

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12328. A bill relating to the prohibition of riots and incitement to riot in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12329. A bill to amend section 2(3) and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12330. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 12331. A bill to provide Federal leadership and grants to the States for developing and implementing State programs for youth camp safety standards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 12332. A bill to provide more effective control of lobbying activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12333. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to make certain metropolitan areas eligible as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 12334. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. AYRES, Mr. QUIE, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. ASHBOOK, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. COWGER, Mr. WATSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BROCK, Mr. TAFT, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. MATHIAS of California):

H.R. 12335. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to further limit political activity on the part of workers in poverty programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12336. A bill to provide for the establishment and development of the Kenilworth National Capital Park in the District of Columbia for the benefit of the people of the United States and, in particular, children; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HICKS (for himself and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 12337. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to crediting certain service of females sworn in as members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 12338. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 12339. A bill to establish an Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation and a Joint Committee of Congress on Program Analysis and Evaluation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 12340. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mrs. MAY, Mr. LLOYD, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 12345. Resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary neighborhood action crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban

dwellers in preventing riots; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON (for himself and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.J. Res. 786. Resolution to provide for the issuance of a gold medal to the widow of the late Walt Disney and for the issuance of bronze medals to the California Institute of the Arts in recognition of the distinguished public service and the outstanding contributions of Walt Disney to the United States and to the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.J. Res. 787. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POOL:

H.J. Res. 788. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to the Congress the power to establish uniform laws for the loss of nationality and citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H. Con. Res. 491. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in re the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself, Mr. BURLESON, Mr. WHITE, Mr. ICHORD, and Mr. STEED):

H. Res. 900. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact of East-West trade and assistance to nations which support aggression, directly or indirectly; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H. Res. 901. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives on the importance of continuation of U.S. operation of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

274. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the pending economic development fund bill for the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

275. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to authorization of the Mid-State project of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDARBO:

H.R. 12341. A bill for the relief of Gaetana Cefalu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12342. A bill for the relief of Teresa Carratello Cefalu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12343. A bill for the relief of Lena S. Tillman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12344. A bill for the relief of Antonio Augusto Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12345. A bill for the relief of Miss Lucia Varon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12346. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Aida Yap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 12347. A bill for the relief of Horace H. Terry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12348. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Nicosia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 12349. A bill for the relief of Christopher Nicholas Rushton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

141. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to special markers on the graves of those participating in the U.S. Constitutional Convention, 1787; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

142. Also, petition of Council of the City of Mansfield, Ohio, relative to uniform annual observance of certain national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. Also, petition of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Washington, D.C., relative to legislation prohibiting the unlawful burning, defacing, mutilating, or trampling upon the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. Also, petition of Takeo Kimura, Member, House of Representatives, Japan, relative to the Price law amendment bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us.

In the vast difficulties confronting the makers of peace in these days so full of tension, restore and strengthen and sustain our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness: for Thy Name's sake.

We seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty.

Open our eyes to simple beauty all around us, and our hearts to the loveliness men hide from us because we do not try enough to understand them.

As heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 11, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—COAST GUARD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard and the Environmental Science Services Administration which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the weekend, the President vetoed H.R. 11089, the so-called Government employees' life insurance bill.

The President has indicated that he would be most happy to sign a bill encompassing the features which he originally sent to Congress for consideration.

I would point out that under the bill passed by Congress, the life insurance benefits for Members of Congress—those which cover us—would have been raised from the present amount of \$20,000 up to \$40,000.

I would hope that the Senate and the House would seriously consider a reintroduction of the bill as proposed by the President and the passage of that bill, which I can assure them the President would be most happy to sign.

ESCALATION OF VIETNAM WAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, bombing within 10 miles or 1 minute away from China's border is a very dangerous extension of the war. It brings us that much closer to the brink of a possible confrontation with China which could be made probable through a miscalculation, an error, or otherwise.

The closer we get to China increases the possibility of such a confrontation and also enhances the chances that the internal difficulties which beset China today, and have for some months past, will be either forgotten or put aside and all factions in China will be drawn together as one. Let no one fool himself as to what a confrontation with China would mean, because it would bring about a drastic revision at home through a tax increase well beyond the 10 percent proposed. It would call for price and wage controls. It would bring about a stepped-up draft call and make mandatory a callup of the Reserves and the National Guard.

There have also been suggestions on the last day or so that the mining or quarantining of Haiphong could be something we could do with a minimum of mines and manpower. Should we undertake this highly questionable move, it would create the possibility of a confrontation with the Soviet Union. The implications of these two moves could bring about retaliatory measures in Korea, Berlin, and elsewhere. It would be well for all of us to consider the possibilities, probabilities, and implications inherent in the first tactic now underway and the second which has been suggested by high-ranking military and congressional leaders.

It is my understanding that proposals have been made by some to the effect that bombing of the north should be stepped up to get at the point of origin of men and supplies. In my judgment, it would be far more preferable to consolidate and concentrate our activities to South Vietnam and to follow through on

the Cooper formula to interdict the flow of men and materiel along the Ho Chi Minh trails at the point of penetration at the 17th parallel in Laos and Vietnam and to extend the defensive barrier along the parallel across the demilitarized zone into Laos.

It appears to me that our latest move and latest suggestions, if implemented, would only serve to stiffen Hanoi's spine, keep her further away from the conference table, and make the possibility of a negotiated peace much more difficult to achieve.

ORDER FOR SENATE TO MEET AT 11 A.M., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16—RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MONDALE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, the Senate convene at 11 a.m., and that at the conclusion of the prayer and the approval of the Journal, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [MR. MONDALE] may be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next the Committee on Foreign Relations may be authorized to meet during the Senate session on that day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the annual report on the international educational and cultural exchange program conducted during fiscal year 1966 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256, the Fulbright-Hays Act).

This report covers a period which saw the completion of two decades of international educational exchange and the laying of new foundations for its future. The groundwork done this year led eventually to the passage of the International Education Act of 1966, a milestone in our efforts to improve our citizens' knowledge of their world.

Today the United States looks ahead confidently to its relations with the rest of the world. It is a view in which there are great hopes and many hazards. Were our goals no more than materialistic, if we sought no more than power and material abundance, if we gained no more than scientific breakthroughs and mili-

tary superiorities, ours might soon become a nation spiritually deprived and psychologically estranged from much of the world around us.

But it is to people, not things—to the warmth and generosity of the American people, not to material things, that we turn in order to break the barriers of misunderstanding that forever threaten to divide us from our fellow men. The international exchange of students, teachers, scholars, and leading specialists is one of the Nation's most effective means for dispelling ignorance, prejudice, and international suspicion.

The educational and cultural exchange program is a relatively small but highly effective instrument in international relations. It enlists the participation of talented individuals who constitute a creative and influential minority in society. Henry Adams said in his "Education":

The difference is slight to the influence of an author, whether he is read by five hundred readers or by five hundred thousand; if he can select the five hundred, he reaches the five hundred thousand.

The program is not a "crash" one, but is designed, like education itself, to plant and cultivate the seed of understanding, which, having germinated and taken root, quietly flourishes.

Too often today men are tempted to think, in Emerson's phrase, that "things are in the saddle." Educational and cultural exchange reminds us that it is not on things—not on machinery and gadgetry—but on the minds and hearts of men that the human fate depends. Our educational and cultural exchange programs are person oriented. They are our American testimonial to the belief that, though mountains cannot meet, people always can.

I commend this report to the thoughtful attention of the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 14, 1967.

LAIRD, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10509) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HULL, Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. MAHON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

REPORT ON TRANSFER OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the transfer of certain research and development funds which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 57

"Whereas, the Nebraska Legislature, in 1947 unanimously approved the Nebraska Reclamation Act which permitted the formation and organization of the 550,000 acre Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District in Buffalo, Hall and Merrick Counties, to further develop proposals of the multipurpose Mid-State Project, to utilize a portion of the water of the Platte River, now flowing unused to the Gulf of Mexico; and

"Whereas, the Mid-State Project proposal will have flood control as one of its multipurpose functions and will include a chain of 23 reservoirs along the north edge of the Platte River Valley from Elm Creek on the west to Lower Prairie Creek site on the east, floodways from the valley's edge to the Platte River and numerous waterways which will provide flood protection to much of 100 miles of the district's length; and

"Whereas, the June, 1967 floods in the Central Platte River Valley caused hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of damage in the District's area which the Mid-State Project, if operative, could have prevented; and

"Whereas, had the project been built, much of the destructive June, 1967 flood waters could have been saved for beneficial use in the district's area; and

"Whereas, there is now pending before the 90th Congress, Bills in both the Senate and House of Representatives, which provide for authorization and construction of the Mid-State project by the Secretary of Interior, under Federal Reclamation Law, as a unit of the Missouri River Basin Project; and

"Whereas, legislation for this purpose has been introduced in the Congress of the United States for several sessions; and

"Whereas, this Body adopted its Resolution 11, on its twenty-seventh day, February 8, 1967; and

"Whereas, Mid-State Legislation did clear the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on June 14, 1967.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in seventy-seventh session assembled:

"1. That the Legislature memorializes the 90th Congress and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to support the proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation for the \$106 million Mid-State Project and approve during this session of Congress the above legislation for its authorization and early construction.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the Clerk of the Legislature, to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, of the 90th Congress, to Hon. Henry Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and Hon. Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and to each member from Nebraska in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"JOHN E. EVERROAD,
"President of the legislature."
"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the legislature."

Two resolutions of the Ninth Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

RESOLUTION NO. 309

"Relative to respectfully petitioning and memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon the pending Economic Development Fund bill for the territory of Guam, and in deciding on the amount of such fund, to take into consideration the local monies so far spent on behalf of that Federal obligation to transport off-island personnel to the island as set forth in the Organic Act of Guam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas, there is now pending before the appropriate committees of the United States Congress, legislation which would set up an Economic Development Fund to be used by the territory of Guam in developing its civilian economy now so exclusively dependent upon military expenditures; and

"Whereas, the need of such a fund is great, there being many possibilities for economic development in Guam which either require costly investigation or long term investment before being realized; and

"Whereas, in addition, the experience of Taiwan and Okinawa has demonstrated that when such an economic fund is set up, it serves as seed money, which germinates growth throughout the economy and is thus repaid many times over in the way of additional revenues for both the government and the people; and

"Whereas, in setting up such a fund, and in determining the appropriate amount thereof, the Congress of the United States might well bear in mind that although Section 26(b) of the Organic Act of Guam (Section 1421d(c) Title 48, U.S.C.) requires that the transportation costs of bringing off-island employees of the Government of Guam into and from the territory be borne by the United States, the Government of Guam has from the inception of civil government absorbed this expense which has so far totaled approximately Seven Million Dollars (\$7,000,000), which would therefore appear to be an appropriate and fair sum with which to set up the Economic Development Fund, representing as it does, a debt, of sorts, running from the United States to the Government of Guam; now therefore be it

"Resolved, that the Ninth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully petition and memorialize

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FLOOD, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. HULL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MAHON, Mr.

the Congress of the United States to favorably consider the pending legislation which sets up an Economic Development Fund for the territory of Guam, and in determining the amount of such fund, to consider using the amount the Government of Guam has paid to date in underwriting the off-island transportation costs that are the obligation of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the Chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the Secretary of the Interior, to Guam's Washington Representative, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly and regularly adopted on the 11th day of July 1967.

*"J. C. ARRIOLA,
"Speaker.
"F. T. RAMIREZ,
"Legislative Secretary."*

"RESOLUTION No. 314

"Relative to respectfully petitioning the Congress of the United States to exempt Guam from the operation of the U.S. coastwise shipping laws.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas, under existing maritime laws, the territory of Guam, although over six thousand miles from the west coast of the United States, is nevertheless deemed a coastal port, and, thus, is held to be subject to the coastwise shipping laws of the United States, the principal results of which application are that all cargo from Guam to the United States or from the United States to Guam must be carried in United States vessels, and that U.S. vessels in making the Guam run receive no subsidy from the United States as they do in making runs to foreign ports; and

"Whereas, since in point of geographic fact, Guam is hardly a coastal area, being much nearer foreign ports than domestic areas, and the run to Guam being much more of a lengthy and costly undertaking than a run between, say, Seattle and Vancouver, Canada, it would appear to be only reasonable and fair that Guam be removed from the operations of these laws so as to rationalize its shipping systems; and

"Whereas, such removal of Guam from the coastwise shipping laws would be advantageous both to the people of Guam and to the American shipping companies since the latter would begin receiving the subsidy for making the run to Guam, and since the former would presumably pay lower freight charges than those high charges caused by the operations of the coastwise laws, the high cost of shipping goods to Guam being one of the principle deterrent factors in developing Guam's economy; and

"Whereas, the Legislature is advised that the territory of the Virgin Islands which is only ninety miles from Florida is not within these coastwise shipping laws and as a result is able to operate a successful light industry by utilizing raw materials shipped from foreign ports in foreign vessels, and since the problems of Guam and of the Virgin Islands are in many respects similar, the Legislature is hopeful that the Congress will be able to mete out the same treatment to Guam with respect to the shipping laws as has been previously given to the Virgin Islands; now therefore be it

"Resolved, that in view of the foregoing, the Ninth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to exclude Guam from the operation of the coastwise shipping laws; and be it further

"Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption thereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Maritime Affairs, to the Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Chairman of the House Committee on Maritime Affairs, to the Secretary of Transportation, to the Guam's Washington Representative, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly and regularly adopted on the 11th day of July 1967.

*"J. C. ARRIOLA,
"Speaker.
"F. T. RAMIREZ,
"Legislative Secretary."*

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1124. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 502).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2281. A bill to exempt certain businesses whose annual volume of sales made or business done is less than \$500,000 from the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2282. A bill to incorporate the United States of America Standards Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2283. A bill for the relief of Edythe Asher Gray; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2284. A bill to allow certain service with international organizations to be considered creditable service for civil service retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2285. A bill for the relief of Gordon Shih Gum Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2286. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Panola and Shelby Counties, Tex., within the Marshall division of the eastern district for the U.S. district courts in Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2287. A bill for the relief of the town of Bremen, Ind., and

S. 2288. A bill for the relief of Donald F. MacPherson and Margaret MacPherson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2289. A bill for the relief of James Oscar Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2290. A bill to provide for additional research and training pursuant to the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 in order to solve the particular water resources problems in large river basins; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2291. A bill to provide for the continuation of certain compensation under the War Claims Act of 1948 and for an increase in the amount of such compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the above bills which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax, and to require that evidence of payment of such tax be shown on highway motor vehicles subject to tax; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF THE SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO ACHIEVEMENT OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BAKER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 155) to express the sense of the Senate concerning a means toward achieving a stable and durable peace in the Middle East, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BAKER, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN BUSINESSES FROM FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and 29 other Senators, I submit, for appropriate reference, a bill to exempt certain businesses, whose annual volume of sales made or business done is less than \$500,000, from the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

In connection with the bill, I allude to an item that appeared in the newspaper this morning. A portion of the article reads, as follows:

The National Federation of Independent Businesses claimed yesterday that more than half a million persons have lost their jobs as a result of the new Federal minimum wage.

The Federation said results of its continuous field surveys show 588,000 have lost their jobs so far as an apparent result of the \$1.40 an hour minimum wage that went into effect in February.

The Federation said its survey, covering 54,308 of the Nation's 4.7 million independent businesses, showed a 12 per cent decrease in employment since the new wage law went into effect. The Federation warned the loss of jobs is increasing.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in its entirety and that the newspaper article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The bill (S. 2281) to exempt certain businesses whose annual volume of sales made or business done is less than \$500,000 from the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2281

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3(s)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) is an enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated) or is a gasoline service establishment whose annual gross volume of sales is not less than \$250,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated)";.

(b) Section 13(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "such establishment has an annual dollar volume of sales which is less than \$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "such establishment (except a gasoline service establishment) has an annual dollar volume of sales which is less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated) or is a gasoline service establishment and has an annual dollar volume of sales which is less than \$250,000".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective thirty days following the date of enactment of this Act.

The article presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

WAGE OF \$1.40 IS BLAMED FOR DIP IN HIRING

The National Federation of Independent Business claimed yesterday that more than half a million persons have lost their jobs as a result of the new Federal minimum wage.

The Federation said results of its continuous field surveys show 588,000 have lost their jobs so far as an apparent result of the \$1.40 an hour minimum wage that went into effect in February.

The Federation said its survey, covering 54,308 of the Nation's 4.7 million independent businesses, showed a 12 per cent decrease in employment since the new wage law went into effect. The Federation warned the loss of jobs is increasing.

As a result of the new law, the Federation said, more and more small businessmen are working out methods and buying equipment that will permit them to fire their least skilled employees.

INCORPORATION OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA STANDARDS INSTITUTE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a proposal to incorporate the United States of America Standards Institute.

The purpose, as recited in the bill, is to act as the national coordinating institution for voluntary standardization in the

United States of America through which organizations concerned with standardization may cooperate in recognizing, establishing, and improving standards of the United States of America, based on a consensus of parties at interest, to the end that such standards remain dynamic; that duplication of work is minimized; that promulgation of conflicting standards may be avoided; and that individual enterprise and initiative is encouraged.

Mr. President, I doubt whether we appropriately appreciate what mechanical standardization means to this country and to our industry. I think back to the time, for example, when there were scarcely two countries among the more sophisticated countries of the world where railroad gauges were precisely the same. Therefore, a railroad car from a French railroad could not run on an American railroad and vice versa. The same thing happened as far as screw threads were concerned. When screw threads were spaced differently they could not be mixed up and there was nothing but confusion throughout industry.

Mr. President, this is one of the most important matters of which I am aware. That is the reason this organization should have a Federal charter, so that it can go forward with this highly important work. The matter will, of course, come before the Committee on the Judiciary. I trust that in due time we can expedite action on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2282) to incorporate the United States of America Standards Institute, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today that would remove an inequity in the civil service retirement system.

Since 1955, employees of the Government who have transferred to international organizations for periods of up to 3 years have been entitled to full credit for the time served for the purposes of computing their annuities.

Those who have served in international organizations before that time are not so fortunate. They are generally entitled to be credited for only one-half the period served in an international organization. Furthermore, if they were not reemployed with the Federal Government immediately after terminating their employment with the international organization, they are entitled to no credit at all.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today would remove this discrepancy. Subject to a requirement that they make a deposit calculated on the basis of the salary they received, those who have served with international organizations before 1955 will be treated in the same way as those who have served since that time.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2284) to allow certain service with international organizations to be considered creditable service for civil service retirement purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRANSFER OF PANOLA AND SHELBY COUNTIES, TEX., FROM THE TYLER DIVISION TO THE MARSHALL DIVISION OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the transfer of Panola and Shelby Counties, Tex., from the Tyler division to the Marshall division of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

The effect of this legislation would be to correct a difficulty in the present division of the district. These two counties are much closer to Marshall than to Tyler. The most direct route to Tyler for someone living in northern Panola County, for example, would take him through Marshall. This transfer of jurisdiction will result in a substantial saving of time and expense to litigants, members of the bar, and jurors. This will be an economy in the operation of the courts.

This measure has the support of the members of the bar of Harrison, Panola, and Shelby Counties, Tex., and the approval of the chief judge of the District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2286) to provide for the inclusion of Panola and Shelby Counties, Tex., within the Marshall division of the Eastern District for the U.S. District Courts in Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE RIVER BASINS RESEARCH ACT OF 1967

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for additional research and training under the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. In particular, this measure would be directed at solving water resource problems in large river basins and would authorize increased opportunities for investigation, study, and training in this important field. As our knowledge about water pollution increases and our control techniques and facilities become more complex and numerous, there is an ever increasing need for highly skilled and trained personnel which this bill would attempt to meet.

As one of those who has strongly supported the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, the Water Quality and the Water Resources Planning Acts of 1965, and the increased authori-

zation for water resource research in 1966, I am very pleased that the Federal Government has taken the lead during the last few years in encouraging the study of water quality control problems and the maintenance of desirable water standards. Congress took a momentous step forward in 1964 when it authorized substantial grants to each State for the purpose of helping to establish a water resources research institute at a college or university in that State. Although the act of 1964 provided for an additional \$1 million to be appropriated for each of the next 9 years for grants and contracts to educational institutions, State and local governments, or private institutions for research into water problems, Congress in 1966 generously raised this amount to \$5 million for the fiscal year 1967, and authorized an additional million dollars for each year until the annual total reaches \$10 million in the fiscal year 1972. I have no doubt that these expenditures will be made wisely and that from them will flow sizable benefits to the American people.

The bill I am proposing today is supplemental to and in addition to that which has already been established. It would not repeal or restrict in any way that which has already been accomplished. Rather, it would focus attention on the needs and problems of large river basins as such, assuring that in each such basin there would be established a water resource institute whose primary function would be the careful study and analysis of that particular river basin as an entity. It should be pointed out that this would not involve any duplication of facilities or services; wherever possible, the Secretary of the Interior would be directed to make necessary arrangements for the institutes which are contemplated under section 100 of the 1964 act to serve as the water resource institute for each particular large river basin. However, in case none of the institutes established under the 1964 law are able to fulfill this function, then the Secretary could enter into arrangements with other educational institutions for this purpose.

Mr. President, the need for establishing water quality standards and the increasing necessity for diligent compliance with these standards by municipalities, industrialists, and agriculturalists demands greater knowledge of a river as an organic entity. The interaction of flows into a stream channel from both the cultural and physical sources has, as yet, never been completely defined for any major river or river system. Knowledge of the interrelationship of biological, chemical, and physical components in a flowing stream could enable more complete control of water quality while utilizing the surface water resource for the maximum benefit to man.

If river basin research and training institutes are established for each large river basin, they could provide the facilities and staff necessary for study and evaluation of that river system and recommend specific measures for its control. Each river basin in this Nation presents a different pattern of land use, a

different industrial complex, a different pattern of human occupancy. Because no two rivers can be expected to respond identically to the varied landscapes through which they flow, no common pattern of controls can be expected to result in equally desirable conditions of water quality. As increasing use is made of our surface water supply, we must have knowledge which will enable the projection of river quality conditions with anticipated greater use; without such ability based upon fact, we can expect only to attempt solutions to existing problems, never to attain the position of management of the resource. The river basin research institutes proposed in the bill, through specific control programs designed for a river as an ecological unit, could provide the basis for continuing management.

Scattered throughout many river basins are numerous small communities and small industries which, individually, contribute only minor quantities of waste effluent. Collectively, however, they can have a significant role in the deterioration of the stream or river into which these effluents are poured. To many of these communities and industries, the cost of establishing control measures and treatment facilities, or even the cost of the research necessary to determine the needed facilities, would be a prohibitive financial burden. The creation of research institutes would provide the opportunity for evaluation of the conditions which exist and would encourage the adoption of control measures to protect streams from pollution.

Many industries, municipalities, and State and local governmental units desirous of establishing and maintaining adequate facilities to minimize pollution of water resources find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to locate adequately trained personnel whom they can employ for this purpose. The bill proposes that fellowship grants, administered through institutions of higher learning offering advanced degrees in the fields associated with water quality control, as well as specialized short-term training, should be authorized. If adopted, this would provide opportunities for needed research, as well as the training of personnel, and it would permit the application of practical techniques and scientific procedures to existing problems. The present and anticipated shortage of trained personnel can be alleviated only by attracting students to this field through provision of adequate facilities in a realistic training situation.

Additionally, the provision of training grants would permit local governmental units, as well as industry and agriculture, to obtain much needed in-service training to up-grade local programs of water quality control. Experts in this field have reported to me that the present demands for personnel has resulted in the employment of persons with little or very limited training for the job to be done, and the general lack of opportunity for additional training for these persons to improve their competency imposes a definite obstacle to achieving any rapid advance in obtaining better quality waters.

The river research and training insti-

tutes proposed in this bill could help provide opportunities not now sufficiently available to solve today's water quality control problems. At the same time, they would serve as primary centers for study and analysis of the interrelated water resource problems in our major river basins. For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe this approach merits serious consideration and prompt attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2290) to provide for additional research and training pursuant to the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 in order to solve the particular water resources problems in large river basins, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMPENSATION UNDER THE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the continuance of certain compensation under the War Claims Act of 1948 and for an increase in the amount of such compensation. Let me state at the outset that this bill, if adopted, would apply to a very limited number of U.S. citizens who suffered injury while they were interned by the enemy in the Far East during World War II and who have ceased to receive compensation because, with the passage of time, their payments have reached the present statutory maximum.

A number of civilians, many of whom were employees of the U.S. Government, were captured by the Japanese in the early months of World War II and interned in prison camps. During confinement, many of these individuals suffered great hardship, contracted serious diseases and incurred physical injuries. Congress recognized the contributions and sacrifices made by these people by passing the War Claims Act of 1948 and adopting basic amendments in 1954 and 1962.

The amount of compensation these civilian internees have been paid has not been large. In addition to assistance with medical and hospital costs, disability payments have been made to former civilian employees of the Government who suffered permanent injuries while in prison camps. Disability payments, which are administered by the Bureau of Employee's Compensation in the Department of Labor, under the law are determined on the assumption that the average weekly wage of the recipient was equal to \$37.50. Thus, a former employee who incurred a 50-percent disability is entitled to a monthly compensation of one-half of \$140.00, or \$70 per month.

Unfortunately, not only are payments low but also those who incurred partial disability can receive no more than a total of \$7,500 in payments under the law. The maximum limitation does not apply to those internees who have been determined to have suffered 100-percent disability. This differential treatment, coupled with the fact that the maximum

compensation for employees incurring injuries since 1946 has been greatly increased, appears to be inconsistent if not unfair. It seems to me that there is ample reason for modifying the law in order to remove completely the maximum allocation for partial disability and increasing modestly the amount of benefit these former employees may receive.

Available information indicates that no more than 5,000 persons ever sought compensation for injury or disability under section 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948. At present, approximately 200 are now receiving monetary benefits under this section, while 600 or 700 have been getting medical assistance. My bill would make it possible for these 200 former employees, many of whom have reached retirement age and suffer from various infirmities, to continue to receive assistance after their total payments have reached \$7,500. In addition, it would permit a number of others whose payments expired some time in the past because of this limit, to be entitled to future payments. Let me point out that the bill would not retroactively reimburse these persons for any period of time during which they have not been eligible for payments. To the contrary, compensation payments would not be resumed until at least 1 month after this bill is enacted.

In addition to removing the \$7,500 maximum limitation, the bill would increase the monthly disability payments to 125 percent of the amount otherwise provided under the law. In view of the marked rise during the last two decades in the cost of living and in both governmental and private compensation programs, an increase of one-fourth in these benefits seems to be both modest and equitable. Note that under the new schedule a person with a 50-percent disability determination would receive only \$17.50 per month additional payment beyond the present level, or a total monthly payment of \$87.50.

Even though this measure would affect the welfare of a comparatively small number of people, to each individual involved it could mean much in the remaining years of life. Many of these employees were middle aged at the time of their imprisonment and now are approaching or have entered retirement. Because of their disabilities, few have been able to carry on their former type of employment on a regular, full-time basis. Let me single out one example which has come to my attention as an illustration of the need which exists. The particular person I have in mind was a civilian employee of the Navy in the Philippines at the time of his capture and internment by the Japanese. He sustained multiple injuries for which he was declared later to be eligible for compensation, and in addition has received medical care at Government expense. Because of an injury to his spine and other related illnesses, he has been able to work only in limited occupations and has been hospitalized on numerous occasions. Now at age 76, unable to work, and having several years ago reached the maximum limit of \$7,500 in compensation which the

law provides, he is clearly in need of financial assistance.

Mr. President, it is time that this situation be rectified. The present maximum limitation on total payments for those who were partially disabled should be removed and the amount of compensation should be increased to a realistic figure. It is my impression that failure to change the act previously has been partly due to oversight and to the small number of persons directly involved. Apparently those who are charged with administering this act would not be opposed to the type of amendment I am proposing. Because most of the former Government employees covered by the act are near or have attained retirement age, and their number is growing less with each passing year, I urge that this measure be given prompt and sympathetic consideration by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2291) to provide for the continuance of certain compensation under the War Claims Act of 1948 and for an increase in the amount of such compensation, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A STABLE AND DURABLE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have today submitted a resolution which will provide a mechanism for achieving a stable and durable peace in the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 155

Whereas the security and national interests of the United States require that there be a stable and durable peace in the Middle East; and

Whereas the greatest bar to a long-term settlement of the differences between the Arab and Israeli people is the chronic shortage of fresh water, useful work, and an adequate food supply; and

Whereas the United States now has available the technology and the resources to alleviate these shortages and to provide a base for peaceful cooperation between the countries involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the prompt design, construction, and operation of nuclear desalting plants will provide large quantities of fresh water to both Arab and Israeli territories and, thereby, will result in—

- (1) new jobs for the many refugees;
- (2) an enormous increase in the agricultural productivity of existing wastelands;
- (3) a broad base for cooperation between the Israeli and Arab Governments; and
- (4) a further demonstration of the United States efforts to find peaceful solutions to areas of conflict; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested

to pursue these objectives, as reflecting the sense of the Senate, within and outside the United Nations and with all nations similarly minded, as being in the highest national interest of the United States.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in my opinion, the greatest bar to a long-term settlement of the differences between the Arab and Israel people is the chronic shortage of fresh water, useful work, and an adequate food supply. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, have proposed an imaginative solution to these problems and I believe the Senate should promptly indicate its support for the plan. The plan envisages the construction of three very large nuclear desalting plants which will provide tremendous quantities of fresh water to the arid lands of the Middle East.

The abundant supply of water will, of course, result in an enormous increase in agricultural productivity and in many jobs for the refugees now wandering aimlessly in the desert areas. The Eisenhower plan further provides a broad base for cooperation between the Israel and Arab Governments and would be a tangible demonstration of the U.S. efforts to find peaceful solutions to areas of conflict. Support for this plan was also voiced by the Republican coordinating committee when, on July 24, 1967, it recommended:

The United States should propose a broad-scale development plan for all Middle Eastern states which agree to live peacefully with their neighbors.

The Republican Party would not willingly see the rehabilitation of the Middle East become a political issue in the United States. Our country's efforts to bring peace to that war-torn region should continue to be bipartisan. In this spirit we hope for vigorous Administration and widespread public support for the bold and imaginative Eisenhower Plan to bring water, work and food to the Middle East.

This constructive proposal would provide huge atomic plants to desalt sea water, the first of which would produce as much fresh water as the entire Jordan River system. This in turn would irrigate desert lands to support the Arab refugees and bring yearned for prosperity to both Arab and Israeli territories.

The Eisenhower Plan is sufficiently far-reaching to encompass all Middle Eastern states, and all should be invited to adhere. However, even if some should decline, the Plan could be initiated pending their later cooperation. The construction of the first plant would require the agreement of only two or three countries, such as Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, or Lebanon. Once the immense benefits of the vast increase in water supplies become evident for all to see, it would be difficult for any Middle Eastern leader to deny his people the opportunity to share in the prosperity being created.

Widespread bipartisan support for the plan has also appeared in a number of leading newspapers and periodicals. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials published in the New York Times and the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 23, 1967]

EISENHOWER'S MIDEAST PLAN

The fighting has been over for six weeks in the Middle East but the first steps have yet to be taken toward peace. The debates of the emergency General Assembly have, as anticipated, proved futile. While the Security Council has sent United Nations observers to Suez, war has merely been replaced by an armed truce that Soviet weapons shipments could convert into another round of combat. It is essential now that diplomacy be deployed in more constructive work than the posturing, vituperation and propaganda of this Assembly session called at Moscow's insistence.

The elements of a settlement are known: Israeli troop withdrawals; termination of Arab belligerency and recognition of Israel's right to live; resettlement of Arab refugees by both sides; free navigation in Aqaba and Suez; agreed borders; special status for the Old City of Jerusalem or at least its religious shrines; fair division of water; regional economic development; demilitarized zones; a U.N. presence; pledges of nonuse of force, including guerrilla raids; limitation of arms deliveries.

The question is how to begin. Which of these elements, put in place, can lay the foundation for the others in a stable structure?

An imaginative new approach is urgently needed. It could lie in an audacious attack on the two most recalcitrant elements in the twenty-year Arab-Israeli conflict—water and refugees. Former President Eisenhower is sponsoring such a plan, as C. L. Sulzberger's columns reported last week. It is a plan so daring in its conception and so huge in size that it could conceivably capture the imagination of many who now are too absorbed in nursing their hatreds to be distracted by smaller proposals. Mr. Eisenhower's idea which has been worked out in some detail by Admiral Lewis Strauss, dwarfs all previous development plans, including the Johnston Plan of his own Administration which called for sharing the remaining unused water of the Jordan River. It is four times the size of a similar project suggested in London last month by Baron Edmund de Rothschild.

Mr. Eisenhower would provide the Mideast with three gigantic atomic plants to desalinate sea water, the first of which would produce as much fresh water as the combined flow of the whole Jordan River and all its tributaries. The three plants together would be the equivalent of two-and-a-half Jordan Rivers. They could irrigate vast desert regions and bring into bloom a new California in the Middle East, large enough to resettle all the Arab refugees and, with industry stimulated by cheap atomic power, to raise living standards generally in the Arab world.

The economic feasibility of atomic water-desalting in this area already has been favorably evaluated by Israel. Construction of a first plant, far smaller than those projected in the new plan, has been shown to be economic if credit can be obtained at 3 1/4 percent interest. Larger plants would produce water more cheaply. Some experts believe that a chartered corporation like Comsat that would raise public and private funds internationally could not only finance the plants—the total cost would be less than one year's expenditure on the moon program—but pay a return to investors.

