rejected 2 to 1.

Forty Representatives and Twenty-two Senators Support Moving Expense Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the names of Members of Congress, in both the House and the Senate, who have introduced legislation with respect to the taxation of reimbursement for employees' indirect moving expenses.

This legislation is badly needed to correct a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service that permits an employee to exclude from his taxable income only the bare amount reimbursed by his employer for moving himself, his family, and his possessions to a new assignment in another location. This ruling means that the individual and his wife, who must go house hunting and incur other expenses of relocating, are obliged to take into their taxable income any amounts reimbursed to them beyond the cost of the actual physical move. Obviously this is an injustice, for such reimbursement is not income to them.

The overall effect of this ruling is to hamper the mobility of labor and reduce the efficiency of many companies that contribute to the prosperity of the economy and help sustain the war effort. In my own State of Washington, for example, the Boeing Aircraft Co., which among many other companies is making a fine contribution to the war effort, has numerous employees in widely separated localities, all of whom should be readily transferable as the need arises. For this company and its employees, or for any other company and its employees, to have to be hampered by the present ruling seems to me both unnecessary and unwise.

As you will see from the appended list, those who have introduced or sponsored corrective legislation come from both sides of the aisle. Many are members of important committees in both the House and the Senate. As the issue is wholly nonpartisan and has no ideological overtones, I invite and urge all other Members of the Congress to join with us in introducing or sponsoring similar legislation in the hope that this would encourage the Treasury and the administration also to lend their support.

The list follows:

MOVING EXPENSE BILLS, AS OF JUNE 13, 1966

SENATE BILL

S. 3181: McCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota; cosponsors: BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada; CANNON, Democrat, of Nevada; CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas; CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska; DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois; HART, Democrat, of Michigan; HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida; JAVITS, Republican, of New York; MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky; MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota; MURPHY, Republican, of California; PEARSON, Republican, of Kansas; RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut; RUSSELL, Democrat, of South Carolina; TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia; TOWER, Republican, of Texas; YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota; Bass, Democrat, of Tennessee; CASE, Republican, of New Jersey; HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska; WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey.

HOUSE BILLS

H.R. 13070, BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 13175, ROSTENKOWSKI, Democrat, of Illinois.
 H.R. 13213, SCHNEEBELI, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 13229, CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri.
 H.R. 13230, KEOGH, Democrat, of New York.
 H.R. 13629, MAY, Republican, of Washington.
 H.R. 13678, THOMPSON, Democrat, of Texas.
 H.R. 13915, BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 13993, HORTON, Republican, of New York.
 H.R. 14055, UTT, Republican, of California.
 H.R. 14099, HERLONG, Democrat, of Florida.
 H.R. 14646, FULTON, Democrat, of Tennessee.
 H.R. 14933, GRABOWSKI, Democrat, of Connecticut.
 H.R. 14951, BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia.
 H.R. 14999, McCARTHY, Democrat, of New York.
 H.R. 15132, KARSTEN, Democrat, of Missouri.
 H.R. 15158, COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina.
 H.R. 15205, BATTIN, Republican, of Montana.
 H.R. 15214, LANDRUM, Democrat, of Georgia.
 H.R. 15218, ULLMAN, Democrat, of Oregon.
 H.R. 15247, PELLY, Republican, of Washington.
 H.R. 15270, WHALLEY, (Republican, of Pennsylvania).
 H.R. 15357, TEAGUE, Republican, of California.
 H.R. 15390, McGRATH, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 H.R. 15403, WATTS, Democrat, of Kentucky.
 H.R. 15419, FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 15443, TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas.
 H.R. 15463, CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 15496, BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 15505, NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota.
 H.R. 15507, OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana.
 H.R. 15516, WAGGONER, Democrat, of Louisiana.
 H.R. 15574, JENNINGS, Democrat, of Virginia.
 H.R. 15587, BATES, Republican, of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 15598, MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota.
 H.R. 15606, CORMAN, Democrat, of California.

H.R. 15614, HATHAWAY, Democrat, of Maine.
 H.R. 15616, MACKAY, Democrat, of Georgia.
 H.R. 15642, RESNICK, Democrat, of New York.
 H.R. 15645, SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia.