Unlike previous development plans, which depended on Arab-Israeli agreement, this one obviously could go forward in one or two countries at a time—starting with Israel and Jordan perhaps, or Israel, Jordan and Egypt. Once under way, it would be difficult for other countries to stay out. If there are political objections to American plants, French, British or Russian desalting plants could be contracted for.

The aim would be to change the atmosphere in the Middle East. An attempt would be made to turn the focus of thoughts from the hatred and feuds of the past to the opportunities of the future. To fight over buckets of water and strips of desert should begin to seem ridiculous when whole rivers and miles of fertile fields can be obtained more easily. If that day of wisdom can be reached, border problems and other questions should prove easier to negotiate.

[From the Washington Star]

WATER FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

A plan to enhance the regional economic development of the Middle East by means of water desalting plants is now on President Johnson's desk. The basic idea is constructive and worthy. Indeed, at a time when arms are again pouring into the Arab lands, it looks like one of the few positive steps that might be taken toward peace in the area.

The author of the plan is Lewis L. Strauss, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. President Eisenhower has enthusiastically forwarded the blueprint to the White House. The program calls for constructing three huge nuclear desalination plants, capable of producing rivers of fresh water. One would be on the Mediterranean coast of Israel, another in the Gaza Strip, and a third in Jordan on the Gulf of Aqaba. Much of the output of these plants would be used by resettled refugees.

Clean, sweet water is a magical element in the Middle East. The Israelis already have shown what miracles can be performed with it by irrigating citrus and other crops in the desert. And both Strauss and Eisenhower think water may be the universal solvent to wash away ancient ethnic hatreds in that region.

It will take an act of political statesmanship on President Johnson's part to endorse this plan. Admiral Strauss at one time was cordially disliked in the Senate, which refused to confirm him as Secretary of Commerce in 1959. Johnson was among those voting against the appointment.

And although Eisenhower's interest in Middle Eastern water problems goes back more than a decade, President Johnson also has been active in this area, pushing ahead with studies on a U.S.-Israeli nuclear desalination project on the Mediterranean much like one of those Strauss proposed.

There are reasons to hope that the Arabs will listen to talk about water. Both Israel and five Arab nations that had wrangled for years over the Jordan's waters have been represented at international conferences here on desalination. Just the other day, Egypt's President Nasser, striking a new note of moderation, said he would be agreeable to talks with the United States, presumably to re-establish diplomatic relations. If he will talk about this, perhaps the door will remain ajar for discussion of water too.

The plan—whether one gives it a Strauss or Johnson label—is a fresh note of hope. It deserves a thorough public airing and bipartisan support.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 259

Mr. MILLER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 260

Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. TOWER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. STENNIS) pro-

posed amendments to Senate bill 1872, *supra*, which were ordered to be printed.

ELECTIONS IN SAIGON

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times contains some interesting comments by Mr. James P. Brown, a member of the editorial board of the New York Times, concerning the coming elections in Saigon.

In his article, Mr. Brown presents a brief summary of the events of the past 18 months relating to the elections and the problems our Government faces in its announced objective of assisting the South Vietnamese people achieve self-determination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRoubled OUTLOOK FOR SAIGON'S ELECTIONS

(By James P. Brown)

Eighteen months ago at Honolulu, the President of the United States and the military rulers of South Vietnam mutually pledged to hold free elections that would offer the people of South Vietnam a government of their own choosing.

From the United States point of view, such elections were a moral and practical necessity. They were needed to introduce in Saigon a popular government that would justify to an increasingly skeptical world the proclaimed American objective of self-determination for the South Vietnamese people. They were also needed to install a Saigon government capable of rallying support throughout the countryside for the faltering war and pacification efforts.

Returning from Honolulu, Premier Ky made no move to set the Constitution-building process in motion. He talked vaguely of elections toward the end of 1967. But, bolstered by the endorsement he had received from President Johnson, the Premier moved to strengthen his dictatorial grasp on the Saigon Government.

However, he misjudged the temper of the South Vietnamese people—and apparently of some of his own military associates as well. When the Premier abruptly dismissed the popular commander of the First Corps Area, demonstrations broke out in the northern cities of Hue and Danang, demanding an end to military rule. In the face of mounting protest, which soon spread to Saigon, Ky hastily promised early elections and a speedy return to civilian rule.

Weeks later, however, after demonstrators had been suppressed in a bold show of force, Ky withdrew many of his promises. He was still committed irrevocably to elections; but he moved skillfully to devise an electoral process that would maximize the influence of the junta, minimize the impact of the Buddhists and insure continuing military rule for at least another year.

DOUBTS ABOUT JUNTA

Two months before the September 1966 voting for a Constituent Assembly, a Times correspondent reported from Saigon: "The generals appear to regard the election and Constitution-making process as largely a method to legitimize their own power and not as steps toward an eventual civilian government."

The election itself was something less than a model as a free expression of popular will. Not only Communists, but "pro-Communists" and "neutralists" were barred from the ballot, categories broad enough to permit the exclusion of almost anyone of

whom the regime disapproved. There were widespread reports of government pressure to turn out a big vote, and to elect government sponsored candidates.

Within these limitations, however, the balloting was conducted with surprising efficiency and without many of the more flagrant abuses that had been customary in previous Vietnamese elections. Although the 117-man Assembly that was chosen was drawn largely from the old, privileged urban elite dominant since the last days of the French, its members began to display signs of independence.

This democratic spirit was soon tempered, however, by pressures from the junta. It obtained, in the end, essentially the kind of Constitution it wanted, though not without some compromise.

Having successfully engineered the writing of a Constitution that could become the vehicle for continued, strong military rule—as in Korea—and having promoted an election law weighted heavily in their favor, the military leaders might have reasonably been expected to play the election game according to rules they had largely determined. This has not been the case.

In the past few months, the military men have violated rules on campaigning and censorship. They have obliged the Assembly to eliminate two serious rivals. They have harassed their civilian opponents.

EMBASSY SILENCE

And in an ultimate show of contempt for the whole electoral process, they have passed the word—now retracted under Washington pressure—that no matter who wins they intend to go right on setting national policy through a “military affairs committee.”

In the fact of these indignities, the American Embassy in Saigon has maintained a resounding silence. Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy offers unpersuasive denials that anything is seriously amiss. And other high officials in Washington continue to boast of “democratic” development in Vietnam in superlatives that make the realities of Saigon all the more appalling. Unless Saigon and Washington move much more resolutely to salvage their Honolulu pledge, the turn will be downward toward disaster. It is late, but not too late.

U.S. BOMBING NEAR THE CHINESE BORDER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished majority leader commented on the bombing of a bridge in North Vietnam near the Communist Chinese border, a 1 minute's flight from the border. The bombing of this target and targets always nearer the center of Hanoi definitely represents a change in policy by our Government. Many including myself had hoped that the President and the administration would adopt another type of policy, the cessation of bombing in North Vietnam to seek negotiation rather than one of escalation of bombing activities.

I voice the hope that, if not before the elections have been held, then after the elections have been held in South Vietnam, the administration will test the course toward negotiation, one that many have suggested and the one which I have emphasized in many speeches, the cessation of bombing without conditions.

Mr. President, there has been a growing chorus in the Congress for intensified bombing, but I do not believe it represents any additional support for bombing. Those who advocate this course, have

done so for some time, and now, perhaps, speak with a louder voice. I would point out, however, that the proposal I have made for an unconditional cessation of bombing, has received support from Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, some of whom heretofore had supported intensified bombing. Many agree that cessation would test the willingness of North Vietnam to enter negotiations. I hope the administration will make a decision—if not before the election, after the election—to cease the bombing unconditionally to determine if we can find a way toward negotiation and settlement of the war.

INCREDIBLY RECKLESS BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, within the last 2 days our warplanes have bombed railroads, bridges, and buildings in North Vietnam so far to the north of Hanoi that the targets bombed, evidently on order of President Johnson, are within 10 miles of the border of Communist China. This is an incredibly reckless action and in addition, a stupid one.

Then, over the weekend here at home we observed the spectacle of Adm. Ulysses Grant Sharp, commanding our fleet in the Pacific deviating from his duties and appearing on television advocating greater escalation of our involvement in Vietnam and bombing of more targets in North Vietnam, including Haiphong Harbor.

Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of our Army, also appeared on television and insisted that the South Vietnamese presidential elections to be held September 3 will be honest. He denied that the Saigon regime's military junta of 10 generals, who overcame the duly elected civilian government of South Vietnam by a military coup, have by their actions turned the coming elections into a farce and a fraud.

Here we have a spectacle of a top admiral and the Chief of Staff of the Army uttering policy statements, stepping out of their roles as Army and naval officers. With a tremendous war effort such as we are making with more than one-half million fighting men waging war in Southeast Asia, obviously professional officers of our Armed Forces, who would ordinarily have been retired following 20 or 30 years of active duty as colonels in the Army or captains in the Navy, become generals and admirals. Many hundreds of them now confidently aspire to, and achieve, promotions to be generals and admirals before retiring from the armed services. This is the unfortunate end result of increasing the number of our Armed Forces to well over 3 million, fighting an American war, and permitting the generals and admirals in the Pentagon to have this Nation police the entire world and to play an increasingly large role in formulating national policy.

Mr. President, as an example of that situation, I refer to the sending of three of our airplanes into the Congo to give logistic support to President Mobutu of the Congo; and sending those planes there without informing the Congress.

General Johnson, in his television remarks, said he previously had doubts regarding the coming election and wondered whether it would be an honest election. So, he said he raised the issue earlier this week with Gen. Cao Van Vien, South Vietnam's Chief of the Joint General Staff, and General Vien “assured me that there would be honest elections.” General Johnson added, “and I believe him. He is a straightforward man.”

Vietnam over thousands of years has been one nation. Furthermore, the Geneva agreement of 1954 stated:

The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

This is a clear statement that this is a demarcation line, or zone, within a country and very clearly there is no “aggression” from the north. Very definitely this is a civil war in Vietnam. Furthermore, General Westmoreland has stated that the bulk of the VC fighting us in South Vietnam were born and reared in the Mekong Delta. Gen. Richard Stillwell, his second in command, stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting against us in the Mekong Delta which is south of Saigon were born and reared in that area.

It is unfortunate that we tolerate generals and admirals speaking out publicly on matters of foreign policy. It would be well if President Johnson would recall the fact that when Prime Minister Churchill was in this country during World War II and it was suggested to him by President Franklin D. Roosevelt that the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of Great Britain, who accompanied him, should be invited to address a joint session of the U.S. Congress, the Prime Minister responded immediately and vigorously:

His Majesty's government speaks through me, its First Minister, not through some general.

REASONS FOR A RESIGNATION FROM U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the end of my remarks a statement of resignation from the U.S. Military Academy submitted by a young citizen of my State whom I had the honor to nominate as a cadet. The statement sets forth clearly, thoughtfully, and without recrimination the cadet's reasons for resigning. I believe that it is of interest, first because it tells something about the way in which our professional officers are trained, but, more important, because it is a statement of the essentially civilian values of our democratic society. It seems clear that this young man has resigned from the Military Academy not for lack of respect for the Academy and the U.S. Army but because of a positive preference for freedom of thought and freedom of action, values which inevitably are circumscribed in the Armed Forces.

Although I fully respect this cadet's reasons for resigning from the Military Academy, I believe that he probably would have made a good officer. I cer-

tainly have no regret for having nominated him.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CORPS OF CADETS,
West Point, N.Y., February 18, 1967.

Subject Resignation.

To Tactical Officer, Company A, 2nd Regiment U.S. Corps of Cadets, West Point, N.Y.

1. I hereby tender my resignation as a cadet, and request that it be accepted to take effect immediately.

2. My reasons for resigning are as follows:

a. After having completed two years of study here at the Military Academy, I have decided that I no longer desire to remain here as a cadet, nor do I desire a Regular Army commission and a career in the Army. This is obviously a change from my earlier choice, and my decision to resign has been arrived at after a prolonged and thorough consideration of all the possible ramifications. I have been contemplating such a decision for over a year, and I have done everything possible to obtain objective appraisal and independent advice from various parties. It has been a difficult decision, but I feel it is one that I must make. I believe I have had sufficient experience as a cadet and a former Army dependent to make such a decision; I believe that I understand what is demanded of me as a cadet and, later, as an officer, and this, coupled with my changing values and goals, has led me to the conclusion that I cannot nor will not fulfill the requirements for a successful career in the Army. Since the deadline for such a decision is rapidly approaching (due to directives from the Department of Army), and I can see no reason to embark upon an undesired career only to change careers later in life, I have made the final decision. There are a great number of factors which have caused me to reject my early desires for such a career. Some of these factors lie within in the Academy and the Army, while others are purely personal in nature.

b. I have found through my training and contact with the military establishment, limited though that training and contact may be, that I do not fit well into the system. I have found that the tasks encountered by a junior officer are to me, at best, tolerable and, at worst, quite undesirable. Some men may derive great personal satisfaction in leading a platoon or company of enlisted men through the rigors of combat or combat training—I do not. I derive no personal satisfaction from the strict orderliness of the military establishment, nor in a supreme devotion to duty, when such duty is merely to execute without question the wishes and orders of superior officers in a pyramidal bureaucracy. I derive no personal satisfaction in the prospect of being sent by my government to distant parts of the world to act as an instrument of military diplomacy. I find no satisfaction in a system in which I am given a thorough and broad education, and then required to adhere to a system of strict obedience to orders and formula. I do not mean to imply that an officer's work is not difficult or challenging—the opposite is quite true. However, the work and challenge is all well delineated within the system, with little room allowed for pursuit of objectives in new and unique ways.

c. Since becoming a cadet, I have been greatly disillusioned by what I have found at the Military Academy. Much of the fault for this lies with me, since it seems I was not sufficiently aware of what I was to encounter. Nevertheless, I believe fault also lies with the Academy, in that the Academy did not fully outline what it would demand of me as a potential cadet. I have found a number of practices here at the Academy that run counter to my personal convictions and de-

sires, so much so that they have entered very heavily into my decision. Lest I leave the impression that I am dealing only with vague generalities, I will list a number of specifics. I have found intolerable the tremendous amount of subjugation and regimentation that the Corps of Cadets, and I as a member, has been subjected to. For much of it I can see no purpose, other than perhaps such ambiguities as "discipline" and "training". For instance, I am required to attend a weekly Christian religious service; the ideal of individual freedom to worship or not to worship has been removed. I am confined to my room every evening for a "study period", except on Saturdays, when I am permitted to leave the barracks complex so long as I account for my absence on an absence card in my room. I am confined well within the limits of the post, except during leave periods (for a sophomore, leaves are normally granted at Christmas, summer, and on one weekend each semester). Furthermore, all cadets are continually subjected to punishment for a myriad of offenses, all at the discretion of superior officers. I will now list a number of such cases, not for humor, but to illustrate the excessive regimentation encountered here. A number of cadets in my company have been punished for not covering themselves with sheets when sleeping. Cadets are continually punished for "public display of affections", such as holding a girl's hand at a dance. I myself was punished rather severely for an offense for which I was exonerated by a board of three officers. (It was explained to me by an officer that the punishment was necessary to "serve as an example".) A number of cadets have been punished for sleeping during evening study periods. Others have been punished because their dates wore skirts with hemlines too far above the knees, in the judgment of an officer. I could continue, but the point is made.

In every respect, a cadet is completely regulated and regimented. All of his activities are supervised by superiors, much as they are in the rest of the Service. However, there are striking differences. The military indoctrination here permeates every activity—from recreation to religion to academics. The undergraduate education is administered almost solely by officers—all well educated but also continually cognizant of the need to discipline and regiment the student body. Every course is geared to its military application. To develop aggressive combat leaders, every cadet is pitted against his colleagues in a never ending competition. Grades and class rank are conspicuously posted, intramural athletics are required for all, and military training is put on a competitive basis. This is perhaps good, but it is carried even farther and its value and merit then becomes questionable. For instance, all cadets are periodically required to pass judgment on all their classmates and subordinates within their company as to these cadets' military aptitude. The Honor Code requires every cadet not only to personally adhere to it, but to ensure that all other cadets do so. It is a grand system in which every officer monitors the cadets, and every cadet is required to monitor his colleagues. The result is an efficiently self-policed system of rules and regulations, in which no deviation from the prescribed path can go unpunished, in one way or another. Each cadet is pitted against every other cadet in the struggle to succeed. If a cadet follows all the rules, he runs the risk of alienating himself from his contemporaries, whereas failure to follow all the rules can only result in official chastisement.

d. I would be hasty to make a decision to resign without examining what a career as an officer has to offer, and how well I would fit such a career. Certainly much of the restriction, subjugation, and regimentation will be alleviated upon graduation. However, can one logically believe that the system of in-

doctrination here at the Academy is not a preparation for a career that embodies many of the same qualities? I do not believe so. No one can deny that the Army is a strictly ordered and regimented organization, far more so than most other professional organizations. It is precisely this strict adherence to doctrine that I find personally objectionable. I do not believe that I can perform to the best of my abilities under a system that can tolerate no deviation from a rigidly prescribed pattern.

e. As a young adult male, I am obligated to render military service to my country. It is my intention to do so if called upon. However, there is a great degree of difference between voluntarily choosing a military career, and serving a legally required obligation. So long as the choice is mine to make freely, I can only choose a civilian occupation.

f. I must emphasize that it is not the purpose of this letter to criticize, condemn, or pass judgment upon the Military Academy or the Army. In the first place, I am not qualified to do so. Secondly, the Academy has proven over the years that it is quite capable of fulfilling its mission—that is, capable of producing superior officers. The point in question is whether or not I desire the Academy to mold me into such an officer. Just as some people are not psychologically prepared to become doctors or lawyers, others are not so prepared to become career officers. This, of course, casts no doubts upon the merits of these professions. I am simply saying that I am not the type of person who could or would best serve the Army from a professional point of view. I feel it is both in the Army's and my own best interests that I resign now, and begin the pursuit of another profession.

3. Since the date of my entrance, my treatment as a cadet has been without discrimination and similar to that given all my classmates.

4. I am 20 years of age. My parents' consent to my resignation is attached hereto.

5. I understand that upon acceptance of my resignation I will be transferred to the Army Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade and, that I may be ordered to active duty for not more than four years.

6. I agree to liquidate any indebtedness to the Treasurer, U.S. Military Academy, as soon as possible after my account is settled and final statement rendered.

7. The provisions of paragraph 35d, AR 601-100 have been brought to my attention. I am aware of the fact that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person who was a cadet at the United States Military, Naval, or Air Force Academies may be originally appointed in a commissioned grade in the Regular Army before the date on which his classmates at that Academy are graduated and appointed as officers. In addition, no person who was a cadet at, but did not graduate from, an Academy may be credited, upon appointment as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army, with longer service than that credited to any member of his class at that Academy whose service in the Army has been continuous since graduation.

READERS BITE ON TONGUE-IN-CHEEK ARTICLE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a column by Russell Baker, in the New York Times of August 10, 1967, apparently has misled some readers. With tongue-in-cheek, Mr. Baker alleges that H. Rap Brown is an unknown outside agitator on the payroll of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that Stokely Carmichael was invented 3 years ago by my committee. Farfetched as this attempt at humor is, it must be made clear that these in-

dividuals are not now, nor have they ever been, on the payroll of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1967]
RAP BROWN, A CONGRESSMAN'S FRIEND IN NEED

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, August 9.—Many persons have been infuriated this summer by the demagogic virtuosity of H. Rap Brown, but very few know "Brown's" true identity. His real name is John Green and he is an undercover outside agitator on the payroll of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

His assignment is to help Congress find inexpensive solutions to the nation's racial problem. When racial animosity threatens to erupt at a given location, Green—or "Rap Brown," to use his undercover name—hurries to the scene, delivers inflammatory harangues and in other unsavory ways seeks to make himself highly visible.

HOW IT'S DONE

In this way, Brown helps Congress to save billions. A Senate aide who insists on anonymity explains.

"If riots break out, Congress naturally has to investigate the cause and produce solutions to eliminate it. Some of these solutions can get pretty expensive. If you can discover that the riots are caused by outside agitators, however, you can let the taxpayer off cheap with a bill to provide prison accommodations for any agitators caught crossing state lines."

Thus, as an undercover outside agitator, Green performs an important financial service for the "white power structure" for which, in his identity as "Brown," he is forced to profess violent dictate.

LAUNCHED IN COMMITTEE

The idea for a Congressional corps of undercover outside agitators originated three years ago when the Appropriations Committee invented "Stokely Carmichael."

"Carmichael"—his real name is Peter Mulligan—was an ambitious young lawyer with a theatrical taste for rhetoric and undercover work which was not satisfied by the humdrum of his chores on the Senate staff.

At that time the civil-rights movement had begun to generate such popularity that Congress foresaw it might soon be required to support public promises with large outlays of cash.

To forestall this possibility—after all, the United States could rebuild its cities or it could unbuild Vietnam, but it could scarcely be expected to do both without affecting the economy—Mulligan was sent forth as "Stokely Carmichael" to reduce public support for the civil-rights movement.

It is said that "Black Power!", his slogan which so successfully cooled the egitarian ardor of white liberals, was actually the inspiration of Senator Eastland of Mississippi. In any case, it helped Congress avoid some rather heavy expenditures, and incidentally generated a good deal of New York sympathy for the Mississippi way of life.

When Mulligan tired of the thankless role of undercover outside agitator and expressed a yearning to see that world, he was taken on by the C.I.A., with the stipulation that he maintain his "Carmichael" cover. He was last heard from in Cuba.

Congressmen are naturally reluctant to say how many other undercover outside agitators they have in the field, ready to provide them with quick low-budget solutions should social breakdown continue. And, of course, as more sensitive Congressmen remind us, the

use of undercover agitators is not dictated solely by stinginess.

"The fact is," one such Congressman explained, "some problems are so difficult that we can't do much about them, no matter how much we have to spend. Still, the public expects us to come up with answers. As long as we have a few 'Rap Browns' working for us we can be certain of having an answer when the public wants it."

TO CREATE AN ILLUSION

The Congressman's need to create the illusion of being at grips with great issues which are, in fact, beyond him extends to fields other than race. It maintains a large cadre of undercover peace agitators, for example.

These are the agents who conducted the now infamous flag burnings this year for the House of Representatives, which was then sorely frustrated by its inability to come to grips with the Vietnam issue.

With the speed of a Warner Brothers cavalry, the House galloped to defense of the flag by voting to imprison its desecrators. Thus its undercover agitators help it to deal with crisis abroad and at home, and "Rap Browns" save the day.

RELIEF OF CONGESTION AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

MR. SPONG. Mr. President, last week I called attention to an editorial published in the Washington Post regarding the current efforts by the Civil Aeronautics Board to relieve congestion at National Airport.

Today the Post commented editorially on that subject again. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Dulles, Not National," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES, NOT NATIONAL

The proposal put forward by Trans-World Airlines for reducing the congestion at National Airport is one that the CAB should explore in depth. TWA suggests that each airline be required to assign to Dulles or Friendship 25 per cent of its flights involving cities less than 225 miles away, 50 per cent of the flights of 225 to 650 miles, 66 2/3 per cent of flights of 650 to 900 miles, and all flights of more than 900 miles.

The idea has the advantage of forcing from National some of the feeder traffic from small cities, particularly in the South, as well as some of the longer flights. It also has the advantage of mollifying some Congressmen who are more worried about retaining the use of National for themselves and their constituents than they are about solving the problems of congestion, noise and pollution that National creates.

But the proposal is only a temporary solution. The growth of air traffic is so great that, although TWA's formula would move 22 per cent of the present operations out of National, the airport would be just as crowded in less than three years as it is now. In that time, TWA assumes, National will be rebuilt so it can handle more passengers.

The details of the plan, unfortunately, are designed to appeal primarily to the Congressmen who have complained the most. For example, it would move out of National none of the nonstop flights serving Atlanta and only about a third of those serving Chicago while moving about half of those to and from Boston. The complaining Congressmen, of course, are those who fly regularly from Chicago and Atlanta.

The simple fact is that Dulles, not National, ought to be this city's major airport. It will become that in time. Its passenger

traffic was up almost 27 per cent in the first six months of this year while National's was up 14 per cent.

The CAB can go ahead and take the steps needed to shift the emphasis from National to Dulles. It can use the formula TWA proposes, reduce the mileage zones, eliminate more longer flights into National, and establish a permanent pattern of air traffic. It will have to do that sometime; it ought to do it now.

JUDGE HOOKS ATTACKS VIOLENCE

MR. BAKER. Mr. President, I think that most Americans and Tennesseans are acutely aware that the Rap Browns and Stokely Carmichael speak only for themselves and not for Negroes or whites.

However, Judge Ben L. Hooks, of Memphis, judge of Shelby County criminal court, division IV, and incidentally himself a Negro, recently made a speech in Knoxville pointing out that black power, in its construction meaning, does not mean racism and destruction. Rather—

It calls for the Negroes to help clean up undesirable conditions, take advantage of all educational opportunities, save their money, establish financial institutions.

I congratulate Judge Hooks for this excellent talk, and I commend him for his good judgment.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Knoxville Journal of August 10, recording his talk, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO JUDGE ASSAULTS RIOTS, "BLACK POWER"

Denouncing violence and race riots as "something evil," a Negro jurist from Memphis has told a Knoxville audience that, regardless of how wrong the riots are, they should make Negroes and white people more aware of the needs of the underprivileged.

Judge B. L. Hooks, judge of Shelby County Criminal Court, Division IV, made the remarks at a banquet of the M. W. Prince Hall Grand Lodge F&AM, part of the statewide Negro Masonic body's 97th annual convention being held here this week.

The black power concept as advanced by Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown and others was assailed by Judge Hooks. "If black power means disobeying and denouncing the laws of the country, violence, destruction of homes and businesses, such as we've seen in Detroit, Milwaukee and other cities, then I'm against it," he declared.

"Black power, in its constructive meaning, calls for the Negroes to help clean up undesirable conditions, take advantage of all educational opportunities, save their money, establish financial institutions," he said.

"It means Negroes are to have their votes counted in all elections, whether we vote together with the white people or in a block," he said.

"These riots may be a call to all of us, white and Negro, and especially to the middle and upper class Negro, to work more diligently with those who are on the bottom economically that their plight may be eased," Judge Hooks said.

"Many times," he said, "God has used people who did not own him or confess him as he used the Assyrians, Babylonians and Chaldeans, to chastise his own people when they have strayed. So the question may very well be not why men did this but why did God permit it?"

A Memphis native, Judge Hooks received his law degree from DePaul University, Chicago, and has served as a minister, businessman and practicing lawyer. He was once assistant public defender for indigent defendants in criminal court.

The judge said the hate philosophies of Carmichael, Brown and others are frequently spread by communications media attempting to report the facts.

"Stories of what these people say frequently give the illusion of a larger following than they have," he said, adding that greater coverage should be given to the more moderate Negroes who are more representative.

But he added: "I don't think anybody is really speaking for the black people on the bottom. That's our big challenge: to reach them, communicate with them and see if we cannot translate their frustration into something real without having to use violence, which is something evil."

CONGRESS IS WRONGFULLY MALIGNED

MR. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Congress has been maligned and held up to public scorn by people who seem to believe that Members of the House and the Senate are somehow responsible for the rioting we have seen taking place in many of our cities this summer.

This line of reasoning is that Congress has neither done enough, spent enough, nor been sympathetic enough to the needs of citizens in urban areas. Only yesterday, Congress was portrayed in an editorial cartoon as some dark, evil thing, stirring up some kind of witch's brew, while cities burned in the background.

I, for one, Mr. President, am fed up with charges that Congress has been derelict in its duties and unmindful of the plight of the poor, ill-housed, and uneducated. This abuse is an insult to every Member of the Senate and the House.

The record of this Congress, of the 89th Congress—which did more and spent more than any other in the history of our Republic—and of all preceding Congresses speaks the truth. Billions upon billions have been poured into our cities and States in an effort to reduce unemployment, provide education and job training, and in general to alleviate poverty in every practical way.

Recently in the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee noted that the Federal Government plans to spend \$25.6 billion in the current fiscal year in programs designed to help the poor. At the same time, we have endeavored to wage a \$2-billion-a-month war in Vietnam. Consequently, the national economy is strained virtually beyond endurance, and we are now asked to put an even greater burden upon the hard-working taxpayers of this country.

Many of these programs have been worthwhile, although sometimes their administration has left something to be desired. And no doubt they will be continued and expanded, as far as we are able under present budgetary restriction, because the Congress is sympathetic to the Nation's poor. Every determined effort to provide opportunity for economic advancement will be made. It is the duty of our Government and the Congress to

provide opportunity for our citizens. Then it is up to the individual to provide the qualities that the Government cannot supply, and that is personal initiative and a willingness to work.

All these programs and all these billions of dollars cannot make everyone healthy, wealthy, and wise, neither can we alleviate poverty by the stroke of a pen or by creating another extension of the already vast Federal bureaucracy. Moreover, judging from the tragic riotings we have seen, neither can we expect the outpouring of billions of dollars to automatically result in domestic tranquillity or obedience of the law.

These are matters which address themselves to individual citizens and to State and local law enforcement. It should be clear to everyone by now that, unfortunately, law and order will be very difficult to maintain so long as the Rap Browns, the Stokely Carmichaels, and others like them go about preaching hatred and mob violence.

The fact is that people cannot be bribed into obeying the law. So far as some of these programs are concerned, I believe we need to take a closer look at them to see if they are really doing the job they were meant to do.

Mr. President, the Monday, August 14, edition of the Wall Street Journal contains an excellent editorial in this connection. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CALLOUS CONGRESS

In the wake of the widespread city rioting, liberal politicians and others have tried to pin much of the blame on Congress for its refusal to vote "enough" funds for anti-poverty programs. While the lawmakers are far from perfect, the charge in this case is more than a little unfair.

The Congressmen, of course, have helped bring down the attack on themselves. A Federal rat-control bill, whether it was necessary or desirable legislation or not, surely deserved better than the sorry attempts at humor the lawmakers lavished on it. For a lot Americans, rats are no laughing matter.

Along the way the Administration has added to the confusion, with its talk of all sorts of economies on the domestic front. It's small wonder that the impression has got abroad, in some quarters at any rate, that the Administration and Congress are really pinching pennies.

The impression, as House Appropriations Chairman Mahon said in a speech the other day, is quite erroneous. During the current fiscal year, he notes, the Government plans to spend \$25.6 billion to help the poor, a sharp increase from the \$22 billion outlay in the year before. "It is time," he says in defense of his colleagues, "for somebody to take note of what Congress is trying to do for the poor."

Whereupon the Texas Democrat rattled off a long list of the varied Federal programs, all of them supposedly aimed at combating poverty or its effects: Urban renewal, public housing, manpower training, child care, school aid and the rest.

In view of the size and cost of those programs, it's difficult to argue that Congress has been niggardly with dollars. Yet in one way the Administration and Congress have shown a certain callousness toward the poor.

The very phrase, "war on poverty," implied to many that here was a fight that not

only could be won but could be won pretty quickly (though Vietnam by now is changing some old American notions of warfare). As the politicians angled for votes, they seemed convinced that they had the once-and-for-all solutions to the age-old problems of the poor; all that had to be done was to back up those ideas with cash.

Unfortunately problems built up over more than a century are simply not susceptible to instant solutions, no matter how well devised the programs may be. And the fact is that a good deal of the poverty war has been either poorly planned or poorly conducted—or both.

Disillusionment was quick to set in among the poor themselves. When people are promised the impossible and come to believe in it, even sizable gains can appear sharply disappointing. In the not-very-long run, this sort of vote-buying can turn out to be not merely cruel; it can boomerang politically as well.

A realization of that sort may be creeping over Washington. At any rate, there's more emphasis in official circles on education as the best long-term hope of easing poverty. The former Federal official who argued for shoring up the Negro family structure no longer is quite the pariah he once was. Though Rep. Mahon is a conservative Southerner, many liberals now agree with him that Federal money is simply not the answer to everything.

President Johnson firmly declares that the nation can afford both to fight the war in Vietnam and to attack its problems at home, and it is true enough that the nation is rich. But its resources are not so limitless that it can afford to shovel billions more into domestic programs that achieve little or nothing of any real value, and in some cases even do harm.

Congress, at least, now has ample opportunity to learn from past mistakes. If it fails to do so it will deserve to be labeled callous.

HUMAN RIGHTS COVENANTS

MR. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, for several months, now, I have every day addressed this legislative body on the need to ratify the human rights covenants. The irony of having to speak to the Senate of the United States on the necessity of conventions against genocide, slavery, and forced labor is apparent; it is equally incongruous that the highest legislative body of one of the oldest and proudest existing democracies on earth should balk at ratifying documents that do nothing but expound those rights that Americans have fought and died for many times.

I do not have to inform the Senate that this body's recalcitrance in ratifying these covenants is directly in conflict with the declared position of the United States in the United Nations, or that nonratification, in fact, undermines one of the primary reasons why the U.N. was formed. All 100 Senators know that.

Nor do I have to enlighten the Senate that its refusal to ratify these treaties makes mockeries of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Senators know that too.

The question I ask today is not whether these apparent contradictions will lead some people to misunderstand the true intentions of this Nation in world affairs; but whether, in fact, the position of the United States in international affairs has not drastically changed without our ever admitting it.

August 14, 1967

Mr. President, 60 new nations have joined the original United Nations. I do not think it is farfetched to suggest that the reluctance of most of the nations to follow our leadership is related to positions we take on questions like human rights.

New nations to the U.N. are almost always new nations to the world. There is Burundi, the Congos, Dahomey, Gabon, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, the Maldivian Islands, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Zambia, to name a few. How many Senators know where these countries are?

It is time we begin to examine in earnest our position in relation to these new nations of the world. Are they willing to follow us? What social example do we set for them? These are questions we must begin to ask ourselves, for they are the same questions that the developing nations are asking.

Mr. President, let us act to insure that the United States does not become a lost leader in human rights. Let us ratify the human rights covenants now.

WHERE ARE THE VOICES OF CONSCIENCE?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a situation obviously exists in Yemen about which I cannot keep silent any longer. Most recently a team of doctors, sent by the International Red Cross, has testified to the fact that the Egyptian Government of Mr. Nasser is using poison gas indiscriminately in Yemen.

By all accounts, the Egyptian Air Force, after proving its courage and ability in the late war with Israel, has now turned its wrath upon the primitive, defenseless citizens of the villages of Yemen.

The poison gas agents, Mr. President, have been proven to be of Soviet origin. This is ironic as well as sad. The Soviet Union, whose citizens were themselves victimized and slaughtered by the millions by the Nazis, now turns around and supplies the poison gas with which Nasser wipes out Yemeni villages. I wonder what the 20 million Soviet citizens killed by the Nazis would say to that?

It seems that the mighty Egyptian Air Force is bombing these villages indiscriminately. It also is evident from all reports that no warning is given.

An article published recently in the New York Times, which has already been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, gives a point-by-point rundown of the investigations made by the team of International Red Cross physicians. It is obvious that the evidence is conclusive and damning.

Now that the point has been established, I cast about me in wonder because I hear no international voice of protest against what must be called an absolutely heinous crime against the most innocent of people.

It would, of course, be useless to appeal to Mr. Nasser's sense of justice or fair play, since he possesses neither, does not understand the former, and is incapable of exercising the latter.

It would be a further exercise in futility to ask Nasser to turn to the reform

of his society and uplifting of his own people. He is unwilling to do the former and does not even understand the meaning of the latter.

Therefore, those who seek some sort of recourse must turn to the United Nations. I have so far listened in vain for the voice of U Thant speaking out against this violation of international law and human decency.

Surely, if Mr. Thant has the concern for justice that he has evinced in the past, he will use his forum at the United Nations to speak out against this horror.

If the United Nations is to recover from its recent setbacks and remain a voice for justice in the world, now is the time for it to speak out. The evil is obvious, outrageous and backed up by solid evidence.

Not to act would be a negation of all the United Nations is supposed to stand for. Not to act would be a negation of the beliefs Mr. Thant professes to hold to. Not to act would be abandoning these poor tribesmen to the barbarities of modern science. It would be as great a crime of omission as was committed when Mussolini attacked Ethiopia.

People like Mr. Nasser will continue to seek out weaker nations and conquer them if they are not brought up short by the force of international opinion.

If the United Nations does not speak out now, what meaning will all the international shoutings of recent weeks mean? If Nasser and his cohorts were accorded a respectful hearing and sympathy, shall not the tribesmen of Yemen receive the same?

I also wish to ask why other voices have not been raised against this shocking series of atrocities by the Egyptian Government?

There are certain fruits of man's mind that are genies the world does not dare release from its international bottle. Chemical, bacteriological, and radiological warfare are the deadliest genies in mankind's bottle. Woe unto that desperate or deranged leader who uncorks it. The awful human suffering he causes can be matched only by the burden of guilt he and his nation must carry.

I call upon the United Nations, the State Department, and those other Members of this Chamber to speak out, swiftly and forthrightly, against this awful barbarity.

We dare not let this continue.

Let us keep in mind what President Lincoln said:

To sit in silence when we should protest makes cowards out of men.

This statement is as true and apropos now as it was then. The warning is plain. Let us waste no more time. Let us cease toleration of these acts forthwith.

THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL IS A GREAT STEP FORWARD IN PROTECTING THE CONSUMER, BUT IT CAN BE FURTHER IMPROVED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs is holding hearings on the important truth-in-lending bill, approved by the Senate on July 11. This is welcome news, and we may

hope that the version reported to the other body will be stronger than S. 5. The Senate bill was an initial victory for the consumer and a tribute to those who long have championed truth in lending, men like the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXIMIRE] and our distinguished former colleague from Illinois, Senator Douglas, and women like the distinguished former Senator from Oregon, Mrs. Neuberger. But the Senate's bill can be strengthened.

Now we have another consumer champion at work as the Representative from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] seeks to improve this proposed legislation.

We know that no bill is perfect. When S. 5 was approved by the Senate, I pointed out areas that I felt could be strengthened, particularly in the field of revolving credit charges. The Senate bill does not require all revolving credit plans to disclose the annual percentage rate at the time the account was opened and on the periodic monthly statement. If we are to have truth in lending, all credit charges should be computed. To do this is not easy, and it would place a burden on the stores; yet I am hopeful that it can be done. The able chairman of the House Consumer Affairs Subcommittee has earned our applause for looking into this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of a news story entitled "Congress Expected To Approve This Year a Truth-in-Lending Measure To Protect U.S. Consumers," written by Reporter Nan Robertson, and published in the New York Times, Sunday, August 13, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS EXPECTED TO APPROVE THIS YEAR A TRUTH-IN-LENDING MEASURE TO PROTECT U.S. CONSUMERS

WASHINGTON, August 12.—"There is a price for money as there is for a coffee pot. If we force lenders to say what they are really charging for money, we hope consumers will go out and comparison shop."

So says Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat of Missouri, whose House Consumer Affairs Subcommittee began hearings this week on a tough "truth-in-lending" bill.

It is the first time that a House committee has ever considered a credit disclosure bill, aimed at protecting consumers from their own ignorance and helping them shop for the best bargains in credit.

It now seems likely that Congress will enact a truth-in-lending bill this year. Last month, after a seven-year stalemate, the Senate passed such a bill by a vote of 92 to 0.

The landmark legislation would apply full disclosure to \$30-billion in automobile sales; \$20-billion in personal loans; \$19-billion in big credit purchases such as television sets, refrigerators and furniture; second mortgage loans, and some other credit payments.

TOTAL COST IS KEY

Sellers would be required to reveal total costs, both in terms of annual interest rates and dollar amounts, of installment buying.

An important compromise in the Senate-passed version concerned revolving charge accounts. It permits department stores who offer such accounts to continue giving their customers only the monthly percentage cost of their credit, which is usually 1½ per cent on the unpaid balance.

Mrs. Sullivan's bill would restore the original provision, requiring retailers to in-

form their customers of the true yearly rate of interest they pay.

Revolving credit is the fastest growing kind of consumer credit; there is now \$5-billion of such debt outstanding in the United States. Ordinary revolving charge accounts require a minimum monthly payment, although new purchases may be added before the old balance is paid off.

The retailers argue that it is too difficult to compute the interest rate on an annual basis. Administration witnesses disputed this stand before Mrs. Sullivan's subcommittee this week, and former Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, who was truth-in-lending's stanchest champion in Congress, called it "nonsense."

Spokesmen for the merchants took complicated charts and tables to the House hearings to prove that stating a yearly interest rate would be inaccurate, would overstate the "true" rate and be unfair to the stores and misleading to customers.

In effect, they argued that to compute the "true" annual rate it would be necessary to know the exact average daily balance in the account. Since the average daily balance depends upon the timing of purchases and payments, the "true" rate cannot be disclosed in advance.

A staff white paper written before the Senate committee expunged the original revolving credit clause answered:

"It is not necessary to resort to complicated arithmetic to prove the validity [of a stated annual interest rate]. Common sense says that a yearly rate is 12 times a monthly rate. The only arithmetic involved is $12 \times 1\frac{1}{2}$ equal 18 per cent."

None of the Congressional experts seems to know yet whether full annual disclosure would produce an interest-rate war, as intense competition for customers produces price wars among stores. Massachusetts recently passed a truth-in-lending law incorporating full disclosure of revolving credit rates. It appears to be working well, but observers say that it is too early to tell whether rates will be forced down.

E X T R A P R O V I S I O N S

Mrs. Sullivan's bill has four major extra provisions that the Administration refuses to support until they are studied further. They are:

An annual 18 per cent ceiling on all credit transactions in the United States.

A ban on garnishment, which permits collecting agencies to assess what is owed them from a person's wages through agreement with employers.

Regulation of exchange sales of agricultural commodities—most of which are not covered by any laws—in the same way the Securities and Exchange Commission regulates the sale of stocks. Mrs. Sullivan believes that commodity exchange prices directly affect the cost of food in supermarkets.

Power for the Federal Reserve Board to set limits on the extension of consumer credit if the President declares that a national emergency exists. The board had such powers in World War II and the Korean War.

Mrs. Sullivan says that her bill "is a very far-reaching measure with admittedly highly controversial features."

Some say that if she insists on sticking with the four most controversial provisions, she will delay or kill truth-in-lending. Others insist that she is working from strength—that her bill is so much tougher than the Senate's that she will have more room in which to bargain.

Mrs. Sullivan's bill must still be negotiated through the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee and the full House Banking and Currency Committee and then face floor debate, and, finally, a conference committee with the Senators.

Mrs. Sullivan has five subcommittee co-sponsors for her legislation. Four of them are

Democrats, and one is a Republican—Representative Seymour Halpern of Queens. The subcommittee has 12 members.

A measure identical to the Senate bill was introduced into the House by Representative William B. Widnall of New Jersey, ranking Republican on the full committee. He has seven co-sponsors, four of them on the subcommittee. Two other bills similar to his have also been introduced.

One companion measure is sponsored by Representative Robert G. Stephens Jr. of Georgia, ranking Democrat on the subcommittee. He is to take a stand in favor of the more conciliatory Senate legislation.

The ban on wage garnishment is one of Mrs. Sullivan's favorite issues. Those who oppose such a ban say that it would dry up credit, since the creditor would lose an important weapon in getting his money back.

Some states, such as California, have harsh garnishment laws. Others, such as Pennsylvania, have prohibited all garnishment for many years. Still others do not permit garnishment of the wages of low-income earners but may allow it in the case of a "credit" who is earning a sizable income but ignoring his debts.

To those who say that outlawing wage garnishment will dry up credit, the opposing forces cite a survey conducted by the American Credit Bureau. It shows that the ratio of installment credit to total retail sales is the same in those states that have stiff garnishment laws as it is in those that prohibit such laws.

A truth-in-lending bill was able to get through the Senate this year for several reasons, some of which would also influence the House.

First, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee changed. A. Willis Robertson of Virginia, Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, Paul Douglas of Illinois and Maurine B. Neuberger of Oregon all left. Taking their places were Charles H. Percy of Illinois, Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts, Gale W. McGee of Wyoming and William B. Spong of Virginia.

"It replaced two die-hard liberals and two die-hard conservatives with four moderate types," a staff member said. "Further, there was great personal antagonism between Robertson, who was head of the full committee, and Douglas who was chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions."

John J. Sparkman of Alabama and William Proxmire of Wisconsin, both liberals, are now chairmen of the committee and subcommittee, respectively.

The same source considered the House Banking and Currency Committee as an even more liberal group.

Second, consumer legislation such as auto safety, cigarette labeling and truth-in-packaging has already passed Congress, and the idea is gaining momentum.

Third, consumer measures are increasingly attractive to Congress because they do not drain the Federal till. Truth-in-lending also seems particularly popular with constituents, according to recent polls. The Senate staffer said:

"On an out-and-out consumer issue, you can't be against the housewife not knowing the truth about interest rates."

C U T S P E N D I N G B E F O R E I M P O S I N G A S U R C H A R G E O N P E R S O N A L I N C O M E T A X E S

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Congress is being asked to enact a 10 percent surcharge on Federal income taxes.

Before we vote to impose such a tax on individual taxpayers, I believe that a number of Federal programs of dubious value should be cut back.

This is not to say that by so doing, the expected deficit of some \$28 billion can be entirely overcome. But, at least, a good start can be made to that end.

Let me enumerate some of the programs which I think could stand some significant reductions.

The Government is asking for more than \$4.8 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's activities in the coming fiscal year. I believe that cuts in some areas of this agency would be very appropriate. These requests include funds for Project Apollo, our manned lunar mission, as well as various unmanned shots. In my judgment, our problems here on earth are a good deal more pressing than those on the moon at this time.

Our Government has also asked Congress to appropriate more than \$3 billion for foreign aid. Now, of course, there are instances in which our country should assist other nations. I think it is in our country's own best interests, from the standpoint of its national security, to assist certain nations, but in the past I do believe that our foreign aid program has just been entirely too extensive. I think we have spread moneys promiscuously all over the world and, in many instances, the recipient countries have not only been unthankful for the help that they have gotten from the United States, they have also appeared to expect aid as a matter of course. Some have even demanded aid of us.

Too often they turn right around and kick Uncle Sam right in the teeth. I believe that the foreign aid program could be drastically reduced without, at the same time, jeopardizing our own long-term security interests.

Another area in which budgetary cuts could and should be made is in the so-called war on poverty. Now, I am not against programs that effectively work to alleviate or eliminate poverty. I want to alleviate poverty as much as does anyone else. But I do insist that these so-called poverty programs should be well-planned and effectively administered, and they should actually assist the people who are in need. There have been, of course, some notable successes in the poverty war. For example, I am told that Project Headstart for young school children is a program which has seemed to be worthy.

Another meritorious program has been the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and a third reportedly very meritorious program is the adult basic education program, but there have been a number of other programs in the antipoverty setup which appear to be of more dubious value; programs the only notoriety of which, it seems, has been the front-page unfavorable type.

In this category I would place the Job Corps, which has been plagued with disciplinary problems, extreme high costs and a high dropout rate. Now, of course, here and there I think, the Job Corps has possibly been doing very well. Moreover, there are the various community action programs which, in certain large cities throughout the country, have resulted in agitation. Poverty employees have gone out into the community, as

they have here in Washington, and incited the poor to demonstrate against the police department or to demonstrate against the welfare department or against public officials. They have incited and agitated and, in this way, they have probably contributed to the general atmosphere of rebellion that we have experienced during the past summer. Then, too, there are the VISTA workers. I do not indict all VISTA workers, but much of the correspondence that has come from my people in West Virginia has been very critical of the VISTA workers. These VISTA workers come in from other parts of the country. They do not know the problems of West Virginia, they do not know West Virginia people and, in all too many instances, based on my correspondence, some of the VISTA members have just created problems rather than solved problems. And they have helped to stir up trouble.

So, these are some of the programs that should be cut back, I think. And then, finally, in the wake of the recent riots in Detroit and Newark and other cities, wild spending schemes to alleviate the problems of the cities have been put forth almost daily in the Congress and by the administration. It is obvious that something has to be done about the crucial problems which now face our major cities, but so many of these far out programs which have recently budded and blossomed seem to lack the sound planning which is so necessary if long-range, effective and feasible solutions are to result.

Moreover, I am afraid that this tax proposal, if enacted, could result in a deterrent to the economy, the final upshot being a decrease, rather than an increase, in Federal revenues. The individual taxpayers in the business community, and especially the small businesses, are already heavily taxed, and I just do not feel that we can run the risk of making their burden heavier, without at least first exercising some reasonable economies in Federal spending.

Until our Government shows a firm determination to tighten its belt in such areas as I have just enumerated—and there are others—I shall be very reluctant to vote to place an additional tax burden upon the personal income of the American taxpayer.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the most important announcement, on June 5, by the National Endowment for the Arts of the establishment of the American Film Institute was not, I believe, duly noted by this Chamber.

The United States, which has lead the way in cinematic progress, especially in its commercial aspects, is the one major film-producing country which does not have a national body specifically organized to preserve, study, and nurture the motion picture.

The genius of the American film industry has been the ability to take native talent and join therewith individual expertise from other nations and produce a distinct American art form. One ex-

ample of this is the "American Western," which is now being shot in many nations, especially in Italy and Japan. The Institute, in addition to preserving the work of the past, will assist in the development of new techniques of making films.

Other nations have recognized the value of the movie as an art form. Depositories of matrices have been established and representative films have been shown at festivals. Unfortunately, in this country this type of recognition has only come from private sources such as museums and film clubs. In the past few years the commercial movie festival, showing specific cycles or types of films, has become an almost weekly event in some cities. Indeed, the new popularity of Humphrey Bogart is probably a direct outgrowth of this type of activity.

I should like to compliment the National Endowment for the Arts and its chairman, Roger L. Stevens, on the establishment of the American Film Institute. On June 5, Mr. Gregory Peck, of California, acting chairman of the board, American Film Institute, joined with Mr. Stevens in the announcement of the establishment of the institute. Mr. Peck, incidentally, is not only a fine and noted actor in his own right, but also he has a strong sense of public service and has given himself greatly to the betterment of the public weal. The institute is to be a nonprofit, non-government organization with administrative headquarters in Washington. George Stevens, Jr., the excellent film producer, for several years has been heading up the film division of the USIA, has been appointed director of the institute, which will be guided by a 22-member board. Knowing and admiring each of these men—Roger Stevens, Gregory Peck, and George Stevens—as I do, I am sure this venture is going to be a most successful and fruitful one.

It is interesting to note that the initial funding for the institute is an outgrowth of the farsighted matching grant provision contained in Public Law 89-209, which provides for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. This feature allows the matching of Federal funds with private contributions on a 50-50 basis. In this instance the National Endowment for the Arts has matched the \$1.3 million donated by the Ford Foundation. In addition, \$1.3 million will be contributed over a 3-year period from the member companies of the Motion Picture Association.

The establishment of the American Film Institute is, I believe, a great step in recognizing a truly American art form. My enthusiasm is shared by others, as is demonstrated by articles published in the Washington Post, the Washington Evening Star, and the New York Times, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1967]

UNITED STATES HAS FILM INSTITUTE

(By Richard Coe)

Establishment of the long-promised American Film Institute was announced yesterday

by Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

Gregory Peck, acting chairman of the new institute and head of the advisory council which created it, confirmed that George Stevens Jr., for the past five years head of USIA's motion picture division, will be director and chief executive officer of the institute.

A private, non-profit corporation, the AFI will have its headquarters in Washington, with services eventually to be established in Los Angeles, New York and other American cities.

Activities of the Institute initially will stress five areas:

1) Filmmaker training in one or more established centers of advanced film study for graduates in filmmaking to pursue such careers;

2) Film education for students and teachers in film as an art form;

3) Film production outside the existing commercial and financial structure;

4) Preservation and cataloguing of films coordinating existing regional, private and museum collections and not, at this time, any new archive;

5) Publication of research and activities concerning the four major categories above.

Such an admittedly skeletal outline merely suggests areas into which the Institute will first venture. Taking on his new job, 35-year-old Stevens, unrelated to Roger L., remarked: "Why do it? Because it isn't there."

Because the organization represents a revolutionary step for American film, the months before its actual establishment brought flurries of criticism even before its aims or board of trustees were announced.

"It's the first time in my 25 years on stage or screen," chuckled actor Peck, "that I've seen a show seriously criticized before it opened—or was even written."

The 16-member advisory council, appointed after President Johnson signed the enabling Arts and Humanities Act on Sept. 29, 1965, investigated potential needs and finally retained the Stanford Research Institute to define functions of the proposed organization. Surveys in this country and abroad led to what Peck believes to be "the most comprehensive study even undertaken in the field."

The Board will consist of 22 members, 14 of whom were on the initial advisory council. These 14 are: actress Elizabeth Ashley; Sherrill Corwin, president of the National Association of Theater Owners; the Rev. John Culkin, S.J., director of Fordham University's Center of Communications; documentary writer-director Bruce Herschensohn ("Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"); David Mallery, director of studies of the National Association of Independent Schools; acting chairman Peck; architect William L. Pereira; Arnold Picker, executive vice president of United Artists; actor Sidney Poitier; historian-film critic Arthur Schlesinger Jr.; George Stevens Jr.; director-writer-producer George Seaton; Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America; Richard F. Walsh, president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees.

To these, eight names have been added: Charles Benton, educational producer and until recently president of Encyclopaedia Britannica Films; writer-director Francis Ford Coppola ("You're a Big Boy Now"); Francis Keppel, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, who does not join the board until next Jan.; film critic Arthur Knight of The Saturday Review; director-photographer Richard Leacock, whose documentary of the Kennedy-Humphrey West Virginia primaries introduced his *cine verite* style; Donald H. McCannon, president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Corp., Washington's Channel 5; writer Dan Taradash, whose most noted

screenplay was "From Here to Eternity"; and director Fred Zinnemann ("A Man for All Seasons," "A Nun's Story," "High Noon").

[From the Evening Star (Washington, D.C.), June 6, 1967]

FILM INSTITUTE IS NOW A FACT
(By Harry MacArthur)

That proposed American Film Institute now is a fact rather than a dream. The announcement that it has been established was made yesterday by Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the National Council on the Arts, at a luncheon at the Madison.

At the same time it was announced that George Stevens Jr., who has been head of the United States Information Agency's motion picture and television service, would be the institute's director and chief executive officer. News of his resignation from the USIA post was made public yesterday morning.

The choice, already hailed by President Johnson, is herewith hailed here, too. The new institute's first director has grown up with movies as the son of the distinguished director of the same name. He did a noteworthy job in his five years with the USIA, giving, as the President put it, "a new vision and excellence to government filmmaking."

Stevens (George Jr.) approaches his new job with zest and an awareness of the importance of film. A graduating high school student, he pointed out, has seen 500 motion pictures and spent 15,000 hours watching television against 10,800 hours in the classroom.

Gregory Peck also was present for the American Film Institute's inaugural ceremonies. Acting chairman of the board of trustees during the formative stages, he outlined the institute's aims. They are:

1—To recognize, assist, encourage and promote elements of progress and scholarship in the film arts and humanities.

2—To encourage and support the growth of creative activities and creative talent in film in a climate of freedom of thought, inquiry, imagination and individual initiative.

3—To maintain, develop, disseminate and coordinate the nation's artistic and cultural resources in film.

4—To foster and support film, film scholarship and teacher training for film study in general education.

5—To encourage and promote greater public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of film.

6—To encourage and promote increased opportunities in film and to provide or support productions and projects that will assist and encourage film artists to achieve, demonstrate and maintain high standards of professional excellence.

7—To facilitate the exchange of information and to support the publication of scholarly works pertaining to the history, theory and practice of film art.

8—To initiate and support research in the history, criticism, theory and practice of film art and to provide or support other relevant projects including surveys, research and planning in film.

9—To award fellowships and grants for training and work shops in the history, criticism, theory and practice of film.

George Stevens Jr. clearly has his work cut out for him. He does begin, however, secure in the knowledge that the film institute comes into being on a firm financial foundation.

The initial three-year budget has been set at \$5.2 million, of which \$3.9 million already is in hand or committed. The bulk of this is in a \$2.6 million grant made available by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Ford Foundation.

An additional \$1.3 million has been made available by the seven member companies of the Motion Picture Association of America (Columbia, MGM, Paramount, 20th Century

Fox, United Artists, Universal and Warner Bros.).

How these leaders in movie-making feel about the institute is expressed by Jack Valenti, MPAA president:

"The member companies of the association believe it is in the urgent long range interest of the motion picture for the institute to be born. It is important to encourage and train talented young filmmakers, upgrade and aid the educational work in film being carried out by American colleges and universities, and to bring attention on important film archival work. The endurance of excellence in motion pictures will be the prime objective of the American Film Institute. In this aim, the entire motion picture industry is eager to join."

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1967]
AGENCY TO PRESS MOVIES' ARTISTRY—AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE FORMED IN WASHINGTON

(By Vincent Canby)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—The American Film Institute, a non-profit, nongovernmental corporation, has been formally established to preserve and develop the nation's "artistic and cultural resources in film."

George Stevens Jr., 35-year-old director of the United States Information Agency's film division, is resigning that post to become director and chief executive officer of the new corporation, which will be guided by a 22-member board of trustees.

Formation of the institute, which will have headquarters in Washington, was announced at the Madison Hotel here today at a press conference held by George Stevens, Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the National Council of the Arts, and Gregory Peck, the actor, who is acting chairman of the institute's board of trustees.

OTHER SUCH GROUPS LARGER

With an estimated budget of \$5.2-million for the first three years, the American Film Institute comes into being as the third-largest such organization in the world in terms of money. Its Soviet counterpart has an annual budget of between \$4-million and \$5-million, and the Swedish Film Institute an annual budget of \$2.25-million.

The United States, where motion pictures had their birth, is one of the last of the major producing nations to establish such an organization. Britain, France, Italy and India have them.

As outlined by Roger Stevens, the institute will concentrate on the following areas:

Filmmaker training. It will establish one or more Centers for Advanced Film Study, to act as a bridge between college or university study and a film-making career.

Film education. The institute will explore ways to help develop and improve the study of film as an art form "with its own esthetics, history and techniques."

Film production. The institute will make grants to young filmmakers for the production of documentary and experimental films, both short and feature-length, and will finance the production of such films at its Centers for Advanced Film Study.

Film archives. The institute will work to catalogue and preserve old films.

The institute will commission publications of film news, criticism and textbooks.

Of the institute's initial three-year budget three-quarters is already in hand or firmly committed.

COUNCIL GRANT IS LARGEST

The National Council on the Arts, in the largest single grant it has ever made, has given the institute \$1.3-million. The Ford Foundation and the Motion Picture Association of America have each pledged themselves to grant \$1.3-million, leaving \$1.3-million still to be raised.

George Stevens Jr., son of the Hollywood filmmaker and no relation to Roger Stevens,

pointed to the dominating influence of film today and said: "We cannot be casual about the training of the people who create these images."

PECK REPLIES TO CRITICS

As head of the U.S.I.A.'s film division for the last five years, Mr. Stevens has been responsible for the production and distribution around the world of 600 documentaries and newsreels annually. Under his leadership, the U.S.I.A. began an "internship" program to train young filmmakers. A number of their films, notably the documentary feature on President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning: Day of Drums," have been well received.

Taking notice of criticism that the present board seems to be weighted in favor of the Hollywood motion-picture establishment, Mr. Peck noted:

"I have been in the theater and films for 25 years, and this is the first production in which I appeared that was reviewed before it opened."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 1872, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to its consideration.

MR. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, without losing his right to the floor?

MR. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not take particular pleasure in presenting a \$2.7 billion foreign aid bill to the Senate only 2 weeks after the American people have been told by the President that they must pay a 10-percent war tax. But I do take a measure of satisfaction from the changes made by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the foreign aid program presented to Congress by the executive branch. The bill before the Senate will bring about substantial and much-needed improvements in foreign aid policy, and will help restore the Senate's proper role in the formulation of foreign policy.

For a number of years the committee has tried to bring about an overhaul of the aid program, with few practical results. Only 2 years ago, the Senate voted to terminate the entire foreign aid

program and to start from scratch in developing a new one. Unfortunately, that effort to get a clean sweep failed because of adamant opposition from the House conferees. Last year the committee, backed by the Senate, made a number of recommendations for major revisions in foreign aid; for foreign aid to bear a share of the burden for paying for the Vietnam war; for strict limits on the number of countries to receive aid; for channeling more of our assistance through the international lending institutions; and for tightening up on the military aid and sales program.

I shall not take up the Senate's time by describing the provisions of this bill in detail. The report explains what the executive branch proposed, what the committee did, and why it did it. But I do want to discuss briefly four major points which merit the Senate's attention.

First, the question of amounts. This bill authorizes a total foreign aid program of \$2.7 billion for fiscal 1968, a reduction of \$55 million, or 18 percent, from the appropriation request. It compares with an appropriation of \$2.9 billion for fiscal 1967. In its report on the supplemental economic aid bill for Vietnam in March 1966—a year and a half ago—the Committee on Foreign Relations laid down this guideline for future foreign aid requests:

Foreign aid should not remain sacrosanct when it comes to apportioning the war's financial costs among Federal activities. Belt tightening because of the war must not be restricted to domestic programs but should include our foreign aid programs as well. American citizens should not be called upon to accept reductions in programs which affect their daily lives, see their taxes increased and war costs spiral, while the foreign aid program escapes unaffected and undiminished. (S. Rept. 1060, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 9.)

This admonition was ignored by the executive branch in presenting the aid program for fiscal 1967—and it was ignored again this year. Foreign aid was to be carried on as usual in both years. Congress refused to accept this attitude last year, and the committee has proposed reductions which will insure that the aid program does not escape its fair share of the war burden this year.

The war is now costing at least \$25 billion annually—of course, it is probably far greater than that, although we have no way of calculating it—with the bill mounting daily. The Federal Government faces a deficit that could be twice as large as any since World War II. Taxpayers are told they must pay 10 percent more in taxes. The Nation's balance-of-payments problem worsens and the dollar's position grows more perilous. All this while some of our cities are in virtual revolution because of neglect and domestic unrest becomes more acute.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee, like all Senators, have a responsibility for the setting of national priorities through their votes on authorization and appropriation bills. Under our system, Congress' decisions on the foreign aid authorization bill before the Senate and other measures to allocate the Federal Government's resources constitute collectively a listing of national

priorities. There is something wrong with a system of priorities that proposes to continue foreign aid as usual under the circumstances facing our Nation today.

There is an obligation on the richest, most powerful Nation to help narrow the growing gap between the rich and the poor of this world. But this obligation does not take precedence over the needs of our own citizens. It is more important, in my view, to build hope out of despair for the ghetto dwellers in Detroit, Newark, and Harlem than it is to try to remake the societies of Asia and Africa.

We may be able to pacify every village in Vietnam, over a period of years—

Mayor Cavanagh said following the Detroit riots—

but what good does it do if we can't pacify the American cities.

America will be a greater influence in creating a peaceful world if it does the things at home necessary to live up to its democratic ideals than it will ever be by telling the developing nations, like one would tell children: "Do as I say, not as I do." By cutting the budget request for foreign aid by 18 percent, the committee has taken a modest step toward putting our national priorities in better order.

The second point I wish to bring to the Senate's attention concerns the number of countries to receive aid. Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been concerned for some time about the proliferation of American aid around the world. Ninety-five out of the 120 nations now belonging to the United Nations are slated to get foreign assistance during this fiscal year—economic, military, or commodity aid under Public Law 480. Seventy-four are to get economic aid, 56 to get military aid, and 86 are to receive Public Law 480 help, according to the program presented to Congress this year. In other words, we are providing some type of assistance to practically every non-Communist nation on the globe, except Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and those of Western Europe.

Members of the committee believe that the bilateral aid program should be retrenched, and that a larger portion of our aid should be channeled through international development organizations—the United Nations, the World Bank group, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the African Development Bank.

Foreign aid is spread so thinly around the world that our effort in many countries amounts to no more than an aid presence, a presence that only arouses expectations of progress which are doomed to disappointment. The fruits of current aid policy in many nations are far more likely to be frustration and bitterness than an increase in prestige and influence for the United States.

Last year, in an effort to force curtailment of bilateral aid programs, the Senate fixed limits on the number of countries which could receive development loans or technical assistance—10 for loans, 40 for technical assistance, and 10 for supporting assistance. The limits on loans and technical assistance grants did not apply to Latin America—where 21 nations are slated to receive this type

of help in fiscal 1968. In view of past experience, the committee believed that this was the only feasible way to make the foreign aid officials do what had been urged by nonstatutory language for so many years. On the insistence of the House conferees, the mandatory limits were modified to give the President waiver authority, and the ceiling on supporting assistance was raised to 13. To the committee's regret, the President used the waiver authority to increase the list of loan recipients to 24 above the statutory limit. A more modest increase brought the number of countries given technical assistance grants to 48 and the number given supporting assistance to 16. For all practical purposes, the intent of the Congress was not followed.

This year the committee met the executive branch halfway on this issue. The bill before the Senate contains fixed limits but, instead of allowing loans to only 10 countries as the Senate did last year, the ceiling was set at 15. The ceiling for technical assistance stays at 40, and the ceiling on supporting assistance allows aid to all of the 10 countries programmed by the executive branch. But, instead of limits which could not be increased without amending the law, the committee has approved a procedure, applicable to all three programs, under which additional countries can be added by approval of a concurrent resolution by Congress. If a persuasive case can be made for adding more countries, Congress can, and will, act.

The third point I wish to bring to the Senate's attention is the committee's decision to revise the military assistance and sales program. The committee, by a vote of 12 to 6, decided to repeal the Department's general authority for financing sales of military hardware to the less-developed countries. Many members of the committee have been concerned for some time about our Nation's arms aid and sales policies. Two subcommittees of the committee have held extensive hearings on the subject this year—the Subcommittee on Disarmament, under the chairmanship of the Senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. The information disclosed during the course of those hearings had much to do with the committee's decision to curtail the business of selling expensive and sophisticated military equipment, on easy terms, to countries which cannot afford it and should not have it.

Under current military aid and sales policies, American arms appear in the hands of both sides in all too many regional conflicts around the globe, sapping scarce resources which should be used for economic development, and creating an "arms merchant" image for our country which belies our basic desire for peace. The true interests of this Nation are not served by a policy which encourages the spread of sophisticated U.S. weapons in the hands of poor, unsophisticated people who should be using their meager resources to grow more food and in building roads, schools, and houses, not in buying tanks and jet fighters.

Through use of the revolving fund the Department of Defense now has \$230 million in direct credit outstanding and has guaranteed repayment on \$666 million of credit extended by the Export-Import Bank, and private banks. All of the credit sales financed through this account were to the poor or less-developed countries. I wish to emphasize that termination of this authority will in no way affect sales to the developed nations of Europe, the principal customers for the American arms industry, who buy for cash, with regular commercial financing, or through the normal facilities of the Export-Import Bank. Less than 20 percent of the \$1.5 billion in military sales estimated for this fiscal year were to be financed through the revolving credit account, all to less-developed countries—with one possible exception, which involves a question of definition. Under the amendment approved by the committee all liquid assets of the revolving fund, subsequent repayments on loans, and release of reserves on guaranteed sales, will go into the general fund of the Treasury.