Challenge to Science for a Cleaner America: Environmental Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to include in today's RECORD an outstanding article on environmental pollution by our colleague, Congressman RICHARD D. MCCARTHY.

As a freshman on our Public Works Committee, Congressman MCCARTHY has shown considerable interest in our most difficult task of cleaning up the Nation's waters.

The article appeared in the first quarter of the 1966 Perspective publication by Cornell University:

CHALLENGE TO SCIENCE FOR A CLEANER AMERICA: ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

(By RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Member of Congress, 39th District, New York)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In an area blessed with exceptional benefits of nature—yet in real danger of losing these benefits because of environmental pollution—Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory welcomes the following call to action by a distinguished young Member of Congress from the Niagara Frontier.)

I am honored to be able to present my views on environmental pollution to the readership of Perspective. The noted technical staff and research-oriented associates of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory compose an audience particularly suited to the understanding and fostering of scientific programs for the study of environmental pollution.

The smoke spiraling from your cigarette, the orange rinds and chicken bones cleared from our tables, the empty tin cans and bottles, the combusted coal, oil or gas which keeps us warm . . . where are they going? Into ventilators, incinerators, garbage dumps and the dark urban sky, but what then? They still remain chained to the earth. They are entities which persist in shadow forms, insidiously invading our lives. Although we "dispose" of our refuse, we have not escaped it . . . something of it remains in our environment.

These products, or diverse and novel substances—when multiplied by the prolific thrust of a whole nation—constitute a massive problem. We are confronted with the threat of profound alterations in the air, the land, the living things, and the waters of this country.

We must learn to see ourselves in a new way. We must carefully study the effect of Man's intrusion of pollutants into the physical and chemical balances of the earth. We must recognize the real sources of pollution.

Municipal and industrial sewage is a large and obvious source. It is estimated that in 1964 we dumped into our waterways alone the equivalent of the sewage of 82 million persons. Slaughtering plants, hospitals and mortuaries pour into our surface water all

their discharges of decay and disease, and industry has spewed into our Lake Erie and Niagara River a total of 350 tons of cyanide, phenol, ammonium, compounds, acids, suspended solids, and 2,710 gallons of oil—not just yearly, or monthly, but daily.

Animal wastes, which rise in proportion to the rise in human population sully the air and contaminate the water. One cow generates as much manure as 16.4 humans. One hog produces as much waste as 1.9 people and seven chickens provide a disposal problem equivalent to that created by one person. As a result, farm animals in the United States produce ten times as much waste as the human population.

Solid wastes contribute their weight in pollution to the tune of 250 billion pounds per year. We Americans squeezed 1,244,126,428 tubes of toothpaste last year . . . and the tubes are still with us. Each American discards 1600 pounds of paper, glass, metal, ashes, garbage, brush and grass cuttings annually.

Mining wastes such as zinc seepages contaminate drinking water and abandoned strip mines leave sterile, eroded cavities on our wounded earth.

PESTICIDES UNBALANCE NATURE

Pesticides, especially when applied aerially, are potential air contaminants. The dusts from insecticides, fungicides and herbicides are found scattered many leagues beyond their initial source. DDT has even been found in the bodies of antarctic penguins and arctic snowy owls. Our ignorance of interrelationships between species have led men to use pesticides indiscriminately with great devastation to innocent habitants in their paths.

A great source of pollution lies in the every action of man. He releases some material that may spread into the environment at every moment. Many of these materials are increasing in abundance and are causing problems of growing severity because the capacity of the environment to absorb and neutralize them does not change. The combustion of coal, oil and gas in our homes, vehicles and factories will have added, in a very short time, the significant part of the carbon that was slowly extracted from solar energy by plants and buried in the sediment during half a billion years. Carbon dioxide, called the invisible pollutant, is being shot into the atmosphere at a yearly rate of six billion tons. The use of lead alkyls in anti-knock gasoline since 1923 has contributed enough lead to contaminate the surface of the northern hemisphere to the extent of about 10 milligrams per square meter.

And what are the effects of the tons of sewage, animal wastes, tin cans, shale, garbage, heat, gasses, and pesticides?

EFFECTS OF POLLUTION ARE PROFOUND

In our latest investigations, air pollution is linked with lung cancer, virus infections, asthmatic attacks, cardiac and respiratory diseases, and even lead poisoning.

Water pollution is a known factor in the uncounted hordes of new viruses which increasingly befoul our world. The organic chemical exotics from detergents, industry, and pesticides are one of the most dangerous menaces to wholesome water. Uranium mills and atomic reactor plants have added radioactive wastes to our waters with unknown damage to our health.

Our balance with the other creatures and living things in this world is threatened. Man is the dominating inhabitant of the earth, but he must live in harmony with plants who maintain the oxygen content of the air and furnish the basic habitat and food of animals and men. Micro-organisms perform a spectrum of services . . . they purify the air, soil and water, they recycle the nutrients. Animals change plants into food man most covets, and supply him with

leather, furs, oils, pharmaceuticals, ivory, pearls and wool. Insects are our pollinators, our predators and our creators of silk and honey. We are not respecting these servants of ours and they are chaotically responding to our heedlessness.

The sulfur dioxide in stack fumes kills trees and crop plants, the domestic sewage over-fertilizes our waters, and this enrichment stimulates algal growths which consume the oxygen dissolved in the water, thus suffocating the fish and microscopic animals.

Sediments released into streams by industry smother fish eggs. The numbers of species have been reduced and their delicate relationships destroyed by pollution.

Heat from steel mills, coke ovens, petroleum refineries and steam turbine electricity plants draw immense quantities of water from streams and return it hot or warm, killing much aquatic life. Heat pollution is predicted to multiply eight times in the next 35 years.

Eutrophication or ecological aging is proceeding at such a rate in lakes such as Lake Erie that it may soon be dead.

EVEN THE EARTH IS POISONED

Our loamy earth has been defiled by indiscriminate doses of poisonous metals—among them arsenic. Some orchards no longer bear apples; carrots, beets and spinach are stunted; produce sometimes absorbs the poisons and become contaminated themselves. High salt concentrations make river waters unsuitable for needed irrigation.

Our atmospheric heat balance is changing radically. By the year 2000, there will be about 25% more carbon dioxide in our atmosphere, which scientists predict can dramatically modify our climate.

But perhaps the most grievous consequence of our offenses against nature is the diminishing of the quality of our lives. Beauty and purity enrich each other and inspire man to look beyond his smallest self into the visions of the future and the great gifts of the past. Ugliness is the shabby scab we have grafted upon our magnificent world.

WE ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR TOMORROW

Our children and the futures' children have the right to lie in lush green meadows and watch the miraculous progress of springtime. And we adults have a responsibility to insure this.

I have a whole hat-full of ideas which, I feel, may help solve this vast problem. But, in conclusion, let me suggest just one.

I have sketched for you an immense spectrum of the unknown . . . for this is an obscure and unrecognized field. This vital, all-encompassing reality in contemporary life has not been penetrated, nor has it even been considered a worthy area of comprehensive research.

OUR ENVIRONMENT MUST BE STUDIED

But, this, truly is the field for pioneers. The investigation of how we live, why we sicken or die, why we exist under blue sky or smog, lush foliage or craven sterility, prosperity or dearth, quality or crassness, depression or inspiration . . . this is the knowledge of our environment.

Let me now plead before this scientific audience for our best talent and for an exalted status for this field of investigation.

We need knowledge more than anything else. We need natural and behavioral scientists and engineers who have the imagination, dedication and the skill to gain the understandings of unknown processes and obscure relationships that we must have if our complex civilization is to continue to exist in harmony with its earthly environment.

So we are making progress. But much more remains to be done.

You have seen the sources and effects of environmental pollution, but remember that there is only one cause . . . man. We must now apply man's maximum intellect and distill from our past knowledge and future insight the profound answers.

We need gifted specialists in cell biology to study metabolic pathways, structure distortion, interaction between enzymes and many other deep and challenging biochemical problems.