Some Senators may ask if the repeal of this credit authority will not tie the President's hands in furnishing military aid to a nation when it is clearly vital to the national interest. This is simply not so. Many sources of military assistance will remain after the credit fund is abolished. First, the President, under the authorization in this bill will have \$391 million in grant military aid at his disposal. Second, section 510 of the Foreign Assistance Act authorizes the President to draw down up to \$300 million in materiel and supplies from Department of Defense stocks for grants or sales to foreign countries if he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States. Third, under section 614 of the act, the President has available \$250 million which can be used to provide up to \$50 million in military aid per country, on a loan or grant basis, when "important to the security of the United States," and even the \$50 million limit does not apply, to a country which is the "victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression."

Those two items alone, under sections 510 and 614 of the act, amount to \$550 million; and when we add the nearly \$400 million in grant aid, we have a total of almost a billion dollars for the three items.

Fourth, the Department of Defense may sell weapons and supplies from its stocks to any friendly country, and give up to 3 years' credit. Finally, the regular credit facilities of the Export-Import Bank and commercial banks will be available to some countries now slated to get credit assistance from the revolving fund.

The sources of U.S. arms aid and sales financing, and the authority available to the President to provide help when necessary, will still be many and varied after the revolving fund is abolished. There is no doubt that this Nation will not be found wanting when arms aid to a friend or ally is truly important to the national interest.

In addition to repealing the general authority for credit sales, the committee has reduced the military assistance authorization request by \$205 million. The committee has also adopted an amendment, designed to make U.S. economic aid more effective, which prohibits any aid to countries where economic development suffers as a result of excessive military spending. Often it seems that U.S. development aid only enables a country to buy arms—either from us or third countries—that it cannot afford. These three steps together will do much to bring about a more rational military assistance program, geared to meet legitimate needs in the light of current domestic and world conditions.

The fourth point I wish to mention is the committee's action to add a specific authorization of \$50 million a year for assistance program, geared to meet legislation problems. Every Member of this body is aware of the growing crisis facing the world in the race between population and food. The significance of population growth is evident from the fact that the population of the developing countries is increasing by a rate of about 2½ percent a year while the rates for per capita food production and economic growth decrease. Unless something is done about the population problem, even billions of dollars more in U.S. aid will not prevent these countries from sliding backwards to deeper poverty.

For a number of years the Foreign Relations Committee has urged that higher priority be given to helping other nations on population matters. In order to bring about attention commensurate with the urgency of the problem, the committee approved this amendment to authorize use, on a loan or a grant basis, of up to \$50 million a year in economic aid funds for population work. Aid officials have stated that some \$20 million, plus \$11 million in foreign currencies, will be invested in population programs this fiscal year. I am pleased to see this increase in emphasis and I hope that the new authority approved by the committee will insure that the United States will be ready to help when asked.

Mr. President, Members of this body will be under heavy pressure during the next few days to undo much of the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It is no secret that in recent years nearly every agency of the executive branch has vastly expanded the number of people charged with responsibility for getting legislation passed in a form satisfactory to the executive.

I express the most earnest hope, Mr. President, that Members will accept with great skepticism these efforts to influence them to reject the committee's recommendations. We did not reach our conclusions hastily and they should not be rejected lightly.

In conclusion, I would give but one example of the ease with which Members may be misled.

Headlines and editorials have described the committee's "butchery" or "slashing" of foreign aid. Overlooked is the fact that most of our significant reductions were in military assistance, not eco-

nomic assistance. Also overlooked or intentionally ignored is the fact that the committee bill now before the Senate authorizes \$107 million more in foreign economic assistance for next year than was appropriated last year. What the committee slashed on the economic side was the request of AID for more money this year than they got last year.

I hope the Senate will stand firm with its committee. I believe that the bill reported by the committee provides for continuing foreign aid at a reasonable level, commensurate with a proper balance of priorities for allocating our Nation's limited resources. I hope that the Senate will support the committee's recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the committee's decision to repeal the authority for maintenance of a revolving credit fund for military sales.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES

(A) GENERAL SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES

The committee has made a number of major revisions in the military assistance program. The principal change is to repeal the Department of Defense's authority to finance credit sales of military weapons and equipment, except sales of items from Department of Defense stocks on 3-year hard credit terms. The revolving fund, used to finance credit sales to underdeveloped countries, would be abolished no later than December 31, 1967. All assets of the account, and subsequent receipts from outstanding loans, would be placed in the general fund of the Treasury. Outstanding obligations which come due after the revolving account is abolished will be paid through the regular appropriation process.

The committee has been concerned for some time about the volume and character of sales of U.S. arms abroad, particularly sales to nations which do not need and cannot afford sophisticated weapons, or where the addition of weapons adds fuel to the fires of regional tensions. Last year the committee expressed deep reservations about the military sales program in its report on the authorization bill. "The U.S. balance of payments," the report stated, "is not in such a perilous condition that it has to be salvaged by taking blood money from poorer countries." (S. Rept. 1358, 89th Cong., second sess., p. 3.) The list of countries slated to receive credit financing for arms in 1968 illustrates that this admonition was ignored.

The Subcommittee on Disarmament, under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Gore, and the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. Symington, have studied at length many questions concerning the U.S. arms sales program. The information developed during hearings by these two subcommittees was a major factor in the full committee's decision—by a vote of 12 to 6—to abolish the revolving fund.

The revolving fund, the capital assets of which totaled \$384 million as of June 30, 1967, is used in two ways to finance a foreign country's arms purchases in the United States: through the extension of direct credit to the country, or to guarantee credit provided by the Export-Import Bank (or, in rare instances, credit extended by private banks). When guaranteeing credit extended

by the Export-Import Bank or private banks, the Department of Defense, under the authority of section 509(b) of the act, must set aside as a reserve only one-fourth of the total guaranteed. In other words, on an arms sale of \$4 million the Department commits only \$1 million from the revolving fund. At the end of the 1967 fiscal year, \$280 million in direct credit, and \$666 million in credit backed by a Defense Department guarantee were outstanding.

In fiscal year 1968 the Department of Defense programmed an additional contribution

of \$60 million from appropriations for military assistance and expected to receive \$60.5 million in collections and recoupments for a total input of \$120.5 million to the revolving fund. Under the Department of Defense program, this amount would have financed sales of \$292.5 million to 15 countries. All are less developed countries, with the exception of Israel which, with an annual per capita gross national product of \$1,070, can hardly be considered in that category.

The committee considered the military sales question at length and reached the con-

clusion that continuance of the Department's general authority for credit sales was not in the national interest. According to material provided the committee by the executive branch, U.S. arms sales, government and private, will total \$1.5 billion this fiscal year. Over \$1.2 billion—or 80 percent—of the total will be for cash, financed through commercial sources, or financed by the Export-Import Bank without a credit guarantee by the Department of Defense. Details concerning the financing of arms sales are shown in the following table:

TABLE 720.—FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ORDERS, COMMITMENTS TO ORDER, AND ESTIMATED FUTURE ORDERS

SUMMARY BY TYPE OF ORDER

[In millions of dollars]

Type of order and country category ¹	Actual orders received							Commitments as of June 30, 1967	Estimated future orders		
	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967 ²	Total, fiscal years 1962-67		Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
1. DOD cash orders:											
Developed	832.9	674.7	757.8	692.1	358.5	520.0	3,836.0	1,573.7	506.0	-----	-----
Underdeveloped	15.9	12.0	23.1	117.5	202.2	130.0	500.7	27.6	127.0	-----	-----
Total	848.8	686.7	780.9	809.6	560.7	650.0	4,336.7	1,601.3	633.0	639	600
2. Commercial orders:											
Developed	589.7	443.9	361.1	304.8	267.5	285.0	2,252.0	-----	222.0	-----	-----
Underdeveloped	17.6	38.6	33.0	29.0	98.6	50.0	266.8	-----	55.9	-----	-----
Total	607.3	482.5	394.1	333.8	366.1	335.0	2,518.8	-----	277.9	260	300
3. Total DOD cash and commercial orders:											
Developed	1,422.6	1,118.6	1,118.9	996.9	626.0	805.0	6,088.0	1,573.7	728.0	-----	-----
Underdeveloped	33.5	50.6	56.1	146.5	300.8	180.0	767.5	27.6	182.9	-----	-----
Total	1,456.1	1,169.2	1,175.0	1,143.4	926.8	985.0	6,855.5	1,601.3	910.9	899	900
4. Credit orders financed by the DOD credit sales account:³											
Developed	58.9	89.7	29.6	10.1	8.2	-----	196.5	-----	36.2	-----	-----
Underdeveloped	10.0	45.6	49.7	64.9	17.7	28.3	216.2	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	68.9	135.3	79.3	75.0	25.9	28.3	412.7	-----	36.2	60	66
5. Credit orders financed by the Export-Import Bank with DOD guarantee:⁴											
Underdeveloped	-----	-----	9.0	281.4	314.1	604.5	140.0	256.3	261	284	-----
6. Credit orders financed by commercial banks with DOD guarantee:⁵											
Underdeveloped	-----	-----	49.0	.8	12.0	61.8	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
7. Total credit orders requiring DOD credit sales account funds:											
Developed	58.9	89.7	29.6	10.1	8.2	-----	196.5	-----	36.2	-----	-----
Underdeveloped	10.0	45.6	49.7	122.9	299.9	354.4	882.5	140.0	292.5	-----	-----
Total	68.9	135.3	79.3	75.0	25.9	28.3	412.7	-----	36.2	60	66
8. Orders financed by the Export-Import Bank; no DOD guarantee:											
Developed	-----	161.4	35.0	573.8	885.4	164.2	1,819.8	329.6	296.6	280	250
Total	68.9	296.7	114.3	706.8	1,193.5	518.6	2,898.8	469.6	589.1	-----	-----
9. Total credit-developed countries:											
DOD financed	58.9	89.7	29.6	10.1	8.2	-----	196.5	-----	36.2	-----	-----
Exim financed	161.4	35.0	573.8	885.4	164.2	1,819.8	329.6	296.6	-----	-----	-----
Total	58.9	251.1	64.6	583.9	893.6	164.2	2,016.3	329.6	296.6	-----	-----
10. Total credit underdeveloped countries:											
DOD financed	10.0	45.6	49.7	64.9	17.7	28.3	216.2	-----	36.2	-----	-----
Exim financed	-----	-----	9.0	281.4	314.1	604.5	140.0	256.3	261	284	-----
Other bank financed	-----	-----	49.0	.8	12.0	61.8	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	10.0	45.6	49.7	122.9	299.9	354.4	882.5	140.0	292.5	-----	-----
11. Total credit program.											
Total program:	68.9	296.7	114.3	706.8	1,193.5	518.6	2,898.8	469.6	589.1	-----	-----
Developed	1,481.5	1,369.7	1,183.5	1,580.8	1,519.6	969.2	8,104.3	1,903.3	1,024.6	-----	-----
Underdeveloped	43.5	96.2	105.8	269.4	600.7	534.4	1,650.0	167.6	475.4	-----	-----
Total	1,525.0	1,465.9	1,289.3	1,850.2	2,120.3	1,503.6	9,754.3	2,070.9	1,500.0	1,500	1,500

¹Developed countries are Western Europe except Greece, Turkey, Spain, and Portugal, plus Canada, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand.

²Cash and commercial data for fiscal year 1967 are estimated.

³Credit orders for fiscal year 1966 are understated by 91.8 and for fiscal year 1967 by 37.1 to reflect transfer to the Export-Import Bank.

Source: Department of Defense.

Sales to the developed countries, which can afford weapons, are not affected by the committee's action. The nations of Europe, and Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand—countries which look to the United States as an arms supply source—have sufficient financial standing either to buy commercially, without government credit, or to meet the regular requirements of the Export-Import Bank.

The purpose of the amendment is to get the Department of Defense out of the business of financing sales of sophisticated military hardware, on liberal credit terms, to countries which, in the committee's judgment, do not have defense needs which justify American subsidization or involve-

ment. Current policies have resulted in U.S.-furnished arms appearing in the hands of both sides in all too many regional disputes around the globe, sapping scarce resources which should be used for economic development, and creating an "arms merchant" image for this country which contrasts with our basic objective of promoting world peace. The committee's actions will help force the executive branch to practice what it preaches about preventing arms races and discouraging wasteful military expenditures by poor nations.

The repeal of the Department of Defense authority to finance commercial sales leaves undisturbed a number of sources of arms for the underdeveloped countries, in the rare

cases where the furnishing of military assistance is important to the national interest. Outside the Department of Defense programs, underdeveloped nations can utilize the credit facilities of the Export-Import Bank, if they can meet the Bank's requirements, and private bank credit may be available in some cases—to a nation such as Israel, for example.

There are also a number of sources under the Foreign Assistance Act which will still be available. Authority remains to sell from Department of Defense stocks with up to 3 years credit. Under section 614 of the act, the President has general authority to use up to \$50 million to assist a country when "• • • important to the security of the United

States.", and this assistance can be provided on either a loan or a grant basis. It should be noted that the \$50 million limitation does not apply, and up to \$250 million can be made available to a country " * * * which is a victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression." Military aid was provided to six countries under this authority in the last fiscal year.

Section 510 of the act authorizes the President to provide a country with up to \$300 million, in a fiscal year, in equipment from Department of Defense stocks "if he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States." The law requires that prompt notice of action taken under this authority be given to the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. The Foreign Relations Committee was informed in both fiscal 1965 and 1966 that this authority was used for Vietnam. Upon further inquiry, however, it developed that what happened was that the drawdown authority was used for 17 other countries to replenish military assistance funds diverted to Vietnam. The committee does not approve of this kind of sleight-of-hand bookkeeping and expects the Defense Department's reports to be more candid in the future. Nevertheless, the committee has extended the authority of section 510 (redesignated as sec. 506) for an additional year. And, in addition to these sources, there is the grant assistance program for which the committee has authorized \$391 million. When it is truly important to the national interest that arms be furnished to a foreign country, the authority is available. The committee, however, does not believe that military assistance should be used as a kind of Public Law 480 surplus disposal program for the Pentagon.

* * * * * **REPEAL OF GUARANTY AUTHORITY**

Paragraph (4) repeals subsection 503(e) of the act which authorizes the Department of Defense to guarantee credit extended by any " * * * individual, corporation, partnership, or other association doing business in the United States" for the purchase of weapons, equipment, or military supplies by a foreign country or international organization.

It is under this authority, enacted in 1964, that the Department of Defense guarantees credit advanced by the Export-Import Bank to finance arms purchases by developing countries. Under current procedure, the Department of Defense advances credit to the foreign country with funds it has obtained for that purpose from the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank is given the repayment rights on the credit extended, and the Department of Defense, through its guarantee, protects the Bank against default by the foreign government. Section 509(b) of the existing act requires the Department to obligate only 25 percent of the face amount guaranteed, and of the \$384 million in the credit sales fund on June 30, \$154 million was held in a contingency reserve as a guarantee against credit loans. Of the \$666.3 million in outstanding credit backed by this guarantee authority, \$604.5 million has been extended by the Export-Import Bank, with the remaining \$61.8 million advanced by private banks. All of the sales financed through use of the guarantee authority have been to underdeveloped countries.

The committee, as stated earlier, believes that the entire policy behind the military assistance and sales program needs drastic revision. It has eliminated the guarantee authority as a means of starting to bring the program more in line with what the committee considers to be the Nation's true interests. It does not think that those interests are served by a policy which promotes the proliferation of sophisticated U.S. weapons in the hands of people who should be using

their scarce resources in growing more food and building more schools and houses, not in buying tanks and jet fighters.

* * * * * **Section 201(h). Repeal of the special fund for sales and guarantees**

This section terminates the revolving account for military credit sales authorized by section 508 of the act. It is through use of this revolving account that sales of military weapons and supplies to the developing countries are financed, either through the extension of direct credit or through guarantee credit provided by the Export-Import Bank (and in rare instances, private banks). In the last 5 fiscal years a total of \$412.7 million in direct credit has been extended through this sales account, and since 1965 guarantees have been issued on \$604.5 million in sales financed with Export-Import Bank funds and \$61.8 million in credit extended by private banks. For fiscal 1968 the Department of Defense planned to extend \$36.2 million in direct credit from the fund and guarantee \$256.3 million in sales to be financed by the Export-Import Bank. This account is not used to finance credit for the developed nations; they either buy for cash, on commercial terms, or through the regular facilities of the Export-Import Bank. Out of a total of \$1.5 billion in military export sales estimated for fiscal 1968, only \$292.5 million would be financed through the revolving fund, all of them sales to developing countries (with perhaps one exception—a question of definition).

As of June 30, 1967, the credit sales fund had capital assets of \$384 million, of which \$230 million was committed as direct credit and \$154 million as a reserve to back outstanding guarantees in sales of \$666 million.

The committee, for the reasons stated under general comments, recommends that the revolving fund be terminated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the New York Times of Saturday, August 12, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMIT ON ARMS SALES

The Senate's refusal to prohibit the Export-Import Bank from financing American arms sales to underdeveloped countries is unfortunate but not irreparable. The closeness of the 48-40 vote shows an awareness on Capitol Hill that conversion of the bank into a principal channel for a secret flow of tanks and planes to countries too poor to afford enough shoes and food has been a disservice to world stability.

These sales are diverting scarce Asian, African and Latin-American resources from economic progress and contributing to regional arms races that have more than once exploded into war. Concern over this misapplication of resources is evident in the lowered ceiling that the final Senate bill puts on the arms loan authority.

One explanation for the Senate's failure to go all the way may have been a feeling in some Congressional quarters that taking the Export-Import Bank out of the financing end of the arms business would evade the root of the problem. That root is the Defense Department's revolving fund created by Congress at the request of the Eisenhower Administration in 1957. The understanding was that this fund would help taper off arms grants by facilitating arms credits through commercial banks. Instead, it has become the vehicle for underwriting the "country X" loans through which the Export-Import Bank helps underdeveloped countries buy arms without even knowing which countries are involved.

The system has been conducive to permissive if not overeager sales to underdeveloped countries without any adequate examination of whether each transaction is in the total best interest of the United States. An amendment to the foreign-aid bill by Senator Church, passed 12-6 by the Foreign Relations Committee, would abolish the revolving fund at the end of the year. That would reroute arms sales into the regular channels of the foreign-aid program, where they would be subject to tighter top-level controls within the executive branch and to closer Congressional scrutiny. That is the heart of the matter. The Church amendment sets the stage for the real policy battle on arms sales. The amendment should be passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is about the usual season when we consider the foreign aid bill, and as usual it is beset with some controversy, not only with respect to members of the committee who have heard the testimony on the bill, but also with respect to other Senators and with respect to the divided opinion in the country. I think that controversy and that dissident spirit is certainly understandable.

In the first place, the benefits of this bill, of course, go abroad, in the sense that that is where the goods are sent that may be bought here. The benefits go to nearly every corner of the earth. Probably another reason is that our people, our own taxpayers, do not see the results of this expenditure, and when they hear about the billions of dollars we have expended on foreign assistance without visible results, one can well understand how they feel. A goodly number of the people come to the conclusion that perhaps we have done our share.

I notice in one memorandum there was an indication we have spent about \$120 billion on this program in the last 20 years. The appraisal and survey I made last year, together with the staff, indicated that we probably have spent closer to \$140 billion over the period of the life of this program since it was initiated by the speech of Secretary George Catlin Marshall long, long ago in 1944. However, people feel, and rightly so that that is a very substantial sum of money and perhaps we have done our share, and that perhaps other countries should begin to come forward and pick up a substantial share of this load. Then, too, we now have a major size war on our hands. The outlay for that war is enormous, and none of the Vietnam funds are included in the military aspect of the present bill. Therefore, that amount has to be added to what we finally strike as a total of money that is expended in the field of foreign aid.

Now there comes also a loud clamor at home for benefits of one kind or another which are regarded as having a bearing upon the moving causes for the riotous sentiment that has expressed itself in

more than 80 communities in the United States.

It is therefore understandable why the bill becomes more and more controversial with each passing year.

In the instant bill for fiscal year 1968, in round figures, there is made available for economic purposes \$2.6 billion, and for military purposes \$600 million, exclusive of Vietnam. But that is not the whole story. If we are going to take the whole story of foreign assistance, we must include what we do under Public Law 480. That is indicated to be approximately \$1.8 billion. That is for commodities, whether sold for local currencies or dollar sales, or whether they are just gratis donations.

Then we have the \$124 million for the Peace Corps to add because that also is essentially an assistance operation.

In addition, we are now subscribing to the capital stock of a good many development banks such as the International Development Association, for \$104 million, and the Inter-American Development Bank, for \$300 million.

Thus, there is a total of \$5.5 billion. Let us add to that what the Export-Import Bank does in the foreign field, in behalf of our own business confraternity, and I do not even add that, but we can see that this is quite an astronomical sum.

I thought that the committee made a rather substantial cut. I am not sure that is the entirety of the cut, or whether in both military and economic still further cuts might be made. But the cut in economic assistance was \$531 million, and in the military, \$205 million.

Some time later, I hope to say something about the guarantees which have been scaled down, both as to extent and percentagewise. I remember the years when we belabored the bill on the ground that there should be a large sector to which private enterprise could devote itself. Well, we thought we had arrived at that point. If that is true, there must be some incentive for private enterprise to do so. The risks abroad are great. There is, for instance, the danger always of expropriation of U.S. property. There could even be confiscation. There could also be harassment of enterprises as they go abroad.

Whatever it is, the directors of American business, after all, serving only their shareholders, should be able to see some incentives here. That is why the guarantee program becomes quite important.

I think I sense a rather new approach to the whole program. It has been a long time coming. I think it is here.

First, and I have alluded to it already, I remember the days when we belabored this program up one side and down the other, on the ground that the only way to get the Federal Government out of some of these programs was to swap private enterprise for them. I think that is being developed now.

We have been quite liberal when it comes to grants to countries all over the world. Long ago we should have tightened the purse strings and tried to convert these into loans rather than grants. That day, I think, is rapidly approaching.

Second, the committee report, I think, mentions that there should be commensurate self-help. There is nothing truer than that.

When nations fail properly to appreciate this aid, or fail or refuse—either one—to come through with the kind of self-help to which I think we are entitled for our largesse, then, of course, it is a closed question as to whether a country like that is deserving of our aid.

Then there is the question of indigenous capital. I have mentioned that in other years. It comes starkly home now. The committee report indicates, and I have found this documented elsewhere, that in Latin America it is reliably estimated there is some \$17 billion of indigenous capital invested beyond the borders of Latin-American countries.

One can readily guess that these funds are invested in Switzerland, Sweden, the United States, and elsewhere. But the idea of \$17 billion in Latin-American capital coming to other areas for investment, when there is such a crying need for those funds in the Latin-American countries, betokens either a lack of confidence in the stability of their countries or there may be some other reason.

But, in any event, it is something of a reflection and something of an affront upon the people highly identified with Latin-American governments that so much of that Latin-American capital should go abroad.

I was interested in an item which came to my attention about the Prime Minister of an Asian country who, upon his death only a few years back, was found to have a vast fortune invested entirely outside his own country, the country that he had served as Prime Minister. He had been catapulted into a position where he had a great voice in determining policy and giving direction to the affairs of a country, but his money he invested on the outside, doubtless because he wanted it to be secure. I think we must take account of that fact, for if they have no confidence in their own country, then why should we have confidence in such countries?

But there is still another reason why I am glad that we are now putting some emphasis on the question of population control. The figures I have seen cited would indicate that between 1960 and 1965, inclusive, the population gain in Latin America, on the average, has been about 17 percent. Oddly enough, the gain in food production has been only 10 percent.

One would think that the old theory of Malthus was coming into play, and that the population would finally outrun the capability of a country to provide subsistence for its population. We have not done much as yet in that field, and there is so much that must be done. If, as has been estimated, the world population is expected to double in the next 30 years, it is high time that major emphasis be placed upon the question of population control; in fact, that ought to be made one of the preconditions for aid from this country, otherwise the increases in the numbers of people will simply out-run whatever we can do in the field of foreign aid.

There is still another reason why I

think a new approach has suddenly made its advent. That is that there has got to be more emphasis on farm technology. I have been over the world a good deal, and I have seen the primitive ways in which the soil is tilled. The marvel is that it even produces subsistence. The people have got to be taught technology. From our standpoint, that would be infinitely cheaper than any other aid that we could possibly render. I have seen such technology by our experts in the Philippines, I have seen it in Vietnam, I have seen it in Burma, I have seen it in the Middle East, I have seen it in north Africa. Certainly, the problem is not only the theory of population control but also an improved farm technology which will assure a food supply.

But there is still another consideration. I began to see inklings of it, but not nearly enough has been done about it; that is, a reconditioning of the atmosphere and the climate in a good many countries that will invite private enterprise to enter. Not too long ago, in speaking with the president of a large corporation in New York, we were discussing the need for fertilizer in a number of countries. At that time, he mentioned to me that his company was prepared to build at least five or six plants in a certain country. The difficulty, however, was that those who gave direction to the affairs of the country insisted that they have 51 percent of the stock in each of those countries, and that they have a majority on the board of directors.

What I cannot quite imagine is the directors or the officers of a large U.S. corporation taking their stockholders' money and investing it 10,000 or 12,000 miles from home and then letting somebody else have control over how the corporation is to be managed and how the profits, if any, are to be exported back to this country for the use and benefit of the shareholders. I can understand, I suppose, the mood of the leaders in other countries who took that viewpoint, but if that is the way they feel, I doubt whether they should expect too much that the American people, who, through frugality and thrift, save their money and invest it in corporate equities, would stand idly by while those who manage those enterprises take that money and spend it abroad, without knowing full well where the control lies and how they are going to recapture their capital and profits.

There has got to be a better atmosphere and a better climate if they expect to entice private enterprise money in this country to go abroad.

I think another factor ought to be emphasized in this picture, and that is that it is high time for other countries to do a little more in the foreign assistance field. I am wondering how much France has been doing. It seems to me that if President de Gaulle wants to serve mankind and a feverish world best, instead of making a trip to this continent to stir up the people in Quebec, he might come around and suggest ways in which French money and French talents can be added to this kind of program in the name of France itself so as to alleviate some of the suffering and alleviate con-

ditions that exist in the underdeveloped and undeveloped countries. That would be equally true of Great Britain. That would be true of Canada. It would be true of the Scandinavian countries. Certainly it would be true of Germany.

I think when the President made a report some months ago he said, among other things, that he had managed to get some agreement on the part of other countries to be more helpful in this field, but, as yet, I have seen no facts or figures to indicate to what extent they are going to try to be helpful.

There is one other item that I presume I should mention, and that is the acknowledged existence of certain corrupt oligarchies in some countries in this world. I am not going to mention them. I could allude to one experience in order to prove it. It happened some years ago. When I mentioned to a Cabinet member in a given country that I thought, in view of all we had done, some of our companies were entitled to a little of the drug business, and I mentioned some of the larger pharmaceutical houses in the United States. After a very considerable discussion, he looked me right in the eye and he said, "The reason they do not get very much business is that they do not have very much to offer." I said, "What do you mean—pricewise?" "Oh, no," he said. "You forget that if I get paid at all as a Cabinet officer, I have got to find it myself." That is what I mean by corrupt oligarchies that exist in the world. And if they exist, how do the benefits of the assistance program dribble down to the people for whom our aid and assistance is intended? It just does not work. And only one force that can clean up the mess, and it is the people themselves. It is not easy, I grant you, but some effort has to be made in that direction.

One thing alarms me somewhat about foreign aid and about the attitude that we have taken. I think my own attitude has softened a little, and for a reason. There does exist what I notice has been referred to—and I think it was in the report of the National Republican Coordinating Committee—as the so-called dangerous gulf. If one tried to chart the per capita share of a person in this country, measured against the gross national product, it would amount to \$3,648. But what do you think the per capita share would be in India? It would be \$104. In Indonesia it would be \$70. That is for an entire year. In Nigeria it is \$117. In Bolivia it is \$149. The average for those countries would be \$110. That is about one-thirtieth of the per capita share of the gross national product for each person in the United States of America. Well, can that be called the dangerous gap or the dangerous gulf? One sometimes wonders how long people will put up with that low living standard before they rebel and begin a riotous course.

I think I can conclude all this, and particularly that last, with what that old patriarch Isaiah wrote on the parchments of Scripture a long time ago, when he said:

And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves and curse their king and their God, and look upward.

That is what happens to people in such countries; and there is neither competence, talent, money, nor goods enough in this country to relieve that burden upon the world, unless they exercise a large measure of self-help, and unless other countries which have some capacity for it join in the overall effort.

I believe that the hideous future that one can foresee would result from unchecked hunger, keeps people with their noses in the wind in behalf of some kind of foreign aid program.

But let it be sensible. Let it be reasonable. And let us insist that other countries share the burden with us.

Mr. President, in this connection, I have a report released today by the Republican National Committee, representing the work of a special task force on foreign relations which has been serving the Republican National Coordinating Committee. It is excellently done, and I believe the conclusions merit the consideration of all Americans.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the report entitled "Foreign Economic Assistance," published by the Republican National Coordinating Committee and released today, August 14, 1967, together with a list of the members of the Republican Coordinating Committee and a list of the members of the task force.

There being no objection, the items requested were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE *The cost of U.S. foreign assistance*

The post-war efforts of the United States Government to assist other nations of the globe are now twenty years old.

During that period—from July 1, 1946 through June 30, 1966—the United States provided more than \$117 billion to over 100 foreign nations. This aid ranged in amount from one hundred thousand dollars to the African state of Gambia to \$9.5 billion to France.) Appendix A is a listing of these expenditures since June 1, 1946.)

The foreign aid program today involves major annual expenditures of funds. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, foreign aid expenditures totaled \$3.4 billion—some 3.1 percent of the total Federal Budget. To this amount should be added the agricultural surpluses distributed abroad, loans by the U.S. Government's Export-Import Bank and the U.S. portion of funds loaned by various multilateral agencies.

The problem's magnitude

The economic gap between the United States and the developing nations is increasing every year. The per capita Gross National Product (GNP) of the United States for 1966 was \$3,648. For the same year, that of India was \$104; Indonesia \$70; Nigeria \$117; Bolivia \$149—an average of \$110 for the four. The gap: \$3,538.

The United States per capita GNP in 1960 was \$2,993; for the same other four nations it averaged \$97. The gap: \$2,896.

This gap, is thus widening from \$2,896 to \$3,538, over six years, increased by 22.2 percent.

Our GNP has gone up 21.9 percent since 1960; theirs 13.4 percent. Today, their GNP as a percentage of ours is 3.0 percent, in 1960 it was 3.3 percent. This is the situation—in spite of all the foreign aid efforts of ourselves and others.

We must recognize that neither the U.S., nor all the prospering powers of the world combined for that matter, can solve all the

world's economic problems. Such is the stark magnitude of the problem presented to the world in general, and especially to the United States as its wealthiest nation.

American attitudes toward foreign aid

Support for the principles of foreign aid, private or public, lies deep within our framework of national tradition. Americans responded to Belgium Relief in 1914, the Tokyo earthquake in 1923, and the Arno River flood of 1966 with equal alacrity.

The \$117 billion spent by the U.S. Government since 1946 speaks for itself. Just as surely, Americans recognize that serious flaws exist in our present methods, and in the response or lack of response of others to these methods. Republicans believe we should be able to buy more aid and development for much less money.

We cannot abandon the goals; we cannot continue present activities without major changes.

Republicans have always favored sensible forms of foreign aid

In many instances, American programs of assistance to foreign nations and peoples have proved enormously worthwhile; and often Republican leadership made these successes possible.

The program of relief to Europe after World War I, led by Herbert Hoover, rescued whole nations from the clutches of famine; nor have the Finns forgotten the aid directed to them under Mr. Hoover in 1940. The UNRRA program, whose first director was the former Republican Mayor of New York City, Fiorello H. La Guardia, saved millions of lives after World War II.

The Point Four and Marshall Plan programs, of prime importance in the postwar reconstruction of Europe, would never have come into existence without the approval and support of the Republican 80th Congress.

The Peace Corps and Food-for-Peace concepts were legally incorporated into our aid program by the Republican 83rd Congress under the leadership of President Eisenhower. The International Voluntary Service idea of 1953 was simply enlarged and renamed Peace Corps by the Democrats. The program of distributing agricultural surpluses abroad also began in 1953 under Public Law 480 and was merely renamed Food-for-Peace by the Democrats.

The military aid program was a major element in the alliance system fashioned under the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy.

Even the recent special emphasis status for Latin America stems from the Bogota meeting of Western Hemisphere heads of state chaired by President Eisenhower. The enabling legislation for special emphasis aid to Latin America was passed in 1960 during the Eisenhower Administration. Again the Democrats have developed no new ideas—they have simply added the name Alliance for Progress.

Thus it is clear that the Republican Party has always endorsed the *purposes* of foreign aid.

Moreover, we have always promoted *new ideas* and changes in the aid program aimed at making the large amounts of official capital spent abroad more effective.

Republicans believe that it is again time for innovation and that the *methods* used in administering the aid program today fall far short of what the people have a right to expect.

PURPOSES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

The Republican Party supports the following five purposes of foreign economic aid:

(1) *The promotion of peace, security, and stability abroad in our own national interest.*

To a peace-loving nation such as the United States, security and stability

throughout the free and the uncommitted worlds are in our national interest as well as theirs.