We need microbiologists to penetrate the structure of pollutants, to study how they are metabolized by organisms; why some resist biodegradation and others survive in seemingly impossible environments.

We need population dynamics, studies and much investigation in the behavioral sciences, for pollution would not exist except for man's activities and it concerns almost the entire range of interactions between human beings and their environment. Although all living creatures are affected by pollution, only man has the ability to control or eliminate it. Sociologists, economists, urban and regional planners, psychologists, anthropologists, communications experts and political scientists of the highest calibre must invest their talents to this field.

Atmospheric problems must be analyzed by meteorologists, hydrologists and systems analysts. Great challenges and fascinating problems await gifted engineers. New processes and new designs for sewage treatment

plants, new principles for collection systems, design of water storage and distribution systems are but a few.

And to attract these people, we must provide excellent research environments—such as are provided by Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory—and specific research opportunities. We must create dynamic exchanges between the many fields of study to integrate and unify our knowledge.

Lest it be overlooked, let me emphasize that substantial research funds—from the federal and state levels—are already available and programs are in motion. But we must press forward.

We must also press forward with our program to halt the pollution of Lake Erie. The Federal Government set April 12 for formulating state-by-state plans to clean up the lake. By that date, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan were to inform the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of what they proposed to do with respect to pollution originating within their boundaries.

We substantially increased the amount of public funds available to fight water pollution last year. This year I am pressing for still more funds for this vital purpose.

WHY AM I INTERESTED?

My own concern in these emerging problems began with a love affair. As a little boy from the city, no delight was above that of

launching stick ships into the blue waters of Lake Erie. As a man, the lake and its chaste vastness holds my reverence and is my source of solitude and contemplation.

My commitment to the lake was one of the influences that compelled me to make a difficult decision two years ago. As I watched her harbors fill with acids and slime, and her seashores become desecrated with raw sewage, I knew that I, as a private citizen must do something.

I left the business world and sought a seat in the United States Congress, which the voters graciously granted me. My hope was to be admitted to the Public Works Committee, and particularly to the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee which writes the laws regarding water pollution.

I guess Lake Erie has a lady luck for those who care about her, because, though I was a freshman, I was granted membership in the Public Works Committee and was seated on the key Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee.

This was the beginning of my comprehensive education in the field of pollution. The hours of enlightened testimony by scientists in our Public Works hearings, my own investigations, and those of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, have revealed Lake Erie's problems to be but an urgent segment in our total confrontation of environmental pollution.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Adolph Stasys, assistant pastor, Holy Cross Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, Thou art the Author of the right of man to justice and freedom. For centuries men have fought for freedom of speech, conscience, and religion, and for democratic principles. The efforts recorded in history tell of the unceasing struggle for these convictions.

Yesterday we honored the Old Glory proudly flying on National Flag Day. O Lord, bless the people of this land, its administration and its Congress, and the brave men defending the honor of their Nation's flag wherever they may be.

But, dear God, the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, are still occupied by a foreign force, without the right to freedom, and without their national flags. These nations are observing the 25th tragic anniversary of frightful genocide, when the occupant—Communist Russia—deported hundreds of thousands of people from these countries to die in concentration camps in Siberia. Hundreds of thousands of Baltic peoples perished.

Our God, we pray to You for justice and compassion. Return the deportees to their homelands. Give them the fortitude to endure and restore to them and their countries their rights and freedom. Grant to statesmen of the world the grace and will to work for the liberation of all nations, for peace, and for integrity everywhere on earth.

God bless Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and their peoples.

God bless America. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 13, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 13, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate reported that, on June 13, 1966, he received messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, received on June 13, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of Monday, June 13, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate received, on June 13, 1966, the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed, without amendment, the following joint resolutions of the Senate:

S.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning June 13, 1966, and ending June 19, 1966, as "Gas Industry Week"; and

S.J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as "Father's Day."

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14266) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; that the House had agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEED, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROBISON, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Under authority of the order of Monday, June 13, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate, on June 14, 1966, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning June 13, 1966, and ending June 19, 1966, as "Gas Industry Week"; and

S.J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June 1966 as Father's Day."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of June 13, 1966,