Where domestic economic and political frustrations pile up in the nations of these worlds, resentful leaders seek foreign enemies to explain domestic failures. Wars, near-wars, and armaments are costly—to us as well as to them. Hence, much of our aid should be directed toward cooperation in securing national security and stability. Peace is not guaranteed thereby, but the scales are weighted in its direction. Much of our aid has been and should continue to be directed toward those nations which are most likely to cooperate in building up internal order, especially when pointed toward increasing freedom and prosperity. Korea, the Republic of China, Iran, Turkey, Tunisia.

Chile will serve as examples. All of these—as with all nations which are in similar stages of development—have areas of instability, but their chances of progress toward economic and political maturity have demonstrably been aided by our cooperation. We should continue such cooperation.

Vietnam is a special case. There are many reasons for our involvement, and the search for order and stability is but one among many. It is self-evident to all of us, that if and when peace, security, and stability are attained in Vietnam, our national interest will be greatly advanced all over the world. It is also clear that in attaining such peace, security, and stability, large-scale economic and technical, as well as military, aid will be necessary.

(2) *The promotion of prosperity in other nations as an aid to prosperity at home.*

It is well known that prosperity increases trade; that most of our trade, both exports and imports, is with the prosperous nations. Of our total exports last year, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Japan and Western Europe accounted for \$13.5 billion or about two-thirds of our exports.

As nations increase in prosperity, their purchases from us likewise increase: they consume even more than they compete. For example, Japan, with a per capita income of \$93 in 1935, bought \$22.8 million from us. In 1966, with a per capita income of \$922, it bought \$2.9 billion. During the same 30 years, Mexico's figures were respectively \$61 and \$66.4 million in 1935, and \$470 and \$1.7 billion in 1966. Iran's were \$50 and \$23.3 million in 1935, and \$220 and \$83.7 million in 1966. Venezuela's were \$92 and \$125.7 million in 1935, and \$895 and \$1.1 billion in 1966.

If we can help to set the developing nations squarely on the road to prosperity, our trade with them will inevitably increase.

(3) *The attempt to narrow the dangerous gulf between the "haves" and the "have nots."*

The gap between the Gross National Products (GNP's) of the "haves" and the "have nots" is increasing dramatically. Despite all foreign aid efforts to date, the figures at the beginning of this paper indicate that the magnitude of this problem has been increasing, rather than decreasing, during the 1960's. Attempting to narrow this gap is a matter of conscience as well as sound policy.

In the event of a great disaster, our people have always been ready to respond generously. However, here we are dealing with a long-range situation in which a single gift from our wealth is not the answer. What is needed is the wise use of a portion of our growing annual increment in those situations in which a permanent gain in the productivity of the "have nots" will result. What is also needed—needed more perhaps than our money, machines, food surpluses or technical know-how—is the infusion of our economic philosophy, with its stress on freedom of opportunity and incentive, which has generated the spectacular growth in the "have" nations.

As people nurtured in the Judeo-Christian humanitarian tradition, we are impelled to help others less fortunate than ourselves. Our churches and synagogues, our schools and colleges are the strongest supporters of this approach.

(4) *The demonstration that the free world can give a more satisfying, prosperous life than Communism.*

Clearly we are anti-Communist. Clearly the Communist way of life outrages our deep love of freedom and our religious faith. Yet these great values are not universally shared in the form in which we hold them. Where corrupt governments, exploiting landowners, and greedy money-lenders are able to bleed their people, Communism has all too strong an appeal. It is for us in such circumstances to demonstrate that alternatives which include freedom as a goal can do better than either reaction or Communism. The people in the Republic of China on Taiwan are dramatically outperforming the regimented Chinese on the mainland. In scores of other developing nations—India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nigeria, Brazil—a crucial drama is being played out. If these nations fall, it should not be because we denied them assistance. Ours is an affirmative approach—to build on what there is, with our eyes fixed steadily on the end result.

(5) *The spread of cooperation and friendly partnership among freedom-loving nations.*

We must encourage other developed nations to increase their assistance to the "have nots." We should be prepared to cooperate with other "have" nations in establishing priorities and plans for large projects in developing countries. For long term aid in support of major development schemes, cooperation would be increased and U.S. costs reduced by devising consortiums composed of other non-Communist donors.

The spirit of cooperation must also be shared by those we would aid. The developing partnerships should not be viewed as being one sided, for the aided nations have much to give us while working with us for a peaceful world. They can enrich us with their culture. They can help our students overseas. Above all, they can and must take the necessary cooperative steps within their own boundaries to develop and spread the will to work with the West toward mutually beneficial goals. There are values in such partnerships which pay dividends in peace and understanding to all concerned.

PRINCIPLES AND METHODS

Discouragement and erosion of support for foreign aid have come about, not initially because of disagreement with these purposes, but because of mounting evidence of waste, misuse, and downright failure in far too many cases. It is both easy and fashionable to attack foreign aid itself because of these failures. In some instances, expectations have been too great; in still others, the recipients themselves have been largely to blame; in still others, administrative short-comings on our part are responsible. Not all of these latter are blameworthy, except in retrospect, for the foreign aid program itself was essentially a great experiment.

However, Republicans believe that the United States should attempt to improve its aid program based on the evidence deriving from past experience. Unfortunately, successive Democratic administrations have by and large failed to understand that the amazing and rapid success of the Marshall Plan could not be quickly duplicated among peoples who have not had in their history the experience of industrialization or the social conditions making for progress. Yesterday's problems in Europe are not the same as today's problems in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The disappointing results of the Alliance for Progress bear adequate tes-

timony to this—so far, people's expectations, rather than their living standards, are often the only thing which have been raised.¹

It is obvious that promises of much publicized development programs, if not fulfilled, can be positively dangerous to the fragile social structure of developing nations. Therefore, we must realize that the development methods of the late 1960's must be different in many ways from the reconstruction methods used in Europe in the late 1940's. One crucial point is that the time span involved will be far longer; recipients must be told this rather than being given glib promises about what the future can bring.

It appears that the U.S. Government is learning these things the hard way. It is no service to the objectives of foreign aid to gloss over these difficulties and failures. However, we believe that such problems will yield to diagnosis, given the necessary realism in analyzing their principal causes.

Therefore, the Republican Party attaches special importance to the following methods and principles, the failures to apply which have accounted for most of the justified criticism of aid to date. It pledges itself to their vigorous application.

(1) *No aid should be extended without commensurate self-help effort on the part of those aided.* In this connection, the following activities have been grossly underemphasized.

(a) *Community development*, enlisting the active participation of people at the village and town level. Rural cooperatives are an example, even though they challenge existing local power structures. Such power structures often involve, not only the landlords and politicians, but also the bankers and other money lenders and at times even the religious leaders. Obstacles of this character have been noticeable in nations as diverse as Turkey, India, Brazil, the Philippines.

Painfully but surely, with many mistakes but with many successes, hundreds and even thousands of communities in Latin America, Pakistan, and elsewhere are engaged in cooperative self-help. Often the least costly projects financially are among the most successful. Leadership may be local, AID., or Peace Corps. A modest knowledge of accounting is obviously necessary, but even more important is the capacity for dedicated realistic service that recognizes that permanent benefits can only arise from ultimate local responsibility.

Over-enthusiasm can bring premature multiplication of such projects, as in Peru; but in Peru also can be found some of the greatest successes. Wherever the local effort is most hopeful, aid, however modest, of a financial and technical nature should, where practicable, be forthcoming. This "grass roots" development of attitudes is far more productive in the long run future of a nation than many a grandiose project.

(b) *Utilization at home of capital funds now exported by nationals of the countries aided.* It is reliably estimated that billions, some say perhaps as much as \$17 billion, of indigenous capital is presently invested abroad by Latin American nationals. This sum may be more than the total U.S. aid to these same nations since 1945. The late Prime Minister of one of the Asian countries aided was found to have a vast fortune banked abroad at the time of his death—an amount perhaps equivalent to the total economic and military aid annually extended by us to his country.

It is not enough merely to criticize these wealthy people; nor perhaps should we pe-

¹ The Alliance's basic goal was very appropriately stated in human terms—to increase per capita income not less than 2.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. At the halfway point in 1966 only 7 of 19 countries had managed to meet this goal, and they represented slightly less than 30 percent of Latin America's total population.

nalize their rank-and-file citizens therefore. Local people often have the same fears about investing in their own economies as our capitalists have.

Inflation, instability, corruption, fears of confiscation all take their toll. On the other hand, it is neither justifiable nor possible to bail out nations which are unable or unwilling to create the necessary conditions for investment. Perhaps a combination of taxing exports of capital, joint guarantees or insurance of a substantial portion of investment at home by their governments and ours, together with quiet but persistent pressure for a slow but sure improvement of business practices and climate, may turn the tide.

(c) *Family planning.* The export of American agricultural surpluses, and even progress in international agricultural development, are often at best simply "buying time." Population increases in excess of 2.5 percent a year are likely to equal or exceed the practicable annual gains in gross national agricultural production for many nations. India, the United Arab Republic, Brazil, Indonesia will serve as examples. In Latin America the population increased 17 percent between 1960 and 1965 while their food production increased only 10 percent. Thus many countries are actually *losing ground*.

In some fashion these and other nations similarly situated must meet this problem. We can cooperate technically and financially, but only a determined effort on their part to check their population growth can really do the job. At its present rate of growth, the world's population will double in less than 30 years. No such increase in food production is in sight.

Even the United States with its diminishing grain surpluses could not meet the needs of the single nation of India at its present rate of population growth and need for more than two or three years longer.

(2) *The spread of American agricultural knowledge and techniques should be emphasized.* The great majority of the world's people are poorly nourished and the Communist system has repeatedly demonstrated it is unable to meet this challenge. As Professor Don Paarberg has said, "Agricultural capacity is an asset which we have, which our friends need and which our rivals lack." He suggests we move more decisively in attempting to help the world's hungry people by putting more emphasis on technical aid designed to exploit our agricultural technology, capabilities in fertilizers, insecticides and food processing industries, and agricultural business know-how, especially in developing credit and marketing facilities.

In this connection, we must instill in the recipients the idea that the distribution of American agricultural surpluses is an emergency, rather than a routine, measure. Where necessary they should be asked to agree to improve their own agricultural capacity as a pre-requisite for receiving Food-for-Peace shipments. All too often in the past the provision of our surplus food has interfered with market forces which otherwise would have encouraged agricultural production and has thus fostered the continuance of foolish, centralized planning—usually aimed at building uneconomic industries as in India.

(3) *We should rely more on private enterprise to encourage development abroad.* This requires a more favorable climate in the nations concerned. Threats of nationalization, confiscatory taxation, undue limitations on interest rates, general hostility to investors from other nations, and the lack of native managerial ability do not encourage the influx of private capital. We on our part must be more ready to share controls with foreign nationals, more ready to impart our skills and techniques to them so as to stimulate indigenous investment capable of competing, more willing to accept lower immediate returns in anticipation of a fair and profit-

able return over a longer period. Puerto Rico's progress under Operation Bootstrap is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when a liberal private investment climate is created in a developing area.

(4) *Special care should be taken to avoid aid being used to bolster corrupt and self-perpetuating oligarchies.* No error on our part has been more exploited by the Communists than this. There are the obvious examples, and they have been far from exceptional. Where corruption has been a way of life and where oligarchies, military and otherwise, are the general rule, the dilemma of how to reach the poor man at the bottom is a cruel one. The acid test is whether the benefits are really reaching the masses of the people in increasing measure—and are not disassociated from the United States as a source. Constant, unrelenting pressure toward reform in these matters may be labelled "interference" or "aid with strings attached," but there is no other defensible and permanent answer. Situations will increasingly arise in which aid should be reduced or completely cut off pending reform.

(5) *We should explore the economic viability of regional marketing plans which will give small developing nations wider markets for their products.* The success of the Central American Common Market illustrates possibilities for similar modest groupings in parts of Africa and elsewhere in Latin America. By extending bilateral aid to individual countries participating in such cooperatively-planned efforts, we can promote the economic viability of many of the smaller nations, at least until such time as they prove themselves willing to go beyond joint planning to closer economic or even political association.

Extending U.S. bilateral aid to a country which has agreed with its neighbors on what type of development each will undertake in order to safeguard against duplication in a small market area, such as Central America, is quite a different matter from trying to force nations together which have different aspirations and cultural backgrounds. In this connection, Republicans believe the Administration's plan, as outlined in the Korry Report, of trying to force newly independent and highly nationalistic African states into regional groupings as a pre-requisite for receiving American aid is unrealistic. Moreover, trying to give aid to an amorphous regional grouping cannot possibly garner as much credit for the U.S. as can direct bilateral aid.

Naturally we expect developing countries to place emphasis on productive efficiency so that they can quickly develop the ability to compete in world markets. They gain little by simply widening the area in which protected industries are sustained behind high tariffs or other controls.

(6) *More emphasis should be placed on projects that will visibly reach the masses of people.* Land reform accompanied by marketing cooperatives (as in Chile), land regrouping (as in the Republic of China), and collective availability of up-to-date agricultural machinery and credit are cases in point. Under such conditions, there would be encouragement to greater productivity. Simple roads to market towns, as in Panama, will often mean more than super highways. Schools, health clinics, instruction in home industries and mechanics, are further examples.

(7) *While not making aid conditional upon support for our foreign policy, aid should not ordinarily be forthcoming to (a) those nations whose heads of state (like Nasser) engage in continual intemperate abuse of the United States or (b) those nations which give military aid to our enemies in Vietnam or which engage in military aggression, or (c) those nations which, in contravention of international law, harass American citizens engaged in commerce, or confiscate American-owned property without fair compensation.*

Aid and comfort should not be given by the U.S. to those who consistently help our enemies or the enemies of other free men. Nor should aid be given to those who rattle swords or engage in aggression. If private representation to the nation's leaders does not produce results, the Voice of America, in certain instances, might make this fact clear to the people of a country.

This does not mean that like Robespierre, Hitler, or Stalin we should insist upon support of our foreign policy in all its aspects. We are dealing with independent nations and a measure of demonstrated independence from us in certain matters is often a political necessity for their leaders.

(8) *Our aid should be concentrated in countries of special importance to the United States.* A limited number of countries should receive the major portion of our aid, because (a) they are important economically in that they have an ordered timetable for eliminating the necessity of economic aid—such as Tunisia, Turkey and Iran; (b) they are important to us militarily—such as non-Communist Korea, Vietnam and Turkey; or (c) they are important politically in that our Communist rivals have failed and a new government wants help in returning to free enterprise development—such as Indonesia and Ghana. In other nations we should consider instituting small aid programs designed to demonstrate friendship and maintain a minimum presence. In these latter nations we should attempt to cooperate with the greater efforts of other developed countries. Our list of priority countries should be flexible so that new countries can be added, and hopefully so that some countries will develop to the point that they are able to dispense with our economic aid altogether. For example, the Republic of China no longer needs our economic aid, and also requires less military aid (although it must be kept in mind that termination of military aid is not controlled solely by development factors), and Turkey is approaching a similar situation.

We look forward to the eventual termination of all grants in aid and toward the time in which the normal processes of trade, production and loans will carry the burden of development.

(9) *Evidence that technical assistance is often a better stimulant to growth than large scale capital transfers should be seriously examined, particularly in light of the United States' balance of payments problem.* It is becoming increasingly apparent in foreign, as well as domestic, affairs, that attempts by the Democrats to solve problems by simply applying large amounts of tax dollars to them do not necessarily work. When aid to less developed countries was first proposed, experts stressed the need for technical aid and warned against a large scale public capital investment program. Then, as now, the absorptive capacity of developing countries was definitely limited by a lack of administrative and technical skills. Moreover, large scale grants and loans, particularly program loans which provide balance of payments support, have in many cases made it possible for recipient countries to persist in policies which discourage domestic savings and private investment (both foreign and domestic) and inhibit the development of efficient export production. Republicans believe future aid should be contingent upon the recipients pursuing policies calculated to maximize economic efficiency and the utilization of private capital and know-how.

The Administration's contention that the adverse effect on our balance of payments of capital outflow under aid programs is slight, because aid is "tied" to procurement of U.S. goods and services, is now widely recognized to be misleading. The Department of Commerce published figures in March 1967 showing that the *direct* balance of payments drain resulting from U.S. foreign aid programs in

1966 was nearly three quarters of a billion dollars. *Actually* the amount may be higher since these figures include all offsets resulting from "tied" aid. Foreign governments all too often meet requirements that they spend our aid money on purchases from the U.S. by attributing normal purchases from the U.S. to our aid disbursements.² The Administration should instruct AID to publish figures showing the true effect of foreign assistance on our balance of payments.

(10) *Special attention should be given to situations in which substantial aid is forthcoming from other nations, and in which we are asked to cooperate.* Excellent examples are the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank—both Republican ideas—and the Asian Development Bank.

(11) *We should explore with developing countries ways and means of increasing their earning capacities.* Inasmuch as many developing nations—Brazil, Colombia, Nigeria—have lost more in some years by the fall in the international price of their export commodities than they have gained by foreign aid, the worldwide stabilization of raw material prices is one possible solution which should be considered.

Another possible remedy for one-crop economies is obviously diversification. However, we should keep in mind that many countries, such as Malaysia and the Ivory Coast, have built boom economies by simply emphasizing production of the one or two crops which they produce most proficiently. At the same time, other countries, such as Indonesia and Ghana, have destroyed what should have been viable economies, based upon agricultural earnings, by trying to diversify into uneconomic industrial activity. Still others, such as India, have ignored the most basic food needs of their people in their haste to industrialize. The United States should certainly not encourage any such basically uneconomic activity.

(12) *We should realize that, while certain problems are common to all or almost all of the developing nations, each one is in many matters separate and distinct.* Generalizations—including those in this document—are dangerous. Those in the field realize the truth of this more than those in Washington. These latter attach too much importance to "uniformity."

(13) *We should strengthen the Ambassador in his role as chief of mission.* Only the very strongest considerations should be allowed to over-rule his veto; and, subject only to budgetary limitations, his affirmative recommendations should normally be accepted. His small discretionary fund of \$25,000 for self-help projects which was recently abolished, should be restored. Increased flexibility based on the sound Republican principle of decentralization (but with full accounting) will allow the Ambassador to adapt the U.S. program to the peculiarities of each different situation.

² The testimony of N. R. Danielian, President of the International Economic Policy Association before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 12, 1967 reports, "An examination of net non-military assistance and the U.S. trade balance with selected countries, which have received between 50 and 60 percent of total U.S. aid for the years 1958-1965, shows clearly that total net U.S. economic assistance exceeded our trade surpluses with these selected countries by an amount fluctuating between \$1.3 and \$1.7 billion a year." See Appendix B for the I.E.P.A. figures on the trade imbalance. Indications that "tying" often actually amounts to substitution for normal purchases is also demonstrated by the fact that our trade imbalance in 1958 with these 25 countries was \$1.8 billion and in 1965, when assistance was substantially "tied," it was \$1.6 billion, or nearly the same.

(14) *The techniques and insights of the social sciences should be brought to bear upon development problems and projects.* Social scientists in the countries concerned should aid in tackling their own problems of economics and technology. In this way their peculiar knowledge can assist in overcoming the barriers found in the existing customs of their countries which stand in the way of modernization. Tribalism in Africa, the now dwindling hacienda society in rural Latin America, certain religious traditions and practices elsewhere will serve as examples.

(15) *To insure a more effective aid program, continuous emphasis should be placed on securing qualified personnel to administer aid.* Aid should not be given unless there are really qualified personnel, both American and local nationals, available to administer it. Qualifications must include a capacity to understand the culture in which a person is to work. Without constructive competency and solid training, aid will be wasted. Many of our failures can be laid at the door of the limited number of such persons, the inadequacy of their training, and the absence of the right motivation. It is equally important that we assist developing nations to produce qualified administrators who can work with the U.S. and perhaps others in promoting growth.

(16) *Much more attention must be paid in the U.S. to the realistic evaluation of what our aid is actually accomplishing.* Both the Executive and Legislative Branches must broaden their supervision over AID and insure maximum objectivity. If the sponsoring agency under the present Administration is unwilling to be realistic in such matters, then Congress must act responsibly in giving its own time and in employing the necessary qualified staff to perform this function. This requires much more than a "fishing expedition." It should be approached constructively.

The importance of effective aid cannot be over stressed and the issues involved in improving the program are far too important for narrow partisanship. Aid is an expensive humanitarian experiment. The American people have a right to expect sound administration of their funds and solid progress as a result.

APPENDIX A

Total United States foreign assistance, by country July 1, 1946 through June 30, 1965

[Figures in millions of dollars]

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan	307.1
Ceylon	92.2
Cyprus	20.9
Greece	3,685.8
India	5,941.5
Iran	1,550.3
Iraq	102.6
Israel	1,133.1
Jordan	512.3
Lebanon	93.0
Nepal	86.1
Pakistan	2,944.9
Saudi Arabia	136.9
Syrian Arab Republic	84.0
Turkey	3,752.4
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	1,100.3
Yemen	39.1
Central Treaty Organization	52.4
Near East and south Asia regional	1,119.5
Total	22,754.4

LATIN AMERICA	
Argentina	712.9
Bolivia	435.9
Brazil	2,871.5
British Guiana	17.1
British Honduras	3.8
Chile	1,130.3
Colombia	734.7
Costa Rica	136.3
Cuba	57.6

APPENDIX A—Continued

Total United States foreign assistance, by country July 1, 1946 through June 30, 1965—Continued

[Figures in millions of dollars]

LATIN AMERICA—Continued

Dominican Republic	207.9
Ecuador	248.8
El Salvador	99.9
Guatemala	210.7
Haiti	110.6
Honduras	74.8
Jamaica	40.3
Mexico	1,055.1
Nicaragua	112.0
Panama	159.6
Paraguay	90.2
Peru	675.2
Surinam	5.0
Trinidad and Tobago	43.3
Uruguay	113.6
Venezuela	388.1
Other West Indies	3.3
ROCAP	84.1
Latin American regional	740.1

Total 10,561.7

FAR EAST

Burma	114.6
Cambodia	343.1
China	4,778.2
Hong Kong	55.7
Indochina, undistributed	1,535.2
Indonesia	875.9
Japan	4,138.7
Korea	6,315.9
Laos	418.6
Malaysia	39.1
Philippines	1,914.8
Ryukyu Islands	325.7
Thailand	442.8
Vietnam	2,383.7
Far East regional	2,723.9

Total 26,405.9

AFRICA

Algeria	163.7
Burundi	72.4
Cameroon	25.1
Central African Republic	2.8
Chad	4.2
Congo (Brazzaville)	2.4
Congo (Léopoldville)	317.4
Dahomey	8.7
Ethiopia	247.6
Gabon	4.8
Gambia	.1
Ghana	170.4
Guinea	70.2
Ivory Coast	26.0
Kenya	36.4
Liberia	237.0
Libya	217.3
Malagasy Republic	7.9
Malawi	8.7
Mali	15.8
Mauritania	2.8
Morocco	529.4
Niger	8.8
Nigeria	163.7
Rwanda	1.7
Senegal	25.0
Sierra Leone	27.2
Somali Republic	47.6
Republic of South Africa	167.4
Southern Rhodesia	7.1
Sudan	91.5
Tanzania	44.0
Togo	9.9
Tunisia	470.3
Uganda	17.3
Upper Volta	5.5
Zambia	30.2
East Africa regional	11.2
Regional, USAID/Africa	1.0
Africa regional	54.1
Total	3,354.6

APPENDIX A—Continued

Total United States foreign assistance, by country July 1, 1946 through June 30, 1965—Continued

[Figures in millions of dollars]

EUROPE	
Albania	20.4
Austria	1,257.1
Belgium-Luxembourg	2,107.3
Czechoslovakia	193.0
Denmark	933.7
East Germany	0.8
Finland	146.7
France	9,465.1
Germany (Federal Republic)	5,149.0
Berlin	131.9
Hungary	31.5
Iceland	76.4
Ireland	195.9

APPENDIX A—Continued

Total United States foreign assistance, by country July 1, 1946 through June 30, 1965—Continued

[Figures in millions of dollars]

EUROPE—Continued	
Italy	6,089.4
Netherlands	2,617.7
Norway	1,283.4
Poland	573.6
Portugal	531.1
Spain	1,908.7
Sweden	125.2
United Kingdom	9,269.8
U.S.S.R.	186.4
Yugoslavia	2,761.4
Europe regional	2,796.5
Total	47,852.0

APPENDIX A—Continued

Total United States foreign assistance, by country July 1, 1946 through June 30, 1965—Continued

[Figures in millions of dollars]

Canada	40.0
Australia	142.6
New Zealand	21.5
Trust Territory of Pacific Islands	107.4
Nonregional total	5,779.0
Total	6,090.5

Total assistance to all countries 117,019.1

(Source: Data obtained from the official Government Reports by Senator Dirksen who inserted these statistics into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, VOL. 112, PT. 12, PP. 16471-16505.

APPENDIX B

U.S. NONMILITARY FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (NET) AND TRADE BALANCES BY COUNTRIES, 1958-65

[In millions of dollars]

Countries	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964		1965	
	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²	Net economic aid ¹	U.S. trade balance ²
Afghanistan	19	-4	19	-10	13	-10	30	6	13	-8	32	-3	37	6	34	2
Bolivia	22	17	22	14	13	14	23	16	29	20	44	18	33	17	30	7
Brazil	145	-33	35	-216	42	-147	270	-68	157	-117	128	-186	212	-148	149	-183
Cambodia	37	-2	21	-7	25	24	9	20	5	20	2	7	-1	2	-23	
Ceylon	20	-5	19	-12	8	-25	9	-17	8	-19	4	-21	4	-27	4	-23
Chile	47	-7	33	-76	10	121	43	87	-24	109	-32	96	-38	104	24	
Colombia	92	-147	32	-134	-7	-54	54	-31	43	-50	69	-9	38	-35	34	-80
Ecuador	3	-9	2	-12	7	11	-4	11	11	-26	14	-11	17	-4	17	-28
India	243	63	320	129	523	412	370	230	528	411	736	509	864	651	849	580
Indonesia	24	-112	17	-123	45	-132	54	-29	88	-15	77	-7	32	-102	-4	-123
Jordan	57	10	60	16	62	17	61	24	53	20	54	37	45	20	37	19
Korea	311	213	232	131	261	148	228	155	233	204	231	211	157	169	165	149
Laos	30	2	35	3	33	1	51	2	30	4	31	6	39	7	58	8
Liberia	8	14	9	59	8	-4	19	17	35	20	11	4	12	-13	25	-11
Malaysia	(*)	-85	(*)	-150	1	-138	2	-126	12	-155	6	-150	2	-82	4	-123
Morocco	26	33	45	29	61	29	97	55	48	42	53	49	38	31	51	49
Nepal	6	(*)	3	(*)	8	(*)	10	(*)	9	(*)	14	(*)	17	(*)	16	1
Pakistan	145	81	142	65	229	131	218	158	322	243	378	341	377	336	348	291
Philippines	42	18	24	-36	24	-10	11	17	24	-59	8	-34	49	-27	45	-34
Poland	99	75	66	43	127	111	57	34	60	48	46	66	52	84	-6	-31
Thailand	30	-4	48	-28	42	11	29	25	31	32	29	57	18	58	25	67
Tunisia	26	4	30	7	55	21	77	38	53	44	38	25	45	31	54	39
Turkey	122	72	111	44	101	66	153	69	202	106	173	154	126	96	132	81
Vietnam	204	57	168	46	186	48	144	62	148	101	189	114	221	131	300	187
Yemen	(*)	5	(*)	5	(*)	6	(*)	6	(*)	8	(*)	6	(*)	5	(*)	
Total	1,758	251	1,498	-218	1,882	478	2,129	685	2,250	827	2,512	1,140	2,544	1,160	2,478	868

¹ Disbursements less repayments.

² Exports and imports, f.o.b.; includes U.S. exports financed by military grants and credits.

³ Less than \$500,000.

⁴ Not available.

⁵ Not statistically significant.

Sources: International Monetary Fund, Direction of Trade, Annual 1958-62, pp. 128-130; March 1965, pp. 63-64; Annual 1961-65, p. 285; National Advisory Council, Semiannual Report to the President and Congress, January-June 1964, pp. 75-77; U.S. Department of Commerce, Foreign Grants and Credits (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964 and 1965).

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Presiding Officer: Ray C. Bliss, Chairman, Republican National Committee.

FORMER PRESIDENT

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 300 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

FORMER PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Barry Goldwater, Post Office Box 1601, Scottsdale, Arizona (1964).

Richard M. Nixon; Nixon, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander, 20 Broad Street, New York, New York (1960).

Thomas E. Dewey, 40 Wall Street, New York, New York (1944 and 1948).

Alf M. Landon, National Bank of Topeka Building, 1001 Fillmore Street, Topeka, Kansas (1936).

SENATE LEADERSHIP

Everett M. Dirksen, Minority Leader. Thomas H. Kuchel, Minority Whip.

Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

Margaret Chase Smith, Chairman, Republican Conference.

George Murphy, Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Comm.

Milton R. Young, Secretary, Republican Conference.

Hugh Scott, Vice Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Comm.

HOUSE LEADERSHIP

Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader.

Leslie C. Arends, Minority Whip.

Melvin R. Laird, Chairman, Republican Conference.

John J. Rhodes, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

H. Allen Smith, Ranking Member of Rules Committee.

Bob Wilson, Chairman, National Republican Congressional Comm.

Charles E. Goodell, Chairman, Planning and Research Committee.

Richard H. Poff, Secretary, Republican Conference.

William C. Cramer, Vice Chairman, Republican Conference.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION

John A. Love, Governor of the State of Colorado, Denver, Colorado.

John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.

George W. Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, Lansing, Michigan.

Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, Albany, New York.

Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island, Providence, Rhode Island.

Nils A. Boe, Governor of the State of South Dakota, Pierre, South Dakota.

Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington, Olympia, Washington.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Ray C. Bliss, Chairman, Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. C. Wayland Brooks, Assistant Chrmn., Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Collis P. Moore, Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, Box 225, Moro, Oregon.

Donald R. Ross, Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, 1406 Kiewit Plaza, Farnam at 36th, Omaha, Nebraska.

Mrs. J. Willard Marriott, Vice Chrmn., Republican National Committee, 4500 Garfield Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

J. Drake Edens, Jr., Vice Chairman, Repub-

ican National Committee, Post Office Box 9385, Columbia, South Carolina.

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLICAN STATE LEGISLATORS ASSOCIATION

F. (Monte) Montgomery, Speaker of the House of Representatives, State of Oregon, Salem, Oregon.

STAFF COORDINATOR

Robert L. L. McCormick.

MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE'S TASK FORCE ON THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Robert C. Hill, Chairman, United States Ambassador to Mexico, 1957-1961.

David N. Rowe, Vice Chairman, Professor of Political Science, Yale University.

Gordon Allott, United States Senator from Colorado.

Robert Amory, Jr., Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, 1952-1962.

John B. Anderson, Member of Congress from Illinois.

Tim M. Babcock, Governor of the State of Montana.

Frances P. Bolton, Member of Congress from Ohio.

Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of United States Naval Operations, 1955-1961.

Lucius D. Clay, General of the United States Army, Retired.

Philip K. Crowe, United States Ambassador to Union of South Africa, 1959-1961.

Joseph S. Farland, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, 1960-1963.

Paul Findley, Member of Congress from Illinois.

Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Member of Congress from New Jersey.

Ernest S. Griffith, Dean, School of International Service, American University, 1958-1965.

Mrs. Cecil M. Harden, Republican National Committeewoman for Indiana.

Joe Holt, Member of Congress from California, 1953-1959.

Walter A. Judd, Member of Congress from Minnesota, 1943-1963.

John D. Lodge, United States Ambassador to Spain, 1955-1961.

Gerhart Niemeyer, Professor of Political Science, University of Notre Dame.

Nicholas Nyaradi, Director of School of International Studies, Bradley University.

Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, 1957-1958.

G. L. Ohrstrom, Jr., Investment Banker.

William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1963-1967.

Richard B. Sellars, Republican National Committeeman for New Jersey.

Robert Strausz-Hupé, Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Kent B. Crane, Secretary to the Task Force.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hollings in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I did not agree with all the decisions of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that my individual views be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. COOPER

I am filing my individual views on S. 1872, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, as I did not support in the committee and do not now support certain decisions made by the committee. In this statement I shall emphasize only two subjects that I believe deserve the most careful consideration of the Senate.

Changes and emergencies are constantly occurring which affect our relationships with other countries and our national security. If the Congress considers foreign assistance a worthwhile instrument of our foreign policy, then it ought to provide the President some flexibility for its effective conduct.

I disagree, therefore, with the decision of the committee to fix an exact limit upon the number of countries to which economic assistance can be extended under the development loan, technical assistance, and supporting assistance programs.

The amendment adopted by the committee would limit assistance for development loans to 15 countries, for technical assistance to 10 countries, and for supporting assistance to 10 countries. The amendment provides that if the President determines that assistance should be extended to additional countries in the national interest, he could do so until his request is approved by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. The language is as follows:

"Such loans (assistance) may be made in any additional country if, following submission of a report by the President to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives detailing the justification for the making of loans (assistance) in such additional country during such fiscal year, the Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution stating in effect its approval of the making of such loans (assistance) in such country."

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 also fixed limits on the number of countries in the three above categories of economic assistance of 10, 40, and 10, respectively.

But it did provide the President could extend assistance to an additional number of countries by a procedure of reporting to the Congress, if "at least thirty days shall have elapsed following the submission by the President to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of a report stating that the making of loans in such additional country during such fiscal year is in the national interest and giving his reasons therefor."

Acting under this authority the President extended assistance in fiscal year 1967 to additional countries—19 for development loans, eight for technical assistance, and seven for supporting assistance. The committee considered that these increases were not justified, repealed the above authority, and substituted for it the language I have quoted earlier requiring a concurrent resolution of the Congress before assistance to additional countries could be approved by the President.

I believe the amendment adopted by the committee is too rigid. I offered in the committee an amendment which provided for the same primary limits of countries to be aided as the committee amendment—15, 40, and 10, respectively, in the categories of development loans, technical assistance, and supporting assistance. My amendment would maintain the present authority of the President. If the President determined it necessary in the national interest to extend aid to an additional country—not exceeding two in number for development loans, and nine (including seven self-help amounts to Africa) in number for technical aid—he could do so 30 days after submitting a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Speaker of the House—under the authority now available under existing law. The additional number of countries represents those

which the Agency for International Development stated it believes would require assistance.

My amendment would meet an objective of the Congress to limit aid to those countries which will need assistance, and which meet the criteria of self-help established in the Foreign Assistance Act. At the same time it would give to the President the discretion which he needs if the foreign assistance program is to be effective in the conduct of foreign policy.

I point out that my amendment would not increase the funds which may be authorized and appropriated by the Congress.

I disagree with the committee's reductions in the authorization of funds for the Alliance for Progress and for the program of technical assistance.

The authorization requested for the Alliance for Progress is \$750 million for fiscal year 1968. The committee reduced the authorization to \$578 million.

The Alliance for Progress has been supported by three administrations and by the Congress. It has been expected that through the joint efforts of the countries of Latin America and the United States, with the Latin American States employing maximum efforts of self-help and proceeding gradually toward economic integration, that their countries would be able to institute reforms and advance the living standards of their people.

The statement of Secretary of State Rusk before the committee regarding the progress of the Alliance is a modest statement:

"The Alliance is taking hold. Most Latin American nations are making healthy strides toward stability and future self-sufficiency. In all but a few, governments are now working to meet the needs of all the people. Much has been done to improve tax structures and tax administration, to fight inflation, and to strengthen institutions required for more productive private enterprise. A start has been made to expand educational and health facilities, and a number of countries have instituted far-ranging agricultural and land reforms. Of course, much remains to be done."

The economic and social progress of the Latin American States is important to them, and it is also important to the interests of the United States and the security of the Western Hemisphere. The United States should continue to give its full cooperation, assistance and leadership to the Alliance for Progress.

Finally, I disagree with the committee's recommendation that there be cuts in the technical assistance program. The technical assistance program is the foundation of our efforts to help other nations build sound economies, constructive social structures, and political systems with democratic values. The technical assistance program is the present-day descendant of the old point 4 program begun under President Truman. In the years since point 4 began, it has been the program of widest acceptance, and its worth has been proven again and again. It aims to strengthen the essentials necessary for development. It aims to improve agriculture, for it is essential that a country must be able to feed its people. It aims to better the health of their people, for a diseased, sickly and weak people cannot work to improve their nation. Technical assistance programs have eradicated malaria throughout the world. It has done much to reduce the ravages of many of the endemic diseases so prevalent in the less fortunate countries of the world. Technical assistance is crucial to the successful carrying out of population programs which are such a vital factor in national development. Technical assistance aims at improving education, for without education an enlightened government is not possible. Technical assistance aims at improving the administration of government and their fiscal policies, for without sound government administration dedicated

to the principle of improving the lot of its people, development is not possible. This valuable and basic work must continue.

I urge that the technical assistance appropriation requested by the administration be fully restored because it is the bedrock of our aid efforts.

The war in Vietnam, its cost, and difficult domestic and fiscal problems at home claim our attention and first interest. But it is of great importance that the United States continue to emphasize this peaceful and constructive effort for an orderly world and for its national interest and security—its foreign assistance program.

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 217 Leg.]

Anderson	Gore	Mansfield
Baker	Griffin	Metcalf
Bartlett	Gruening	Montoya
Bayh	Hansen	Morse
Boggs	Hill	Scott
Burdick	Holland	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Talmadge
Church	Inouye	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Jackson	Yarborough
Ellender	Lausche	
Fulbright	Magnuson	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott	Hruska	Pearson
Bennett	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Brooke	Jordan, Idaho	Percy
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Protrout
Case	Kuchel	Proxmire
Cotton	Long, La.	Randolph
Dirksen	McClellan	Russell
Dominick	Miller	Smith
Ervin	Mondale	Sparkman
Fong	Monroney	Spong
Harris	Morton	Symington
Hart	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Muskie	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT NO. 260

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in a moment or two, an amendment will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], which is co-sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. I believe there will be other cosponsors as well.

The amendment is here. It is cosponsored by Mr. TOWER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS. I think the amendment is in form. I believe, for the information of the Senate, I might just as well send it to the desk and have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 50, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17, and insert in lieu thereof "strike out 'section 508' and substitute 'section 526'".

On page 50, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 5 on page 52, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(h) Add the following new sections after the new section 523:

"SEC. 524. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR CREDIT SALES.—(a) The President may use funds available under this part to finance sales of defense articles and defense services to any friendly foreign country or international organization on such terms and conditions as he may determine.

"(b) In carrying out this section, the President may—

"(1) acquire defense articles and defense services from any source for sale by the United States Government to purchasing countries or international organizations;

"(2) make disbursements on behalf of purchasing countries or international organizations for defense articles and defense services procured directly from suppliers by purchasing countries or international organizations upon agreement of the purchasing countries or international organizations to reimburse the United States Government; or

"(3) purchase from suppliers any instruments evidencing indebtedness issued by purchasing countries or international organizations as security for payments due for defense articles and defense services procured directly from suppliers by purchasing countries or international organizations, and dispose of any such instruments in accordance with section 635(g).

"SEC. 525. GUARANTEES.—The President may guarantee, insure, coinsure, and reinsurance any individual, corporation, partnership, or other association doing business in the United States against political and credit risks of nonpayment arising in connection with credit sales financed by such individual, corporation, partnership or other association for defense articles and defense

services procured in the United States by any friendly country or international organization.

"(b) In issuing guarantees, insurance, co-insurance, and reinsurance, the President may enter into contracts with exporters, insurance companies, financial institutions, or others, or groups thereof, and where appropriate may employ any of the same to act as agent in the issuance and servicing of such guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, and the adjustment of claims arising thereunder. Fees and premiums shall be charged in connection with contracts of guaranty, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance (excluding contracts with any agency of the United States Government). Obligations shall be recorded against the funds available for credit sales under this part in an amount not less than 25 per centum of the contractual liability related to any guaranty, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this part and the funds so obligated together with fees and premiums shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims under such contracts. Any guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this part shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America."

"(1) Section 508, which relates to reimbursements, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 503 is redesignated as section 526.

"(2) In such new section 526, strike out 'furnish military assistance on cash or credit terms' and substitute 'finance sales'."

Renumber the following subsections of section 201 of the bill, accordingly.

On page 54, line 14, strike out the word "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections".

On page 55, line 4, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 55, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

"(c) In order to assure that the programs authorized by this chapter do not encourage military expenditures by less developed friendly countries which impair their economic development or which increase arms races among such countries, no credit sale to a less developed friendly country shall be made under the provisions of section 524 and no guarantee of a credit sale to a less developed friendly country shall be issued under the provisions of section 525 unless such credit sale or guarantee has been approved in advance by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. In no event shall the aggregate net amount outstanding at any time of liabilities and obligations of the United States arising out of any such credit sales and guarantees of credit sales to less developed friendly countries be more than \$300,000,000 in excess of the aggregate net amount outstanding on July 1, 1967. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'less developed' countries shall mean those countries designated by the President as economically less developed for the purposes of the Interest Equalization Tax. The Secretary of State shall submit quarterly reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the implementation of this subsection."

On page 62, line 6, immediately after "635" insert "(e)".

On page 62, strike out line 7.

On page 62, line 8, strike out "(1) Subsection (e) is".

On page 62, strike out lines 17 and 18.

On page 63, lines 14 and 15, strike out "or the guaranty of a sale".

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is sound sense, in the matter of military sales and grant aid, not to unduly tie the hands of the President. I believe that

the pending bill, proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee, is too restrictive and that it would dangerously impede the President in the conduct of our foreign and defense policy.

In particular, this bill, in its present form, would gravely imperil our chances of conducting a wise policy in two critical areas, the battleground of Southeast Asia and the still dangerous Middle East. In the Middle East, for example, the Soviet Union is deliberately using military assistance and sales to destabilize the already delicate political-military balance and so again put Israel in mortal peril. Why should we tie Uncle Sam's hands behind his back so that he cannot help Israel as needed or other less developed nations in that area which it may prove in our national interest, and the interest of Israel, to assist?

Mr. President, this pending bill cannot be taken lightly by anyone interested in our own national security.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised the chairman of the Armed Services Committee by letter on Friday that the Joint Chiefs view with grave concern the reduction of the military assistance portion of the Foreign Assistance Act by \$205 million, and termination of the provisions for credit sales, which would, in their judgment, raise world tensions rather than reduce them.

The Joint Chiefs noted that the cut approved by the Foreign Relations Committee represented almost 30 percent of the proposed program and would have the extremely undesirable effect of negating to a large degree the progress which has been made in the past years in helping to build up free world military forces.

In particular, the Joint Chiefs pointed out:

Since a great majority, approximately 75%, of the funds requested are for the 5 countries on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet Bloc . . . the program for these countries would naturally be most seriously affected. If we are to maintain the integrity of the Korean Armed Forces whose 45,600 troops are making a sizeable contribution in South Vietnam, the other 4 front-line countries must absorb cuts of up to one-third of the proposed programs, and modernization of any equipment would be virtually halted.

The Joint Chiefs also observed in that letter:

Our military capability is not limitless and the equivalent dollar applied for U.S. Forces does not provide the same return for U.S. security as does the same amount applied to maintain the present collective free world defense position. Further, a weakening of that position might be misunderstood by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China as an unwillingness by the U.S. to stand firm. This could invite new probes, increased support of subversion and possibly even open aggression.

Not only does the pending Foreign Relations Committee bill reduce the total grant authority for military assistance by \$205 million, but the action taken by the committee on credit sales makes substitution of that means impossible.

It has been alluded that there are many ways remaining for credit sales, but this is not true.

First, the act repeals all authority to

make credit sales from new production which constitutes 90 percent or more of the program.

Second, it repeals the authority to guarantee credit by private banks or the Export-Import Bank.

Third, it transfers all assets of the act to the Treasury after December 31, 1967.

Fourth, it repeals authority after that date for the executive branch to receive disbursements which come due under past sales, and

Finally, it even repeals authority for the DOD to transfer collections from past sales to the Export-Import Bank or other banks in repayment of disbursements made by those banks.

The facts of the matter are that the remaining provisions allow us essentially only to give the material away under grant programs or sell it on a straight cash basis and on top of that the grant aid amount would be slashed to the extent that the lack of funds and provisions for credit availability would in the opinion of the JCS only contribute to raising world tensions rather than reducing them.

According to the report filed by the Foreign Relations Committee, the credit sales and guaranty authority is not needed for the less developed countries because there is still the legal authority to provide them the arms they need for internal security and self defense by doing so on a grant basis. It is evident that the committee did not vote an outright repeal of the authority to make such grants—but they did effectively emasculate that authority by denying the funds needed to meet legitimate requirements of these countries.

The committee report also contends that underdeveloped nations could utilize the credit facilities of the Export-Import Bank, "if" they can meet the Bank's requirements, and that private bank credit "may" be available to some of these countries, such as Israel. The need to use the words "if" and "may" demonstrates the very shaky foundation of this contention. We already know from last week's debates in Congress on the Export-Import Bank bill that such credit is not, in fact, available without a guaranty of repayment by the Department of Defense.

The committee report also argues that there is still authority under the committee's bill to sell from DOD stocks on up to 3-year credit. This argument ignores the fact that the time has long since passed when the military departments had excess quantities of stocks which could be furnished to foreign countries and that 90 percent of the items sold today to foreign countries come from new production.

In 1963, the Congress added a new subsection (c) to section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which calls upon the President to regularly reduce and terminate all further grants of military equipment and supplies to any country having sufficient wealth to enable it to maintain and equip its own military forces without undue burden to its economy. The President has been fully complying with this mandate, but the bill reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee would, without repealing this

Congressional policy, deny him the means for executing it.

It may be that the committee has reason to question whether in some cases credit sales were made to less developed countries without undue burden to their economies, as required by section 506(c). If so, the remedy is surely not to end all credit sales to all countries but more effective legislative oversight of these transactions and a new statutory limitation on the amount of such sales and on the administrative level at which decisions to make sales are made.

The pending amendment under the cosponsorship of myself, and Senators TOWER, HICKENLOOPER, JAVITS, SPARKMAN, and STENNIS, would accomplish the following:

First, it would reinstate in the bill the following authorities relating to sales which were deleted by the committee: (a) the authority to make credit sales of new production items; (b) the authority to guarantee credit sales financed by private banks and the Export-Import Bank; (c) the authority to continue using the credit sales revolving fund; and (d) the authority to sell to private banks and the Export-Import Bank promissory notes issued by foreign countries as security for defense articles and defense services purchased from the DOD on credit terms.

Second, it would place a limitation on credit sales to less developed countries, comparable to the limitation approved by the Senate last week with respect to the activities of the Export-Import Bank. This limitation has four features: First, no credit sale or guarantee of a credit sale to a less-developed country could be made unless it has been approved in advance by the Secretaries of State and Defense; second, in no event may the aggregate net amount outstanding at any time of liabilities and obligations arising out of credit sales and guarantees of credit sales to less-developed countries be more than \$300 million in excess of the aggregate net amount outstanding at the beginning of this fiscal year; third, the term "less developed" countries is defined to mean those countries designated by the President as less developed for the purposes of the interest equalization tax; and fourth, quarterly reports are required to be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of State on the implementation of this limitation.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment is indeed in the national interest. Certainly, all Senators favor arms control and arms limitation and would prefer a world in which arms assistance and sales were unnecessary. But, Mr. President, we live in a dangerous world, where other powers, in pursuit of their interests, are engaged in serious mischief. The statesmen of the free world must never ease up on their search for sound and safe arrangements mutually to de-escalate arms assistance and sales—arrangements with which we and our friends and allies can safely live. But these arrangements have to be negotiated and worked out with the Soviet Union and with other Communist states. Does it make sense to make drastic unilateral cutbacks in our bargaining power

before the hard bargaining for mutually acceptable arrangements has even begun?

I do not see, Mr. President, how the United States can improve its basic bargaining position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and other Communist powers by weakening it—unilaterally.

Mr. President, in connection with these remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of the letter from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee dated August 11, 1967, from which I have quoted, together with a section-by-section analysis of my amendment.

There being no objection, the items requested were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Joint Chiefs of Staff view with grave concern the recent action of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reducing the military assistance portion of the Foreign Assistance Act by \$205 million and are hopeful that most of this amount can be restored on the floor prior to final action by the Senate. This reduction represents almost 30 percent of the proposed program and will have the extremely undesirable effect of negating, to a large degree, the progress which has been made in the past years in building up free world military forces. Since a great majority, approximately 75 percent, of the funds requested are for the five countries on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet Bloc—Greece, Turkey, Iran, China, and Korea—the program for these countries would naturally be most seriously affected. If we are to maintain the integrity of the Korean Armed Forces whose 45,600 troops are making a sizeable contribution in South Vietnam, the other four front-line countries must absorb cuts of up to one-third of the proposed programs, and modernization of any equipment would be virtually halted. Internal security and civic action assistance to Indonesia, the Philippines, and Latin American nations will have to be curtailed and little or no funds will remain for countries where important bases essential to our security exist such as Spain, Ethiopia, Libya, and Morocco.

To date, cooperative effort and joint commitment by allied and friendly nations have created a free world military posture which represents a total strength far greater than the strength of any single nation. Our military capability is not limitless and the equivalent dollar applied for U.S. Forces does not provide the same return for U.S. security as does the same amount applied to maintain the present collective free world defensive position. Further, a weakening of that position might be misunderstood by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China as an unwillingness by the United States to stand firm. This could invite new probes, increased support of subversion and possibly even open aggression.

In addition to the above, termination of the provisions for insuring sales financed by private credit sources will destroy the sales program of defense articles, except on a cash and carry basis. This could have a destabilizing effect as the control exercised by a careful approval of sales to these nations will have terminated and they will either look elsewhere, primarily the Soviet Bloc, for their requirements, or utilize resources which should be applied to their own economic development.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that the

serious reduction of military aid caused by the lack of funds and provision for credit availability for allied and friendly countries would thus raise world tensions rather than reduce them. To further reduce our already austere assistance program will weaken our collective defense and be an invitation to any adversary to occupy the power vacuum which would result.

Sincerely,

EARL G. WHEELER,
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF JACKSON-TOWER AMENDMENT TO S. 1872

The amendment to page 50, lines 15-17, is a technical change which restores the existing reference in redesignated Section 523 to the Military Credit Sales Revolving Fund.

The amendment to page 50, beginning with line 20, through line 5 on page 52, reinstates the general authority to make credit sales and to guarantee credit sales and strikes out the Committee's language repealing the Military Credit Sales Revolving Fund.

The general authority to make credit sales would become Section 524 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. The language of Subsections (a) and (b)(1) of Section 524 is taken from Section 503(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act. Subsection (b)(2) is also existing authority, and is taken from Section 632(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act. Subsection (b)(3) is new language requested by the Executive Branch and not now in the Foreign Assistance Act. It authorizes the purchase of promissory notes issued by a foreign country to a commercial supplier which has sold defense articles and services directly to the country. In some cases, friendly foreign governments may, for political or economic reasons, desire to deal directly with the U.S. private supplier or lending institution rather than with U.S. Government agencies. This new authority—like the existing sales authority—would be used only when it is in the U.S. national interest that such sales be made. Under this subsection, the Department of Defense would, with respect to approved sales, arrange in advance with U.S. suppliers to acquire from them promissory notes issued by foreign countries and either hold these or dispose of them, in whole or in part, to appropriate financial institutions. It should be noted that enactment of this subsection would not have the effect of increasing the funds available for financing credit sales or the total volume of sales which could legally be financed by such funds; it would only provide an additional optional means of utilizing available funds to carry out approved programs for the assumption by friendly countries of a larger share of the burden of their own defense.

The authorities relating to guarantees would become Section 525 of the Foreign Assistance Act. The language of Subsection (a) of Section 525 comes from Section 503 (e) of the Foreign Assistance Act, and the language of Subsection (b) of Section 525 comes from Section 509 (b) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

The language of the amendment relating to the Military Credit Sales Revolving Fund effects two technical amendments. The section number of the Revolving Fund, which is now Section 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act, is redesignated as Section 526, and the words "finance sales" are substituted for the words "furnish military assistance on cash or credit terms" which now appear in that section. The latter change simply conforms the language of the section to the changes made elsewhere in the Bill to distinguish between grant aid and sales.

The amendments to page 54, line 14, and page 55, line 4, are technical drafting changes to conform the Bill to the insert made on page 55 between lines 4 and 5. The insert adds several provisions imposing a limitation on credit sales and guarantees of credit sales

to less developed countries. No such transactions may be consummated unless they have been approved in advance by the Secretaries of State and Defense. Second, a dollar ceiling is imposed on the total net amount of such transactions which may be outstanding at any time. Third, the term "less developed" countries is defined as meaning those countries designated by the President as economically less developed for the purposes of the interest equalization tax. A list of the developed countries for purposes of that tax was printed in the Congressional Record of August 9, 1967 during the debates on the Export-Import Bank Bill (page 22097). Fourth, quarterly reports are required to be submitted by the Secretary of State to the Congress on implementation of this limitation.

The amendments to page 62, lines 6-8, are technical drafting amendments to conform the Bill to the amendment made to page 62, lines 17 and 18. The amendment to page 62, lines 17 and 18, reinstates the existing authority of the Department of Defense under section 635(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act to sell promissory notes received by DOD under credit sales agreements to private banks and to the Export-Import Bank.

The amendment to page 63, lines 14 and 15, is a technical conforming amendment, reinstating in Section 640 of the Foreign Assistance Act the reference to guarantees which had been stricken out by the Foreign Relations Committee to conform with its deletion of the authority to make guarantees.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator call up his amendment at this time?

MR. JACKSON. Yes. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 260, and also ask unanimous consent that the additional cosponsors previously named be permitted to join with me on the pending amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment not be read again.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT DISCLOSES THAT GRAVITY METERS HAVE BEEN SHIPPED TO BLOC SITE

MR. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not rise to comment on the pending amendment because it has not yet been printed, and it is far too comprehensive and detailed and far-reaching for the Senator from South Dakota to pass any judgment on something of that significance without at least having a chance to read the amendment.

I do rise, however, to call the attention of the Senate to a situation which has developed which provides another frustrating and frightening development from the standpoint of demonstrating the continuing program of this administration to try to strengthen the economy and the military capacity of the Soviet bloc at the very time that the weapons shipped from the Soviet bloc to Communist nations have become responsible for a continuation of the war in Vietnam.

MR. PRESIDENT, I call attention to the fact that the Commerce Department in a communication to me last week, dated August 8, 1967, written in reply to an

earlier letter which I addressed to the Commerce Department, has admitted that two Worden gravity meters, comparable to the one being sought by Poland, and denied, were released for export to Rumania as long ago as July 23, 1965. Because of the widespread interest and the strategic significance of these instruments, I ask unanimous consent that copies of this revealing correspondence be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The first is a letter which I sent to Acting Assistant Secretary McQuade on July 29, 1967, raising the question after it occurred to me that some of the devious language appearing in earlier correspondence from the same department might indicate that there was something more there that might not meet the eye. So I raised the question of whether there had been previous shipments of this highly significant instrument to the Soviet Bloc.

The second letter is from Acting Assistant Secretary McQuade to me under date of August 8, 1967, confirming the fact that these shipments had been made.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 29, 1967.

Mr. LAWRENCE C. MCQUADE,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Domestic and
International Business, Department of
Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCQUADE: This is in further regard to our exchange of correspondence of June 6, 1967 and July 3, 1967, regarding the export approval of the Worden gravimeter.

First of all, it was most gratifying to learn that the sale had been cancelled. It would have been far more reassuring, however, if your information release of July 21, 1967 had resolved the issue once and for all. As it stands, I cannot reconcile the rationale advanced in the release with the explanation given in your earlier letter of July 3, 1967 in which it was clearly stated that the license approval of February 1, 1967 had been withdrawn based on information supplied by intelligence sources.

Since it appears that the Department will favorably receive future applications for the export of gravimeters, it occurs to me that there may have been precedent, that is earlier, shipments of gravimeters to Bloc countries. If this should be the case, I would appreciate receiving detailed information concerning the date the license was approved, the shipping destination, and the reading accuracy of the instruments exported.

Sincerely yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., August 8, 1967.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: This is in response to your letter of July 29, 1967, commenting further about the license for the export of a Worden gravity meter to Poland. In your recent letter you state that you cannot reconcile the rationale advanced in the Department's release of July 18, 1967, with the explanation provided in our earlier letter. You also request information about possible earlier shipments of gravity meters to the Communist countries.

In our letter to you of June 13, Mr. Meyer stated that the Office of Export Control on

February 16, 1967, had requested the applicant to return his license so that the approval action could be reconsidered in the light of the intelligence information provided. Neither at that time nor at any time since did we cancel the license because of the intelligence received. Cancellation occurred on July 14, 1967, at the request of the applicant. Our conclusion in the July 18 release that the issuance of a license against the subject application appeared appropriate has not been altered. For gravity meters of the Worden type or equivalent for use over land areas, approval employing the rationale of the release may be indicated. Approval of airborne gravity meters or those for use in sea areas would, of course, be quite unlikely at this time.

The following is in response to your inquiry about previous shipments of gravity meters to Communist countries. On January 31, 1962, the Department, after the usual consultation with other interested agencies, denied to Poland a Worden gravity meter of the same capability as the one presently under discussion. At that time our technical staff did not consider the Canadian or other foreign produced instruments to be comparable to the Worden meter. On July 23, 1965, however, two Worden gravity meters of a quality comparable to the subject meter were authorized for shipment to Rumania for petroleum exploration, an end-use reasonable for Rumania. Authorization was granted by the Secretary of Commerce only after approval was concurred in by other agencies. By mid-1965 the Canadian manufactured gravity meter was adjudged by government technicians to be comparable to the Worden meter. Further in support of our rationale that approval was the indicated action was the fact that the Rumanians prior to 1965 had provided assurances against the reexport of any United States equipment received by them. No other gravity meters have been licensed to Eastern Europe including the USSR.

Yours sincerely,

LAWRENCE C. MCQUADE,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Domestic
and International Business.

MR. MUNDT: Mr. President, it is very disheartening to learn that our earlier relief over the cancellation of the Worden meter for Poland has turned out to be unjustified due to other such sales which we were unable to stop because they were made before we knew anything about the fact that the negotiations for the sale were pending.

Unfortunately, one bloc country, Rumania, has had in its possession for some 2 years an instrument which the Commerce Department has acknowledged can be used to calibrate the acceleration of the inertial guidance system and to prepare a network of gravity information for trajectory improvement. As I have said before, in view of the importance this instrument has to missilery and its wartime application, I cannot understand how anyone in our administration can find it appropriate to classify this instrument as nonstrategic. Except by classifying it as nonstrategic, it would be impossible, of course, to ship this instrument under the Export Control Act.

My fellow Senators, I would hope that this example will fortify a groundswell of support for my measure, S. 2098, which calls for a total embargo on shipments to Communist countries supporting North Vietnam in its war against the United States and South Vietnam.

It seems to me, by the very nature of what is now being classified as non-

strategic, that it should be apparent that many of these items are of not only indirect but also direct utilization to the Soviet bloc in its desire to bring victory to North Vietnam by supplying it with the sophisticated weapons that it needs to continue the war.

One would think that the debates and the rollcall votes of last week in this Chamber, revolving as they did around the same issue and the Senate-expressed opposition to such trading with the enemy by both its votes and its expressed record of dissent, would have some meaning to those operating these policies from the other end of the avenue. But, it is now clear that the Executive determination and flexibility in the law is being abused to the disservice of the national interest. The Senate must continue to take action in opposition against further aid to our enemy in this tragic time of war.

It is apparent from the record that the administration of the Export-Import Bank by this administration at this hour of war is inadequate to protect America and is working in the interest of the enemy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPT. REY D. BALDWIN

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 95.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 95) for the relief of Capt. Rey D. Baldwin which was, on page 2, after line 8, insert:

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

August 14, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22565

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after discussing the matter with Senators interested in the pending amendment, I ask unanimous consent that beginning not later than 1 o'clock tomorrow the time be equally divided between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] on the pending amendment, and that a vote occur on that amendment at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That during the further consideration of S. 1872, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, the Senate proceed to vote at 2 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, August 15, 1967, on amendment No. 260, offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], for himself and others.

Provided, That beginning not later than 1 o'clock p.m. on that date the time for debate on the said amendment be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the pending amendment the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] addressed a letter to me which I received today at 1:30 p.m. The Senator from Texas has been unavoidably detained but will be in the Senate Chamber, probably about 5 o'clock.

In view of the consent agreement, and inasmuch as not too much time will be allowed tomorrow, I shall read the letter into the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., August 11, 1967.

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: Senator Jackson and I, as members of the Armed Services Committee, are having prepared an amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill which will reverse the effect of the Church Amendment adopted in the Foreign Relations Committee.

I believe the issues of national security involved are of overriding importance, and I'm hopeful many senators on both sides of the aisle will join in offering the amendment which we would like to have printed Monday with co-sponsors. Your advice and assistance will be appreciated. Talk to me directly or have your staff contact my military affairs assistant, Jerry Friedheim on extension 2934.

While the Senate already has expressed in its vote on the Ellender Ex-Im Bill amendment its support of a continuing, controlled and responsible arms sale program, the issue

is renewed in the Foreign Aid Bill. Senator Jackson and I have written into our amendment, in addition to reversals of the Church provisions, careful provision for quarterly reports to Congress and a specific funding limitation to prevent needless, uncontrolled spending.

The Church Amendment adopted by the Foreign Relations Committee: (a) repeals all authority for DOD to make credit sales of items furnished from new procurement; (b) repeals the authority to guarantee credit extended by private banks, exporters, or the Export-Import Bank; (c) transfers all assets of the credit sales revolving fund to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury after 31 December 1967; (d) repeals after 31 December 1967 the DOD authority to receive disbursements from the Export-Import Bank which come due under past sales to the Bank by DOD of evidences of indebtedness; (e) and repeals the authority of DOD to transfer collections received from foreign countries to the Export-Import Bank in repayment of disbursements made by the Bank.

The impact of these proposed provisions would effectively emasculate DOD's ability to participate in credit sales. Repeal of the authority to guarantee credit extended by the Export-Import Bank or others effectively precludes credit sales to underdeveloped countries, since by definition they cannot command regular bank credit. The dissolving of the credit sales revolving fund will even deprive DOD of the funds needed to pay outstanding obligations incurred as a result of past credit sales; and in this same connection, repeal of the DOD authority to receive disbursements from the Export-Import Bank means that DOD cannot pay obligations owed to suppliers on past credit sales without recourse to a special appropriation.

Similarly, repeal of the DOD authority to transfer collections received from foreign countries to the Bank would mean that the Bank could be repaid only by a special appropriation.

It is estimated that DOD would need approximately \$230 million more in MAP appropriations for FY 1968, in order to meet obligations to suppliers during the second half of FY 1968. An additional \$500 million would be needed in subsequent fiscal years to completely liquidate existing obligations arising from past sales. Thus, the Church provisions would cost us \$730 million in new appropriations.

Mr. President, I should interpret this and say that the Jackson-Tower amendment does not, however, ask for any restoration of funds. I want to make that clear.

Continuing reading the letter.

The Church Amendment would clearly prevent DOD from living up to existing commitments unless the Export-Import Bank were prepared to make an unguaranteed loan direct to the country concerned—e.g., Iran where we are committed to more installations of \$50 million each at a rate of interest between 5-6% with repayment over 5 to 7 years. Similarly, the Church Amendment would make it extremely difficult to provide credit sales to countries such as Israel, unless they could obtain direct bank financing. Even if they could, it seems certain that the terms of the borrowing would be far stiffer than our previous arrangements with them.

If we are to have a coherent credit sales program which can be used to finance carefully considered sales to underdeveloped countries as a means of furthering U.S. policy, we must restore (a) the integrity of the credit sales revolving fund, (b) the authority to guarantee credit extended by private banks or the Export-Import Bank, and (c) the authority to make credit sales involving new procurements.

As you are aware there are many classified considerations involved in DOD loans and sales overseas, particularly to the developing nations. Often the U.S. obtains a direct quid pro quo of vital importance to our own national defense objectives. I will, if necessary, ask for a Secret Session of the Senate so that these classified matters can be discussed on the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] with whom I have the privilege to join.

It is really in opposition to the Church amendment.

First, let me say that the Church amendment comes out of the Committee on Foreign Relations by a majority vote. I do not take that lightly, to say the least. Its members are familiar with the problem. But there are angles which I believe should be strongly emphasized because the Church amendment would, in effect, be a unilateral disarmament move by the United States alone. That is one of my principle objections to it.

Since I have been on the Armed Services Committee, and have been getting a little more and more into this problem, I have never been satisfied with the military aid program, by any means, and I would, frankly, like to see it undergo a complete review and have a very definite study made of it by Members of this body who have had experience and background in that field, including members of the Armed Services Committee. I think the program could be improved on. But I believe now, to take it piece-meal, in one approach, and one segment alone, as the Church amendment does, amounts to, as I say, unilateral disarmament and is one of the worst possible times to take that step.

I give, briefly, my reasons for saying that.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I yield gladly to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Would the Senator say that the effect of the Church amendment would be to tie the President's hands behind his back and ask him to try to deal with dangerous and unpredictable situations that exist around the world, putting the President of the United States in a position where he would be severely handicapped in view of the kind of threatening aggression we have from the Sino-Soviet bloc?

Mr. STENNIS. Well, I believe not only that his hands would be tied, but I think to adopt the Church amendment would be to create an atmosphere worldwide that would very quickly develop a new picture whereby other interests, contrary to our own, would seek to move

into those places. That is when the President would really need more discretion to move rapidly than he has now.

I think the Senator from Washington has made a fine point. That is one of the controlling thoughts I have.

Let me say, preliminarily, that even though I have not always voted for the Foreign Aid bill as an entirety, I have always supported the military aid feature of it, and I have often come to the floor, and I was flattered to be asked to come to the floor by someone handling the bill, and speak in favor of that part, especially when the appropriation bill was up. This is a conviction I have developed and have followed over the years.

I know we all wish the world we are living in were different and that it was an ideal situation, but, like it or not, we have to look realistically at the world as it is. We have the United Nations, and we look to it. I would not discredit it, not one bit. I was one of its earliest supporters, even before I came here. But we expected too much of it, and time has proved that it is not an effective substitute for force that may be needed by a country to protect itself. In other words, we have not developed yet a worldwide military force under controlled operations like the United Nations which can move in on problem spots and effectively stamp out embryo wars or some trouble developing in that direction.

We also have to face the fact that we are living in a world in which NATO, even though it carried the hopes of the Western World, is not as successful as it was once hoped it would be. In effect, one of its main allies has withdrawn from it, and it is straining at the seams. Even the most optimistic cannot say that here is a force necessary to protect a country.

Also, SEATO is the same way. We have a war now right in the middle of that area. Even though I do not believe the terms of SEATO bind us to do what we have done in South Vietnam, at the same time there has been an attack in that area of the world where it was felt SEATO would have been an effective means to keep the peace. It is not functioning as such and we cannot look to it as a substitute for the funds that I am going to mention here which would be permitted under the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

On top of all that, if any nation has ever had enough evidence to convince it that it is up to it to be prepared, it is in this case, where we have had to fight alone, almost. We are now engaged in the third largest war this Nation has ever had, with about 500,000 men that are there or expected to be there, and many of them engaged in mortal combat with mounting casualty lists. I say mounting because in many months the casualties of our forces have been exceeding those of the South Vietnamese. We are having to spend more than \$2 billion every month. Unfortunately, things do not look good. There is no bright light at the end of any tunnel. It is highly uncertain how much further we will have to go or how much longer we will have to fight. I did not say how much longer we will have to stay there. I think it is clear we will have

to stay there a long, long time after the fighting has stopped.

But we have no assurance, that anyone will attempt to give, as to how long we shall have to continue in this major war. I do not discount one bit the remarkable work that is being done by our fighting men there and the efforts that are being made by the President and other civilian authorities, including Congress, to find a solution.

But the fact is that in the realistic world we are engaged in a major war. We are having to fight it almost alone, except for the help of Korea, which has a substantial number of men in South Vietnam, and with some help, too, from Australia. Otherwise, we are carrying virtually all the load. Of course, the South Vietnamese are fighting, too. At the same time, the A-1 soldiers of those brave people do not add up to great numbers. So we have to carry the load.

Under those conditions, shall we withdraw unilaterally a part of our program that is designed to help the little nations? It is true that funds will be left in the bill for regular military aid. But it is also true, as in years past, that most of that money will go to our major allies, especially the free countries that are under the very shadow of the Soviet empire or Soviet nations. They are Greece, Turkey, Taiwan, South Korea, and Thailand. Those nations will get almost all of the regular Federal aid in the bill that is not involved in the amendment. But my point is that nothing appreciable will be left in that fund unless some is provided for loans.

Many countries can pay cash or make what are called hard loans. We are not concerned about them. But I believe it would be a step backward, and a dangerous step, one contrary to world conditions, certainly without a complete review of the entire situation, merely to strike out, tempting as it might be, a provision that we wish we did not have to have in the law, the provision that permits country X loans. The fund is provided so as to pay 25 percent, and then to underwrite it to a bank that is established for export-import purposes, as to the balance of the loan.

I hope the day will soon come that we can do that. But I see nothing on the horizon to give ground for jumping in, now, and taking one shot or one bite at the problem by calling off these loans that could otherwise go to countries such as Israel or the friendly Arab countries in the Middle East. If they could not obtain the loans or the arms anywhere else, that would be another thing. That would be all right; one factor would cancel out the other.

But I believe that just as certainly as night follows day, if we move out of those areas so far as these loans are concerned, someone else will move in, almost of necessity those little countries will have to arm themselves, and thereby we will lose our influence there. We will lose their dependence upon us for spare parts and replacements, and lose our connections with them.

This is not a matter of buying their friendship, and it is not a matter of spending a great number of billions of

dollars. There is no great sum of money involved in this matter, after all. The figures will be stated; but I submit that, relatively speaking, they are very small sums.

In my observation, considering the expenditure of billions of dollars for arms we have made over the last 15 or more years, we have probably received more effective return, and more good has been done—although it has not always worked—by taking care of the realistic needs for arms of these little countries, than we have received for any other dollars we have spent.

I shudder to think, not only of what could happen, but of what I believe will happen, if we withdraw our fine influence there—and we do still have influence there—by withdrawing the aid, the help, the sympathy, and the understanding that go with it, and leave those little peoples to the wiles, the mercy, and the selfishness of others who will come in—and, of necessity, will be invited in—so that they may get the arms they need.

It is true that India and Pakistan, to both of which countries we furnished arms by gift and by credit, got into a war with each other. That is unfortunate; but happily it did not last, and it terminated without great injury to either country. That perhaps is the outstanding illustration—at least an outstanding illustration—since World War II, of a situation where our influence did prove helpful. So I do not think we ought to look too much at the contradiction, or what some call the absurdity, of those two nations, after having both been supplied by us, getting into war with one another, using those very arms. That is a chance that will happen sometimes, and it might happen again.

But I wish to say, Mr. President, that my conclusion about this step is not in any way hasty. In addition to what I have said about having supported general military assistance, our Preparedness Subcommittee has been making a special study for about a year, now, of the impact of the commitments and the agreements that we already have around the world, and matching our capacity to meet those commitments, with the capacity of the allies whose capacity we have guaranteed, as well as trying to get some idea of their ability to carry their part of the load.

It is amazingly disappointing to find, after all, what a relatively small amount of that load could be carried by those allies. If we withdraw this part of the program, we would have left only the cash sales or the credit sales that could be financed through a bank, which I think would be few, and the gifts or grants provided in the bill.

I think we ought to discourage, as much as we can, these grants, and seek to encourage the loans, looking to the need of the country and the uses to which the money would be put.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Let me finish my thought.

I believe, as I said at the beginning, that a much better program could be obtained by having a full survey made of

this entire problem, worldwide, and trying to get some kind of a recommendation for a new basis, a new start, or a new foundation for military aid. I would welcome such a study and such recommendations as might come in; but I am convinced, as I have stated, that this proposal is a piecemeal matter which amounts to a unilateral disarmament on our part, and a withdrawal of means of arming when no one else is doing the same thing.

I have been happy to yield to the capable and distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi referred to the uses to which these funds were put, and I rather gathered from his tone of voice and reference, that he thought that was a merit of the program.

If that be the case, I should like to inquire just what justification could be given, or can the able Senator give, for the United States furnishing the money to buy, guaranteeing the sale or the repayment of, or otherwise supplying by the American taxpayer jet fighter bombers to weak countries in South America which are threatened by nobody?

Mr. STENNIS. Well, I think we all know that within limits, it is mighty nice to have something like that at hand that can be used.

I think of what happened in the Bay of Pigs invasion. The Bay of Pigs invasion involved little old planes; I understood they were just trainer planes. They had some crude bombs. But they certainly did serve Castro mighty well.

Mr. GORE. The Senator says it is nice to have them around. Nice for whom? Not nice for—

Mr. STENNIS. For protection.

Mr. GORE. Does any country in Latin America need Sherman tanks and jet fighter bombers so badly that it is necessary to tax the American people to supply them? I am not convinced by these generalized statements my distinguished friend has made.

We are furnishing to many countries military equipment for which they have no need, creating an additional economic burden on them and on the U.S. taxpayer.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator recognizes that a country that has resources or territory that some other country wants is much more likely to be attacked by a stronger power if it does not have any weapons with which to defend itself than if it has a bomber or two.

Mr. GORE. Unfortunately, the identity of countries which receive sales aid is considered confidential, and I do not wish to violate that. However, it happens that I am looking at a record of one very large country in Latin America which, to my knowledge, has not been threatened by any external foe in my lifetime.

That country was furnished 25 fighter bombers under this program.

Mr. STENNIS. I would not try to justify every single loan. If I were on the board and passing on those matters, I might disapprove of some of them. I perhaps would be more conservative than they. However, I do say that to leave

them without the equipment is not the answer.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is my recollection that our Government made strong recommendations to the British Government in connection with a proposed sale of supersonic fighters to a country in South America. I believe, as a result of our recommendations, the British Government has withdrawn those sales.

I share the same concern as the able Senator from Tennessee about this matter.

I point out that the area of tension happens to be in those areas of the world which consist of underdeveloped countries.

It is regrettable, but the area of decision as far as the Communists are concerned has moved toward the underdeveloped countries. That is where the most immediate problem arises.

I for one would hope that there could be a means or a way found to avoid this kind of arms escalation between the great powers. But I submit that this has to be worked out as part of broad disarmament agreements and arrangements. It cannot be done by a unilateral act on the part of the United States while our adversaries retain all the authority and flexibility to deal with this kind of situation.

I believe that is the position essentially of the able Senator from Mississippi, and I commend him particularly for having put this problem, as it is contained in the pending amendment, in the proper national security context.

One of the basic problems we face in this troubled world is how to deal with the contest that is going on in these underdeveloped countries between the United States and the Sino-Soviet bloc.

I wish we could avoid giving these countries any kind of credit, but I submit this is not always possible in the kind of world in which we live.

I commend my friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who is the able chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, for the great contribution he has made in the Senate this afternoon in putting this matter in the proper context.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very generous remarks.

With relation to what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I think it is our special province to protect the South American countries, and I think that is generally known throughout the world.

I think that we have been highly successful. The military officers from those countries who come here for military training are subjected to very fine influences in addition to that training. The money that we spend in those countries for military aid has been rather effective under all the circumstances.

I would not want to stop the loans. If we were to do that, the only programs these countries could participate in would be programs under which they were making purchases or receiving a gift from us.

I believe that this in-between step should be retained.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Washington, as did the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, referred to the committee bill as unilateral disarmament. This is not disarmament. This is an effort to check the United States lead in the armaments race brought about by our giving direct credit and through guaranteeing credit for the sale of arms to countries which have no real need for them, and insufficient economic capacity to carry out economic development and pay for the armaments which our military and our industrialists encourage them to take.

We are financing the dumping of armaments into countries which do not need them and taxing the American taxpayer for it.

The Senator suggested that there ought to be a study made. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee made a study, perhaps not as comprehensive as the able Senator has in mind, but it did make a study.

Unfortunately, the Senate and the American people have difficulty getting at the facts. I have some of them here, but they are classified.

Somehow or other, it is considered injurious to our national security to let the American people, who are paying the bill, to know how many fighter-bombers we furnished to a given country in Latin America.

I do not see how putting this kind of information on the public record violates our national security. Surely, if any foreign foe wished to know how many fighter bombers Argentina has or how many Sherman tanks Brazil has, they could find out by sending an intelligence officer there. However, the American people, who are paying the bill, cannot find out what they helped to pay for.

It is unfortunate that the debate in the Senate must be conducted under a cloak of secrecy. True debate is impossible under such a handicap.

I daresay that if the American people knew all the facts, the sentiment would be overwhelmingly in support of the committee position.

Mr. STENNIS. The American people expect us to exercise our best judgment in this matter for them. And I am sure the Senator from Tennessee is doing just that, as he sees it.

I agreed wholeheartedly with the Senator on the matter of so much material being classified.

I think that if the legislative branch of the Government desires to get more of this information released, we should insist upon our rights and not be satisfied when the administration sends matters back and declares that they are classified. We should require the administration to come over and explain to our staff members and to those of us who are familiar with the matters why the material is classified.

I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator. However, I do not believe that goes to the real problem on which we are

about to embark, which I have already outlined.

Mr. GORE. One other aspect of the problem can be seen in the demonstrable fact that in one country after another, particularly in the underdeveloped countries in Africa and Latin America, there have been coups d'état through which democracy has been smitten to the ground, through which military dictatorships have been installed by the use of weapons furnished by the United States. Yet, to make one small move toward changing that situation is denounced here as unilateral disarmament. It is nothing of the sort. It is trying to stop an improvident, unwise, irrational policy which is not in keeping with this nation's long range interests.

Mr. STENNIS. If I may say to the Senator, the "unilateral" applies to the unilateral withdrawal of the United States from this troubled area in which we are attempting to disarm all these countries—that is, for less armaments; and I favor that, if we can accomplish it. But we are taking that position and we are withholding these arms and the credit. And our adversaries in world affairs—you could almost say antagonists—not following our lead and not following our policy, come right in then; and these little countries still think they need the arms, and they get them somewhere else. Not only does this result in their severing relations with us, but also, we cannot be affiliated with them in furnishing spare parts or furnishing new weapons should they need them.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee—he has good judgment in these matters—that there should be a screening board to pass on what weapons shall be allowed to these little countries under this credit act. Unless they really need the weapons and are in line with the situation that might develop, they should not be allowed to receive them.

I have no sympathy with anyone in the military profession—I respect them greatly—who are just trying to unload some of our arms or are trying to over-arm some country.

I say this to the Senator: Some think that those of us on the Committee on Armed Services absorb a good deal as we go back from year to year and that that impairs our judgment on these matters. I hope that is not true. I can say this: When we had up the amendment the other day, I did not answer the call from the Pentagon on the Ellender amendment. I knew what my mind was and what I should do. My position is the same now as it was then. I am not tied to that movement at all, if there is such a movement, and I do not know of any other Senator on our committee who is.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. A credit revolving fund is what is at issue here. The committee has not proposed that the United States close its doors to the legitimate defense needs of other countries. The committee has not proposed that the United States withdraw from protection of our neighbors. The committee has not proposed that we stop the forges, shut down the

arsenals for our neighbors and other democratic countries. What has the committee done? It recommends only the abolition of the revolving fund.

Why should Congress permit the continuation of a constantly growing revolving fund, beyond its practical control, and operating in such a way that Congress does not really know what goes on? If the country is to have a policy of supplying arms to other nations of the world, surely Congress should exercise its oversight function and annually review these programs, rather than to permit the continuation of a huge revolving fund, for all practical purposes solely within the power of the executive branch.

It seems to me that Congress has a greater function to perform here than it has been performing under the current sales policy. I question the extent to which we have extended the arms sales policy; but if we are to pursue such a policy, why not make the facts available to the American people through debate on the floor of the Senate? There is simply not effective surveillance over our sales policy with this revolving fund in existence.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe those who have charge of this foreign field have rather severe and effective surveillance now, coming out of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of the issue presented by the amendment; and they must make periodic reports to Congress. We know what they are doing, if we could just find time to read all their reports.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] referred to the revolving fund as being something that we did not know anything about; we did not know how it was handled, and so forth. He did not use those exact words, but he said something to that effect.

Is it not true that the Defense Department reports that to the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator is a member, and to the Committee on the Armed Services, of which the Senator is a member?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And to other committees of Congress?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So that we do know what is going on.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the only thing about the revolving fund is that it allows them to collect whenever they can and put that money back into that fund, instead of coming to Congress and saying, "Replenish this fund by the amount we have turned in to the Treasury."

Mr. STENNIS. I believe it is rather well handled in that respect and perhaps rather rigidly handled under Mr. McNamara.

I did not personally approve of all these weapons that have been put out this way. I referred to the use, without necessarily approving their use, but I believe we must keep the principle of the thing alive.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It happens that I was chairman of a subcommittee that held hearings on various aspects of our arms sale and aid policies. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], through his subcommittee on the Middle East, held further hearings. Evidence was adduced during our hearings that many important arms deals had been made without proper information being given to Congress and without effective policy coordination within the executive branch. Let me read a portion of the hearings on this bill. This statement by Senator SYMINGTON is found on page 271 of the record of the hearings:

In February of 1967 Senator Gore asked AID, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Treasury, and the Bureau of the Budget to describe their role in four important U.S. decisions to sell arms:

1. The F-4's to Iran.
2. The F-5's to Morocco.
3. The F-10's to Jordan.
4. The A-4's to Argentina.

A summation of the answers on the extent of their participation from four agencies—AID, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Treasury, and the Bureau of the Budget—most concerned arms sales is as follows:

1. The senior interdepartmental group did not meet on the F-10's to Jordan or the F-4 sale to Iran. The group was not established until after the F-5 and A-4 sales had been made.

2. The State/Defense Coordinating Committee did not meet on the F-4 sale, the F-10 sale, or the A-4 sale. It did meet on the F-5 sale but neither ACDA, Treasury, or the Bureau of the Budget.

All this in spite of the contention of officials that proper coordination had been achieved.

So we see here that not only was Congress not informed, but also, the coordinating committees within the Government did not even meet on these important armament sales.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I recall, the Committee on Foreign Relations is included in the list of committees to which these reports have to be made. If there is anything Congress has not known it is the fault of Congress. Congress has access to the information and the power to bring witnesses.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It is true that the Committee on Foreign Relations is one of the committees to be kept informed. The committee was not informed. The Senator's committee was not informed. Perhaps the Congress is partially at fault for this, as the Senator has said. How do we ask the right questions, how do we summon a witness to testify with respect to something about which we have not even learned? There is much that has not met the eye in these arms deals.

Mr. STENNIS. With regard to the information, and I stand strictly and rigidly for the Congress setting the infor-

mation, the legislative branch has to be more demanding in many fields. I agree wholeheartedly. I understand the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has a memorandum with respect to the information that was given to Congress.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] so that he may read the statement on this point.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was concerned about the point the Senator made. I asked the Department of Defense to prepare a statement which I shall read for the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMENT ON QUESTION: "HAS CONGRESS BEEN INFORMED OF INVOLVEMENT BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK IN MILITARY CREDIT SALES"

The charge has been made that although the Executive Branch may not have deliberately misled the Congress as to the role of the Export-Import Bank in financing military credit sales, it has been less than forthcoming in bringing to the attention of the Congress the facts concerning the Bank's role. This charge is without foundation.

This summary begins with the year 1964, the year in which the Congress authorized the Department of Defense to issue guarantees on military sales.

The written statement submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees in support of the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 stated specifically: "We estimate that in the current fiscal year a total of \$213 million of military sales will be financed through private institutions and the Export-Import Bank". (House Hearings, p. 95; Senate Hearings, p. 530.) The President's Budget for the FY 1965 program stated with respect to the funds being requested for military assistance credit sales that: "Included are the costs of purchase of military equipment and supplies in the United States for sale to countries other than those whose purchases are ordinarily financed by commercial sources or by the Export-Import Bank". (House Doc. No. 266, 88th Cong., 2d sess., p. 307). Finally, in reporting the Foreign Assistance Bill of 1964 to the floor, the Foreign Affairs Committee pointed out in its report that: "The Department of Defense estimates that during fiscal 1964 there will be \$262 million in sales of military items financed by commercial institutions and the Export-Import Bank". Continuing, that report noted that "There is every reason to facilitate the financing of military sales by banks and the Export-Import Bank in a manner comparable to financing of other export transactions. There are a number of countries able and willing to purchase military equipment in this manner where the political situation is such that commercial lenders are reluctant to extend credit at going rates. The purpose of the new authority is to provide a sales guaranty similar to the investment guaranty program." (H. Rep. No. 1443, 88th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 21-22).

When the Foreign Assistance Bill of 1966 was before the Congress, Mr. Henry Kuss, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Logistics Negotiations, testified during his appearance before the Foreign Affairs Committee with regard to the legislative changes requested by the Executive Branch that:

"The most important requests for legislation include:

"... 2. Authority to specifically authorize DOD to sell to Eximbank or private banks promissory notes or other evidence of indebtedness received by DOD from purchasing countries.

"3. Fifty million dollars of new obligational authority to finance or guarantee those military credit sales which for various reasons cannot be handled by the Eximbank or pri-

vate banking institutions." (House Hearings, p. 808).

Later, in response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Kuss explained in detail how the Department of Defense proposed to utilize the request for authority to sell evidences of indebtedness to the Eximbank and to private banks. (House Hearings, pp. 816-817). Further, in answer to a Committee question as to how many Government agencies, besides the Export-Import Bank are involved in obtaining guarantees from the Department of Defense, the Department of Defense advised the Committee that "The Export-Import Bank is the only Government agency involved in the DOD credit sales guaranteed program". (House Hearings, p. 1192). In that same year, when Secretary McNamara appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, he was asked what use would be made by the Department of Defense of the \$50 million being requested for credit assistance. His answer was that: "We use this in some degree as a guarantee fund, we obtained authority of the Congress to guarantee loans made by the Export-Import Bank and other financial institutions [deleted]". (Senate Hearings, pp. 624-625).

The substance of this CY 1965 testimony was not just buried in the Hearings before the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees; it was specifically brought to the attention of the other members of Congress by the Committees in their reports. Thus, the Foreign Affairs Committee in its report on the Foreign Assistance Bill of 1965 pointed out as follows on page 29 of its report (H. Rep. No. 321, 88th Cong., 1st sess.): "Section 201(f) amends section 509(b) of the act, which relates to the administration of guarantees issued in conjunction with military sales, to exempt guarantees issued to agencies of the U.S. Government from the requirement that fees and premiums be charged in connection with the issuance of all guaranty contracts. This exemption is primarily designed to apply to the Export-Import Bank which, at present, is the only U.S. Government agency expected to be affected by it."

With regard to the related amendment authorizing the sale of evidences of indebtedness, the same report noted on page 34 that "The amendment will simplify this complex procedure by enabling the Department of Defense to sell the purchasing government's notes to one or more financial institutions, including the Export-Import Bank, each note backed by a U.S. Government guaranty, and thus eliminate the need for separate loan agreements between the financial institutions and the foreign government". Similarly, the Foreign Relations Committee stated on page 17 of its report on that bill (S. Rep. No. 170, 88th Cong., 1st sess.): "Section 201(f) of the bill amends section 509(b) of the act, which relates to the administration of military assistance guarantees, so that one U.S. Government agency does not have to pay to another U.S. Government agency the fees and premiums charged in connection with the issuance of guaranty contracts. The main purpose is to make it possible for the Defense Department not to charge the Export-Import Bank a fee on contracts which are guaranteed both by the Department and the Bank and on which the Bank collects an adequate fee from the beneficiary of the guaranty."

Finally, the President's Budget for FY 1966 again called the attention of the Congress to the fact that included within the appropriation requested for military assistance were "Funds to provide credit assistance for the purchase of military equipment and supplies in the United States by countries other than those whose credit purchases are ordinarily financed by commercial sources or by the Export-Import Bank." (House Doc. No. 16, 89th Cong., 1st sess., p. 73).

In 1965, the Congress, at the Executive Branch's request, also changed the military assistance credit fund from a subaccount of the parent military assistance account into a true revolving fund. As a consequence, the President's budget for FY 1967 for the first time presented a table showing the status of the operations of this fund. For FY 1966, this table in the President's Budget specifically shows sales of \$92 million by the Department of Defense of evidences of indebtedness to the Export-Import Bank. (p. 76). In CY 1966, the Executive Branch requested the Congress to authorize changes in the bookkeeping of this revolving fund in order to make it legally possible for the President's Budget to show fully in that account the proposed sales program for the budget year and the complete status of the account. The Congress granted that authority in the 1966 Foreign Assistance Act, and the President's Budget for FY 1968 was accordingly even more explicit as to the participation of the Export-Import Bank with respect to transactions handled under the revolving fund. The table set forth on pages 76-77 of the current FY 1968 Budget shows in detail for FYs 1966, 1967, and 1968 the sales of evidences of indebtedness to the Export-Import Bank, changes in the commitments of the Export-Import Bank to purchase future evidences of indebtedness, the amounts collected from foreign countries owed to the Export-Import Bank by the Department of Defense, and the total portion of the accounts receivable which were financed by the Export-Import Bank.

The testimony of the Executive Branch in CY 1966 with regard to the role of the Export-Import Bank was comparable to the testimony of CYs 1964 and 1965. Secretary McNamara's prepared written statement expressly pointed out that the \$56.7 million of new obligational authority being requested for credit sales "will enable us to provide a total of \$244 million in credit sales, mainly for developing countries, many of whom are shifting from grant to sales. This credit, supplemented by credit available through private and Eximbank sources for the industrially developed countries, and combined with cash sales, should make it possible to achieve military export sales orders of at least \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 1967." (House Hearings, p. 272).

In conclusion, the Congressional materials just summarized demonstrate that the fact of the participation by the Export-Import Bank in financing military exports was not kept a secret from the Congress, it was disclosed in the President's annual budgets, in the testimony of Executive Branch witnesses, and in the reports of the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees. All of these materials are unclassified published documents. In addition, the Executive Branch has disclosed to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations during each of these hearings the proposed uses of the credit sales revolving fund. Each annual Congressional Presentation Document has identified the countries for whom credit sales were proposed, the types of items proposed to be sold, the total value of the amount to be sold to each country, and the extent to which these sales would be financed directly by the revolving fund and indirectly through guarantees. While these Presentation Documents are, of course, classified, they have been available for inspection by each Member in the offices of the Committees.

Mr. President, in this statement reference is made to various statements giving notice to the Foreign Relations Committee. Further statements have been made to our Committee on Armed Services. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, although its has jurisdiction, our Armed Services Committee has not been handling any aspect of the foreign military assistance program.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield, but I wish to complete my statement in a few minutes.

Mr. GORE. I merely wish to respond to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able junior Senator from Washington read a special pleading from the Department of Defense. The gravamen of that special pleading is that Congress has had some advance information. Congress has some advance information now on what is planned for this fiscal year. I hold in my hand page 127, marked "confidential," from the military briefing book supplied to the committee, giving a description of the manner in which this revolving fund will be used in the next fiscal year. I read here there is a certain country in South America: \$5 million, military sales. What kind? Where is the official description? It is all confidential and cannot be identified by country on the floor of the Senate. Here is a real military secret. The security of this country would be in danger if the information were made public. Here is the description of the items to be sold: miscellaneous Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment.

Now, the Russians would really learn something important if they knew we were going to supply a particular country in South America with \$5 million in miscellaneous Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment. They would learn even more important secrets from this item for another country. In this instance, the amount is \$3 million. For what? For miscellaneous Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment.

Oh, this would really touch off serious repercussions with the Russians.

Here is another country in South America, likewise slated to receive something described as "miscellaneous Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment."

Let us go to another continent.

Here is the information that we have, describing \$14 million worth of arms to be supplied from the revolving fund to a small country in Africa, with the description: "general defense equipment to be mutually agreed upon."

Oh, what a secret. It is out, except for the name of the country.

How can Congress exercise its function when the Department of Defense hides behind such generalized, unspecific, almost meaningless descriptions?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield right there? May I attempt to answer his question by asking him one?

Mr. GORE. Surely—I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Would not a letter from the Senator's committee calling for the details, or even a telephone call, have brought those details over to the Senator, or to his staff member?

Mr. GORE. Indeed, it did. As chairman of the committee, I summoned the Assistant Secretary and others and we held two hearings. What those two hearings disclosed led to what we are attempting to correct by these committee amendments.

With the Senator's permission, and the permission of the Senate, I should like to have printed in the RECORD the col-

loquy between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and Mr. Kuss of the Department of Defense, on page 272 of the hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not going to object, but how long is it?

Mr. GORE. One page.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this colloquy printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator SYMINGTON. Now, when was the Congress notified that F-4's were going to be shipped to Iran?

Mr. Kuss. I do not believe the Congress was notified, Senator, until Mr. McNaughton spoke on the subject.

Senator SYMINGTON. That was after it was in the press.

Mr. Kuss. Correct, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And we talked about governmental machinery. Is it the policy of the Defense Department to tell the press before it tells the Congress about such sales?

Mr. Kuss. As a matter of fact, I do not believe we told the press. [Deleted.]

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you know who first published it in the United States?

Mr. Kuss. No, I do not.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you not think that, if we sell a sophisticated fighter to a foreign country, that information should be supplied to the Congress?

Mr. Kuss. I would like to answer that question by saying that in addition to considering the problem [deleted].

Senator SYMINGTON. Let me repeat my question, please.

Mr. Kuss. All right.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you not think, if you make a sale of a sophisticated, modern airplane to a foreign government, the Congress should be informed?

Mr. Kuss. I think I can best answer that question by saying it is not my function to determine that answer, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, you could say this, could you not; that you did not inform the Congress?

Mr. Kuss. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And you do not know anybody who did inform the Congress?

Mr. Kuss. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And to the best of your knowledge it would have remained a secret [deleted].

Mr. Kuss. No, sir; it would have been perfectly evident in this year's presentation of the congressional program, because it has been occurring in the last year, and in describing our congressional program for this year we would have been describing that which we have provided to Iran in the last year.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then I would like to correct my question—

Mr. Kuss. It would have been after the fact.

Senator SYMINGTON. I want to be sure I understand. You agreed to do it in August and you would tell the Congress about it when you appeared this spring for additional justification; is that correct?

Mr. Kuss. That is—I answered the question—you said the Congress would never have found out, or the newspapers.

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes, I understand.

Mr. Kuss. My answer is "Yes, they would have found out otherwise."

Senator SYMINGTON. How would they have found out?

Mr. Kuss. Through the congressional program documentation.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would that be before this committee or before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. Kuss. That would have been both be-

fore the Foreign Relations Committee as well as the Appropriations Committee.

Senator SYMINGTON. Some time this spring.

Mr. Kuss. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And that means that the planes would first be sold, then somewhere between 6 and 9 months later the Congress would be informed.

Mr. Kuss. Yes, sir.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, let me read the concluding exchange:

Senator SYMINGTON. And that means that the planes would first be sold, then somewhere between six and nine months later the Congress would be informed?

Mr. Kuss. Yes, sir.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. Well, the Senator has certainly made a contribution to this debate and I consider it a privilege to have yielded to him.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 157)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SONG in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

Man's greatest hope for world peace lies in understanding his fellow man. Nations, like individuals, fear that which is strange and unfamiliar. The more we see and hear of those things which are common to all people, the less likely we are to fight over those issues which set us apart.

So the challenge is to communicate.

No technological advance offers a greater opportunity for meeting this challenge than the alliance of space exploration and communications. Since the advent of the communications satellite, the linking of one nation to another is no longer dependent on telephone lines, microwaves, or cables under the sea. Just as man has orbited the earth to explore the universe beyond, we can orbit satellites to send our voices or televise our activities to all peoples of this globe.

Satellite communications has already meant much in terms of human understanding.

When President Lincoln was assassinated, it took 12 days for the news to reach London. Britons watched and grieved with us at the funeral of John F. Kennedy.

Europeans watched Pope Paul speak to the United Nations in New York—and Americans saw his pilgrimage to Fatima.

The peoples of three continents witnessed the meeting of an American President and a Soviet Premier in Glassboro.

The future of this new technology stirs our imagination.

In business and commerce—

Commercial telephone calls will be carried routinely by satellite to every part of the globe.

Rapid and universal exchange of data through satellite-linked computers will encourage international commerce.

Productive machinery can be operated at great distances and business records can be transmitted instantaneously.

In education and health—

Schools in all lands can be connected by television—so that the children of each nation can see and hear their contemporaries throughout the world.

The world community of scholars can be brought together across great distances for face-to-face discussions via satellite.

Global consultations, with voice and pictures, can bring great specialists to the bedside of patients in every continent.

The art, culture, history, literature and medical science of all nations can be transmitted by satellite to every nation.

Who can measure the impact of this live, direct contact between nations and their people? Who can assess the value of our new-found ability to witness the history-making events of this age? This much we know: because communication satellites exist, we are already much closer to each other than we have ever been before.

But this new technology, exciting as it is, does not mean that all our surface communications facilities have become obsolete. Indeed, one of the challenges before us is to integrate satellites into a balanced communications system which will meet the needs of a dynamic and expanding world society. The United States must review its past activities in this field and formulate a national communications policy.

U.S. ACTIVITIES TO DATE

The Communications Act of 1934 has provided the blueprint for Federal involvement in the communications field. That act, and the Federal Communications Commission it created, have served our national interest well during one-third of a century of rapid communications progress.

The Communications Satellite Act of 1962 established a framework for our Nation's participation in satellite communications systems. Congress weighed with care the relative merits of public and private ownership of commercial satellite facilities. The act authorized creation of the Communications Satellite Corporation—Comsat—a private corporation with public responsibilities—to establish a commercial satellite system.

In 1964 we joined with 10 other countries in the formation of the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium—Intelsat. Fifty-eight nations are now members. Each member contributes investment capital and shares in the use of the system. Comsat, the U.S. representative, is the consortium manager and now contributes 54 percent of the total investment. All satellites managed by Comsat are owned by Intelsat—so that commercial satellite communications has from its beginning been a product of international cooperation.

Progress has been rapid. Early Bird was launched in 1965. Now the Intelsat II series serves both the Atlantic and the Pacific. Twelve ground stations—the vital links for sending and receiving messages—have been constructed over the world. Forty-six are anticipated by the end of 1969.

Today, just 5 years after the passage of the Communications Satellite Act and

3 years after the Intelsat Agreement, developments have exceeded our expectations:

The synchronous satellite, which rotates with our globe and thus maintains a stationary position in orbit, has been developed well ahead of schedule.

Those responsible for U.S. international communications—with ownership divided among a number of surface carriers and Comsat—now look forward to an integrated system which will utilize satellite technology.

Proposals are being discussed for the establishment of a domestic communications satellite—either limited to TV transmission or servicing a variety of domestic communications uses.

Because we have been the leaders in the development and use of satellite communications, other countries are deeply interested in our country's position on the continuation of Intelsat, and in the importance we assign to international cooperation in the field of satellite communications.

On February 28, 1967, I declared in a message to Congress:

Formulation of long range policies concerning the future of satellite communications requires the most detailed and comprehensive study by the executive branch and the Congress. I anticipate that the appropriate committees of Congress will hold hearings to consider these complex issues of public policy. The executive branch will carefully study these hearings as we shape our recommendations.

A number of important communications issues are presently before the Federal Communications Commission for consideration. Some of them have been discussed in the Senate and House Commerce Committee hearings on the Public Television Act of 1967. Comsat and the State Department have opened discussion of the international questions with our foreign partners and their governments.

In order to place this important policy area in perspective, I want the views of the President to be clear. This message includes a report of the past, a recommendation for the present, and a challenge for the future.

GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Our country is firmly committed to the concept of a global system for commercial communications. The declaration of policy and purpose of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 set forth congressional intent:

The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communications needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

The Intelsat Agreement of 1964—to which 58 nations have now adhered—left no doubt as to its purpose. Its preamble expressed the desire—

To establish a single global commercial communications satellite system as part of an improved global communications network

which will provide expanded telecommunications services to all areas of the world and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

Of course, these agreements do not preclude the development and operation of satellite systems to meet unique national needs. The United States is developing a defense system—as will others. But Intelsat members did pledge that commercial communications between nations would be a product of international cooperation.

Today I reaffirm the commitments made in 1962 and 1964. We support the development of a global system of communications satellites to make modern communications available to all nations. A global system eliminates the need for duplication in the space segment of communications facilities, reduces the cost to individual nations, and provides the most efficient use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum through which these communications must travel.

A global system is particularly important for less developed nations which do not receive the benefits of speedy, direct international communications. Instead, the present system of communications—

Encourages indirect routing through major nations to the developing countries;

Forces the developing nations to remain dependent on larger countries for their links with the rest of the world; and

Makes international communications service to these developing nations more expensive and of lower quality.

A telephone call from Rangoon to Djakarta must still go through Tokyo. A call from Dakar, Senegal to Lagos, Nigeria is routed through Paris and London. A call from American Samoa to Tahiti goes by way of Oakland, Calif. During the recent Punta del Este Conference, I discovered that it usually cost Latin American journalists more than their American colleagues to phone in their stories because most of the calls had to be routed through New York.

Such an archaic system of international communications is no longer necessary. The communications satellite knows no geographic boundary, is dependent on no cable, owes allegiance to no single language or political philosophy. Man now has it within his power to speak directly to his fellow man in all nations.

We support a global system of commercial satellite communications which is available to all nations—large and small, developed and developing—on a nondiscriminatory basis.

To have access to a satellite in the sky, a nation must have access to a ground station to transmit and receive its messages. There is a danger that smaller nations, unable to finance or utilize expensive ground stations, may become orphans of this technological advance.

We believe that satellite ground stations should be an essential part of the infrastructure of developing nations. Smaller nations may consider joint planning for a ground station to serve the communications needs of more than one nation in the same geographic area. We

will consider technical assistance that will assist their planning effort.

Developing nations should be encouraged to commence construction of an efficient system of ground stations as soon as possible. When other financing is not available, we will consider financial assistance to emerging nations to build the facilities that will permit them to share in the benefits of a global communications satellite system.

CONTINUATION OF INTELSAT

The 1964 Intelsat Agreement provides only interim arrangements—subject to renegotiation in 1969. Our representatives to the consortium will soon begin discussions for a permanent arrangement.

We support the continuation of Intelsat. Each nation or its representative contributes to its expenses and benefits from its revenues in accordance with its anticipated use of the system. The 58 members include representatives from the major nations who traditionally have been most active in international communications. It has been a successful vehicle for international cooperation in the ownership and operation of a complex communications system.

We will urge the continuation of the consortium in 1969. The present arrangements offer a firm foundation on which a permanent structure can be built.

Some nations may feel that the United States has too large a voice in the consortium. As heavy users of international communications, our investment in such an international undertaking is exceptionally large. The early development of satellite technology in the United States and the size of our investment has made it logical that Comsat serve as consortium manager.

We seek no domination of satellite communications to the exclusion of any other nation—or any group of nations. Rather, we welcome increased participation in international communications by all Intelsat members. We shall approach the 1969 negotiations determined to seek the best possible permanent organizational framework.

We will consider ceilings on the voting power of any single nation—including the United States—so that the organization will maintain its international character.

We will support the creation of a formal assembly of all Intelsat members—so that all may share in the consideration of policy.

We favor efforts to make the services of personnel of other nations available to Comsat as it carries out its management responsibilities.

We will continue the exchange of technical information, share technological advances, and promote a wider distribution of procurement contracts among members of the consortium.

It is our earnest hope that every member nation will join with us in finding an equitable formula for a permanent Intelsat organization.

DOMESTIC COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEMS

Communications satellites have domestic as well as international applications. Satellites that can beam telephone

calls or television programs between New York and Paris can do the same between New York and Los Angeles. Daring proposals have already been made to tap the vast U.S. domestic market.

Our awareness of the social and economic potential of this new technology is met by similar excitement around the globe. Each nation will be making decisions about how domestic communications needs can best be met. The position taken by the United States is particularly important because our domestic market is so large and our role in international communications is so extensive.

There are important unanswered questions concerning the operation of a domestic system. Assuming these questions are answered favorably, we still must make the decision to move forward with such a system consistent with our international obligations.

The space segment of a communications satellite system is international by its very nature.

A synchronous satellite occupies a permanent orbital position in the international domain of outer space.

All satellites radiate electromagnetic energy potentially capable of interference with other communications systems.

All satellites use the internationally regulated frequency spectrum.

In view of the international nature of satellite communications and our commitments under the Intelsat Agreement of 1964, we should take no action in the establishment of a domestic system which is incompatible with our support for a global system.

This does not mean that the United States, or any other nation, will give up vital sovereignty over domestic communications. The flow of satellite communications, both domestic and international, is to and from ground stations owned by the individual nation or its representatives. Each country will have to determine for itself whether it wants to use communications satellites for domestic purposes. It must be prepared to bear the expense of such satellite use, just as it will derive any revenues.

It is the space segment, not the ground station, that is of legitimate international concern. How should a nation utilize satellites for domestic communications purposes?

There are several possible choices:

A nation can lease circuits from an international Intelsat satellite.

It could elect to operate a separate satellite for its own domestic use.

It could join with neighboring countries to operate a separate satellite.

Logically, this decision should be based on economic grounds—whether domestic requirements can be met most efficiently and economically by a satellite owned by Intelsat, or by a separate satellite. Present studies indicate that a high volume of domestic traffic is necessary for a separate satellite to offset the cost advantage of sharing the use of an international satellite. The same considerations apply if domestic needs are to be met by a satellite shared by several nations.

If the regional satellite is to carry international traffic as well, Intelsat—the International Communications Consortium—has an important stake in the

result. Adequate provisions must be made so that any international traffic which is diverted will not jeopardize the economic efficiency of the Intelsat system or limit its extension to developing countries.

Intelsat members should adhere to Intelsat supervision in any use of domestic or regional satellites.

Such supervision should include coordination of design so that all communication by commercial satellite is compatible with the global system. We must not sacrifice our goal of direct communications links among all nations. Domestic and international traffic should be able to flow freely through the entire global system, limited only by the technology itself.

Technical regulation is also necessary so that positions in orbit can be assigned, frequencies can be allocated, and energy from satellites does not interfere with other communications systems.

The alternative to this type of coordination is international communications anarchy—lack of interconnections, needless expense, pollution of frequencies, radio interference, and usurpation of orbital spaces. Nations should have no hesitation in choosing the route of international cooperation.

PARTICIPATION BY OTHER NATIONS IN INTELSAT

I urge the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe to join with the United States and our 57 partners as members of Intelsat. Intelsat is not a political organization. It holds no ideological goal except that it is good for nations to communicate efficiently with one another. It seeks no diplomatic advantage. It is quite simply a cooperative undertaking of many nations to finance an international communications system which is of advantage to all.

In 1963, this invitation was extended by the governments of those nations which joined in the creation of Intelsat. Today, I renew that invitation on behalf of our Government.

I have stated many times my hope that our commercial activities with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe will grow, that our contacts will increase, and that we will emphasize those matters in which our interests are common rather than dwelling on those issues which divide us.

Here is a rare opportunity to join in an activity to bring benefits to all nations and loss to none. Recently the Soviet Union ratified the treaty for the peaceful uses of outer space. Nothing could better symbolize the truth that space belongs to all men, than an international undertaking that permits the free flow of communications. I earnestly hope that the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe will join in this historic action.

The Soviet Union is a leader in satellite technology. I am advised that there is no insurmountable technical obstacle to an eventual linking of the Soviet Molniya system with the Intelsat system. The peoples of the world could rightfully rejoice if our advances in satellite technology were accompanied by this act of global cooperation.

Of course, this participation would require a revision of investment and voting ratios based on Soviet anticipated use of

the system. Our representatives in Intelsat are ready to participate in immediate discussions to make that membership possible.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS OWNERSHIP

Most nations handle their international communications through a "chosen instrument"—generally, a government-owned entity. The United States has no chosen instrument. Several record carriers and one voice carrier handle international traffic. In addition, Comsat provides satellite circuits to these carriers.

Our normal instinct is to favor the existence of multiple companies in each commercial field. We believe that competitive pressures—among technologies as well as companies—will usually generate lower prices for the user. Congress recognized in the 1962 act that Comsat would be required to deal with several international carriers.

Yet, there is a legitimate question as to whether the present division of ownership continues to be in the public interest. Critics argue that:

International communications are provided by an industry which is regulated in its rates and practices. Price competition, as we usually use that term, does not exist.

Divided ownership has resulted in the construction and maintenance of expensive, duplicating communications facilities which increase operating costs and result in higher rates for the user.

Our Nation is in a relatively poor bargaining position on communications matters with foreign counterparts since we do not speak with a single voice.

Disputes have existed between Comsat and the surface carriers over who should own the ground stations in the international system.

Defense communications in the future could be subjected to delay.

Several proposals have been advanced which would affect our international communications posture. Legislation has been proposed to permit a merger of one or more of the international carriers. It has been suggested that Comsat should be permitted, in certain circumstances, to contract directly with users other than the international common carriers.

Questions have been raised whether additional communications capacity should be developed through surface cables, utilization of satellites, or other technologies.

A continuation of the review of these issues is desirable.

TASK FORCE ON COMMUNICATIONS POLICY

I am appointing a task force of distinguished Government officials to make a comprehensive study of communications policy.

It will examine a number of major questions:

Are we making the best use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum?

How soon will a domestic satellite system be economically feasible?

Should a domestic satellite system be general purpose or specialized, and should there be more than one system?

How will these and other developments affect Comsat and the international communication carriers?

These are complex questions. Many of them are being presently weighed by the Federal Communications Commission. But a long, hard look must also be taken by all parties with responsibility in this area—for the ultimate decisions will work a revolution in the communications system of our Nation.

This task force will examine our entire international communications posture. It should investigate whether the present division of ownership in our international communications facilities best serves our needs, as well as which technology can meet new communication requirements in the most effective and efficient manner.

The task force may establish working groups of Government and nongovernment experts to study various technical, economic and social questions.

The task force should also determine if the Communications Act of 1934 and the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 require revision. I am asking the task force to report to me from time to time and to make its final report within 1 year.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

Our Government must be organized to carry out its responsibilities in the communications field. Present authority is widely dispersed. The Federal Communications Commission has heavy responsibilities under the 1934 and 1962 acts. The President and many agencies have responsibilities under these acts, various Executive orders, and as part of their general duties.

Communications is a vital public policy area—and Government organization must reflect that challenge.

I have asked the Bureau of the Budget to make a thorough study of existing governmental organization in the field of communications and to propose needed modifications.

CONCLUSIONS

This message does not create a new communications policy for our Nation. Rather it proposes the foundation for that policy.

It reaffirms our intentions as a partner in Intelsat.

It considers the need for modifications in our international communications posture.

It sets in motion the necessary studies for a better understanding of policy needs in domestic and international communications.

The challenge of this new technology is simple—it is to encourage men to talk to each other rather than fight one another.

Historians may write that the human race survived or faltered because of how well it mastered the technology of this age.

Communications satellites now permit man's greatest gifts—sight, expression, human thoughts and ideas—to travel unfettered to any portion of our globe. The opportunity is within our grasp. We must be prepared to act.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, August 14, 1967.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have just received from the President of the United States a message of historic significance.

President Johnson's message on communications policy does not require a vote from the Congress, or passage of any legislation. But it does deserve, I believe, the study and the support of every Member of this body.

The policy enunciated by the President in this message is in the interest of all nations and all the world's people. For men can never learn to live peacefully together on our planet unless they can overcome the barriers of suspicion and misunderstanding which now separate them.

I can think of no single effort which promises to yield more hopeful results than the one which this message outlines: to join all nations in a global network of instantaneous communication.

But I would point out to my colleagues that this new declaration of the President also serves the vital interest of the United States. We cannot ignore the fact that other nations—other leaders in international communications—are concerned and active in this field. Certainly it is right for the United States, which has traditionally been preeminent in satellite communication, to take the initiative. We must insure that our Nation shall remain a leader in this crucial arena.

I commend the President for his intelligent, far-sighted and thoughtful message, which bodes well for the peace and progress of mankind, and for the continued leadership of the United States.

I commend this historic statement to my colleagues for their earnest and careful and sympathetic attention.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not intend to hold the floor for long. I have spoken "off the cuff" as we use the term here. I do have a few short paragraphs, however, with which I want to conclude my remarks.

Let me repeat my great concern about this matter, that if we stop such a program, others will not only fail to stop, they will move in with renewed vigor and activity on these little countries who are living in such an uncertain world, feeling so helpless that, for psychological reasons, if for no other, they are going to get some of these modern weapons if there is any possible way to get them.

We still have some of that reasoning in our own thinking. I know that the Senator from Tennessee has said something about hydrogen bombs, but he did not read from that record that we have sold any to anyone or loaned any hydrogen bombs, I am sure.

Mr. GORE. No; but we are heading in that direction.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure that the Senator from Tennessee will stop us before we do that.

Mr. President, many of the underdeveloped countries in the foreign military credit sales program face serious external threats, often as a result of massive Soviet shipments to neighboring countries; others face serious internal instability and Castro exported revolution which may require the use of military force.

The Church amendment eliminates our ability to provide credit sales assistance to any of these developing countries, no matter how seriously its existence might be threatened—either externally or internally. We certainly have a problem on our hands with little countries on the other side of the world not threatened externally in the beginning but internally. The budgetary situation of most of the less-developed countries is such that they cannot pay cash for their legitimate security requirements; they cannot obtain commercial credit; but they do have a capability to make credit purchases when the terms are reasonable as under our current credit assistance program.

The effect of the Church amendment on our limited sales to the less-developed countries—small in relation to arms sales by the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom—would be to abandon such sales with attendant influence and other benefits to the United States and leave arms supply in large part to the Soviet Union and Communist China. That is exactly where our adversary in Vietnam is getting his supplies.

There should be no assurance that cessation of our selective credit sales to developing countries will prevent their purchase of arms elsewhere. In the absence of U.S. assistance, they will turn to other suppliers, of whom there are many, standing ready and willing with attractive terms for equipment which is often excessively sophisticated and expensive, but which is, nonetheless, available. We lose our ability to counsel moderation, to help limit purchases to reasonable quantitative and qualitative limits, to help prevent ill-advised diversion of national assets into hardware and away from development.

Mr. President, this is a field that I wish we could get out of, but I am certain in my own mind that those conditions have not yet been attained where we can safely get out; nor do I have a strong hope that they will be attained within a few short years.

That being true, we had better put up with the burden we have now, to carry and continue this conservative, rational, reasonable, and effective program, rather than to strike it out in a moment of haste and regret it later.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIFE INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, President Lyndon B. Johnson has consistently shown concern for this country's Federal employees.

All of us know that the life insurance program of Government employees should be improved, and the President shares that concern. This is why he asked the Congress for legislation which would make that necessary improvement, at a relatively modest cost of \$13 million.

The measure passed by Congress would cost this Nation more than four times that amount. The President has called this additional amount unnecessary and unwarranted, and he has returned this legislation to the Congress indicating a desire to see the enactment of legislation along the lines of the administration's original proposal, and a willingness to sign such a bill if it is passed by the Congress.

I would like to see such legislation prepared, and passed as it will be in the interest of our Federal employees to have it enacted and signed by President Johnson without further delay.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 15, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 14, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Joseph W. Bartlett, of Massachusetts, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, vice Robert E. Giles, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air Force officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be majors

Aloy, Richard N., XXXXX
 Andrews, David B., XXXXXXXX
 Apostalon, Daniel G., XXXXXXXX
 Barlow, Merrill, XXXXXXXX
 Beazley, Curtis E., XXXXXX
 Benson, Charles P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Blank, Kenneth T., XXXXXXXX
 Border, George F., XXXXXXXX
 Bryant, Clarence T., XXXXXXXX
 Bye, Donald R., XXXXXXXX
 Byrd, Lee B., XXXXXXXX
 Carlile, Homer J., XXXXXXXX
 Carpenter, Wilbur L., XXXXXXXX
 Carter, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Cary, Philip W., XXXXXXXX
 Casbeer, Arthur M., XXXXXXXX
 Casella, Peter J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Ciarfco, Glenn T., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Darrel A., XXXXXXXX
 Clifford, Philip G., XXXXXXXX
 Colton, John O., XXXXXXXX
 Cook, Oliver J., Jr., XXXXXXXX

Couey, Earl J., XXXXXXXX
 Craw, Paul R., XXXXXXXX
 Curtin, Henry A., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Richard G., XXXXX
 Detwiler, Henry, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Diercks, Clifford H., XXXXXXXX
 Diglio, Phillip M., XXXXXXXX
 Dizer, Samuel K., XXXXXXXX
 Eaton, Curtis A., XXXXXXXX
 Elliott, Jefferson D., XXXXXXXX
 England, Frederick H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Evans, Lucius O., XXXXXXXX
 Everhart, Howard R., XXXXXXXX
 Ferguson, Edward J., XXXXXXXX
 Foster, James L., XXXXXXXX
 French, Richard E., XXXXXXXX
 Gant, Mason W. III, XXXXXXXX
 Garland, John K., XXXXXXXX
 Garvin, Patrick L., XXXXXXXX
 Genuardi, Andr J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gildea, Joseph E., XXXXXXXX
 Glossbrenner, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Green, Frederick B., XXXXXXXX
 Hall, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Hall, Titus C., XXXXXXXX
 Hartung, Paul T., XXXXXXXX
 Heath, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Henthorne, Harold R., XXXXXXXX
 Hinton, John M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hintz, Richard M., XXXXXXXX
 Holland, William L., XXXXXXXX
 Houck, Francis S., XXXXXXXX
 Howell, David B., XXXXXXXX
 Hunter, Jene D., XXXXXXXX
 Jarrett, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Jenkins, Wayne E., XXXXXXXX
 Jesse, Jerry A., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Wayne E., XXXXXXXX
 Karnes, Henry L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Kastner, Robert E., XXXXXXXX
 Kawanami, George M., XXXX
 Kelley, Edward W., XXXXXXXX
 King, Thomas J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Kohout, Richard J., XXXXXXXX
 Lambert, Jack E., XXXXXXXX
 LaSalle, Valerian, XXXXXXXX
 Lewis, Lloyd E., XXXXXXXX
 Mackellar, Donald V., XXXXXXXX
 Madison, Thomas M., XXXXXXXX
 Madry, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Majesty, Melvin S., XXXXXXXX
 Malone, Frank J., XXXXXXXX
 Mathews, Edward K., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Bernie L., XXXXXXXX
 Minnick, Joseph C., XXXXXXXX
 Montgomery, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Morris, Brooks, XXXXXXXX
 Moss, Bill, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mulcahy, William E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Murray, Joseph L., XXXXXXXX
 Myers, Douglas C., XXXXXXXX
 Nichols, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Nida, Charles L., XXXXXXXX
 Northey, Samuel C., XXXXXXXX
 Nunemaker, Roger P., XXXXXXXX
 NYC, Frederick F. III, XXXXXXXX
 O'Connor, Rexford T., XXXXXXXX
 O'Donnell, John L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Okuma, Shigeo R., XXXXXXXX
 O'Neil, Hugh M., XXXXXXXX
 Pattee, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Payne, Bryce F., XXXXXXXX
 Peele, Warren D., XXXXXXXX
 Peterson, Harry J., XXXXXXXX
 Pfluger, Loren C., XXXXXXXX
 Phythyon, Burt C., XXXXXXXX
 Pitchford, John J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Powell, Donald M., XXXXXXXX
 Power, Robert D., XXXXXXXX
 Price, Edwin L., XXXXXXXX
 Ray, Samuel L., Jr., XXX
 Renner, Charles F., XXXXXXXX
 Rissling, Raymond E., XXXXXXXX
 Rosinsky, Daniel D., XXXXXXXX
 Rutherford, George L., XXXXXXXX
 Sanders, Elwood L., XXXXXXXX
 Schoch, George R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sewall, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Sick, Herman J., XXXXXXXX
 Sikes, Bruner R., XXXXXXXX
 Singer, Donald M., XXXXXXXX

Skipworth, Billy L., ██████████.
 Smith, Howard H., ██████████.
 Smith, James C., Jr., ██████████.
 Spraberry, Hubert O., ██████████.
 Steele, Wayne, ██████████.
 Stresing, Jack R., ██████████.
 Swaney, Walter J., ██████████.
 Tapp, Marshall L., ██████████.
 Taylor, Paul A., ██████████.
 Tegarden, James H., ██████████.
 Thigpen, John H., Jr., ██████████.
 Tober, Elmer R., ██████████.
 Toms, Leon K., ██████████.
 Turley, Hansel W., Jr., ██████████.
 Turner, Robert E., ██████████.
 Villa, Charles, ██████████.
 Vittori, Gene N., ██████████.
 Wallace, Edward C., ██████████.
 Webb, James D., ██████████.
 Weils, Gordon J., ██████████.
 Welch, James W., ██████████.
 West, Joseph H., ██████████.
 Westbrook, James W., ██████████.
 Westcott, Richard D., ██████████.
 Westphal, John R., ██████████.
 Wildermuth, Robert E., ██████████.
 Williams, Doyle C., ██████████.
 Williams, Thomas A., Jr., ██████████.
 Woodard, James W., ██████████.
 Wortman, William B., ██████████.
 Wright, Richard C. B., ██████████.
 Zimmerly, William R., ██████████.
 Zimowski, Francis L., ██████████.

To be captains

Abeln, Thomas J., ██████████.
 Able, William A., Jr., ██████████.
 Achor, John N., ██████████.
 Adams, Harlen G., ██████████.
 Adams, Richard B., ██████████.
 Adams, Willis A., ██████████.
 Adkins, Patrick M., ██████████.
 Ahern, Edward J., ██████████.
 Aimo, Joseph, ██████████.
 Ainsworth, James, Jr., ██████████.
 Albertsen, John S., ██████████.
 Alderman, Winters, G. H., ██████████.
 Alexander, Clifton D., ██████████.
 Alexander, Douglas W., ██████████.
 Alexander, James W., ██████████.
 Alldever, Duane G., ██████████.
 Allen, James H. Jr., ██████████.
 Allen, Theodore J., ██████████.
 Allison, John C., ██████████.
 Alonzo, Donald R., ██████████.
 Amend, John S., ██████████.
 Anderson, Austin D., ██████████.
 Anderson, Bruce D., ██████████.
 Anderson, Kenneth A., ██████████.
 Anderson, Robert D., ██████████.
 Anderson, William G., ██████████.
 Anderson, William J., ██████████.
 Anthony, James L., ██████████.
 Anthony, Victor B., ██████████.
 Armand, Fredrick M., ██████████.
 Arnet, Charles D., ██████████.
 Arnold, Carroll B., ██████████.
 Arquette, Charles A., Jr., ██████████.
 Arundel, Lawrence C., ██████████.
 Ashenberger, Richard H., ██████████.
 Atkins, David G., ██████████.
 Austin, John L., ██████████.
 Aviles, Arturo, Jr., ██████████.
 Azzarita, Nicholas J., ██████████.
 Baertsch, Robert J., ██████████.
 Bagley, Bobby R., ██████████.
 Bagwell, Robert E., ██████████.
 Bailey, Donald R., ██████████.
 Bailey, Jackie L., ██████████.
 Baird, David M., ██████████.
 Balcom, Ralph C., ██████████.
 Ballard, Jack S., ██████████.
 Ballinger, Russell H., ██████████.
 Banks, Marlon C., ██████████.
 Barancik, Frank C., ██████████.
 Baskett, Silas R., ██████████.
 Bassett, James R., ██████████.
 Bates, Bobby J., ██████████.
 Bauer, Robert F., ██████████.
 Bauman, Judson T., ██████████.
 Bauman, Thomas A., ██████████.

Baumgartner, Daniel J., ██████████.
 Bavousett, Conrad L., ██████████.
 Beall, Charles B., Jr., ██████████.
 Beaudoin, Clarence J., Jr., ██████████.
 Bechtle, Walter E., ██████████.
 Beck, Gordon N., ██████████.
 Beeble, Peter, ██████████.
 Beer, Carl N., ██████████.
 Belknap, Dennis J., ██████████.
 Bell, Jimmie E., ██████████.
 Beisjoe, Thomas B., ██████████.
 Benedict, Ronald J., ██████████.
 Bennett, Richard O., ██████████.
 Bennett, Robert J., ██████████.
 Benson, Ronald N., ██████████.
 Bergman, Arthur J., ██████████.
 Bergman, Erwin, ██████████.
 Bergstein, Robert A., ██████████.
 Berrier, John D., ██████████.
 Berry, Kay L., ██████████.
 Bill, Donald E., ██████████.
 Billett, Roger H., ██████████.
 Bishop, Arthur N., ██████████.
 Bjorkman, Paul H., ██████████.
 Black, Cornelius J., ██████████.
 Blackwell, John W., ██████████.
 Blakely, Robert A., ██████████.
 Blanchard, Lawrence C., Jr., ██████████.
 Blanchard, Phillip B., ██████████.
 Blandford, James C., ██████████.
 Blaufuss, Philipp R., ██████████.
 Blaylock, Bobby G., ██████████.
 Bode, John R., ██████████.
 Bogiages, Christos C., Jr., ██████████.
 Boice, Russell T., Jr., ██████████.
 Boland, Robert L., ██████████.
 Boots, Thomas E., ██████████.
 Boston, Leo S., ██████████.
 Bouldin, Roy D., ██████████.
 Bourcier, Lucien E., ██████████.
 Bourgeois, James E., ██████████.
 Boydstone, James B., ██████████.
 Brackett, Donald F., ██████████.
 Braddock, Julian C., ██████████.
 Brame, Albert W., ██████████.
 Brazell, Lee M., ██████████.
 Brazelton, Douglas W., ██████████.
 Breaux, Marvin R., ██████████.
 Breland, Rodney L., ██████████.
 Brennan, Edward M., ██████████.
 Brewer, David P., ██████████.
 Brewer, Stanley M., ██████████.
 Brittain, Charles R., ██████████.
 Brodman, Robert F., ██████████.
 Bronner, Richard E., ██████████.
 Brooks, Jackson P., ██████████.
 Broussard, Arthur E., Jr., ██████████.
 Brown, Chester P., ██████████.
 Browning, Bob D., ██████████.
 Brun, Robert J., ██████████.
 Brunstrom, Alan L., ██████████.
 Bry, William C., ██████████.
 Bublitz, Robert W., ██████████.
 Buchanan, Charles A., ██████████.
 Budzowski, Benjamin M., ██████████.
 Bulmer, Gail T., ██████████.
 Burdall, Gary E., ██████████.
 Burdulis, Peter C., ██████████.
 Burer, Arthur W., ██████████.
 Burk, William R., ██████████.
 Burnett, James L., III, ██████████.
 Busbee, John H., ██████████.
 Bushey, George D., ██████████.
 Bushey, Kenneth E., ██████████.
 Byrus, Robert L., ██████████.
 Caffey, Clement D., ██████████.
 Cagle, Ned L., ██████████.
 Calkins, George W., ██████████.
 Calvert, Donald L., ██████████.
 Cameron, Alex D., ██████████.
 Cameron, Edward E., ██████████.
 Camille, John S., ██████████.
 Campbell, Howard H., ██████████.
 Campbell, Melvin C., ██████████.
 Campbell, Ralph N., ██████████.
 Capper, Calvin W., ██████████.
 Caras, Franklin A., ██████████.
 Carlson, Donald C., ██████████.
 Carlson, Joseph H., ██████████.
 Carlson, Keith T., ██████████.
 Carrier, William L., ██████████.
 Casey, Robert E., ██████████.
 Cassell, Robert T., ██████████.
 Casteel, John H., ██████████.
 Castles, John H., ██████████.
 Casto, James F., ██████████.
 Catherine, Carl C., ██████████.
 Cattee, Eugene P., ██████████.
 Catton, Ronald E., ██████████.
 Cehebbersky, Jack V., ██████████.
 Cecil, James H., ██████████.
 Celano, Alfred J., ██████████.
 Chabolla, Gilbert A., ██████████.
 Chamberlain, Frank D., Jr., ██████████.
 Chan, Keylor, ██████████.
 Chandler, Charles M., ██████████.
 Chatfield, George A., Jr., ██████████.
 Chestnut, Joseph L., ██████████.
 Chick, Jason I., ██████████.
 Chiorino, Silvio B., ██████████.
 Christensen, Robert B., ██████████.
 Christeson, Gerald L., ██████████.
 Christi, Christus, ██████████.
 Christopoulos, Arthur G., ██████████.
 Cisar, Thomas E., ██████████.
 Clardy, David B., ██████████.
 Clark, Milton M., ██████████.
 Clark, Sterling P., ██████████.
 Clarke, Melvin P., ██████████.
 Clum, Alfred D., ██████████.
 Cobb, Billy J., ██████████.
 Cody, Leonard S., ██████████.
 Colburn, Ned D., ██████████.
 Colebaugh, Norman L., ██████████.
 Collier, Robert M., ██████████.
 Collins, David J., ██████████.
 Collins, Phillip B., ██████████.
 Colton, Charles A., ██████████.
 Comley, Ronald E., ██████████.
 Conklin, Philip W., ██████████.
 Conlan, Edward F., ██████████.
 Connor, Lester E., ██████████.
 Conover, Charles B., ██████████.
 Conway, Wayne D., ██████████.
 Cook, William A., ██████████.
 Cooper, David D., ██████████.
 Coote, William A., ██████████.
 Corlett, Robert M., ██████████.
 Cormier, Roy L., ██████████.
 Cournoyer, Henry J., Jr., ██████████.
 Courtright, Morris, Jr., ██████████.
 Covington, Harold M., ██████████.
 Cowdry, Donald H., ██████████.
 Coyle, Edward M., ██████████.
 Coyle, Ronald P., ██████████.
 Crabtree, C. L., ██████████.
 Craig, Marvin L., ██████████.
 Craig, Michael E., ██████████.
 Craig, Wilbert F., III, ██████████.
 Craig, William P., ██████████.
 Crawford, Marcus E., ██████████.
 Crist, Richard A., ██████████.
 Criswell, Robert L., ██████████.
 Crowell, William R., ██████████.
 Crowley, Harry L., Jr., ██████████.
 Cunningham, Thomas L., ██████████.
 Cuny, Theodore W., Jr., ██████████.
 Curatelli, John J., ██████████.
 Currie, William R., ██████████.
 Curtiss, James R., ██████████.
 Cyr, Arthur R., ██████████.
 Dahle, Simend E., ██████████.
 Dailey, James M., III, ██████████.
 Dale, Neil F., ██████████.
 Dalfonso, Edward V., ██████████.
 Daniels, Charles F., ██████████.
 Dasanmartino, Paul, Jr., ██████████.
 Davey, Thomas E., ██████████.
 Davidson, Christopher H., ██████████.
 Davilla, Sidney T., III, ██████████.
 Davis, David L., ██████████.
 Davis, Hugh A., ██████████.
 Davis, Larry L., ██████████.
 Davis, Robert E., ██████████.
 Dayton, Roy D., ██████████.
 Deakins, Frederick C., ██████████.
 Deardorf, Eldon N., ██████████.
 Deavult, Homer D., ██████████.
 Dede, Vernon L., ██████████.
 Delorenzo, Felix S., ██████████.
 Delorenzo, Francis J., ██████████.

Denson, James E., XXXXX
 Derbin, Anthony W., Jr., XXXXX
 Desrochers, Norman A., XXXXX
 Dezutter, James E., XXXXX
 Dibrell, Sam P., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Dietz, Albert E., XXXXXXXXX
 Dillingham, Larry D., XXXXXXXXX
 Dillon, John Z., XXXXXXXXX
 Disbrow, David E., XXXXXXXXX
 Dishong, Clyde E., XXXXXXXXX
 Dix, Claude B., XXXXXXXXX
 Dombrowa, Theodore J., XXXXX
 Donohoe, Paul J., XXXXXXXXX
 Donovan, John E., XXXXXXXXX
 Dornberger, Billy G., XXXXXXXXX
 Dorr, Alan V., XXXXXXXXX
 Dorsee, Noble H., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Dostie, Francis A., XXXXXXXXX
 Dowell, William B. D., XXXXXXXXX
 Downey, James L., XXXXXXXXX
 Downs, Robert A., XXXXXXXXX
 Drye, Homer F., XXXXXXXXX
 Duart, David H., XXXXXXXXX
 Dudash, John F., XXXXXXXXX
 Duffett, Walter N., XXXXXXXXX
 Duffy, James F., XXXXXXXXX
 Duke, Robert R., XXXXXXXXX
 Dultmeier, Galen A., XXXXXXXXX
 Dunham, Norbert D., XXXXXXXXX
 Dunn, James D., XXXXXXXXX
 Durio, Donn L., XXXXXXXXX
 Durkee, William L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Dutton, John A., XXXXXXXXX
 Duval, James R., XXXXXXXXX
 East, Roger W., XXXXXXXXX
 Ebner, Stanley G., XXXXXXXXX
 Eden, Donald P., XXXXXXXXX
 Elbach, William J., XXXXXXXXX
 Eichler, Frank M., XXXXXXXXX
 Einstein, Walter O., XXXXXXXXX
 Elftmann, John W., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Ellis, Keith W., XXXXXXXXX
 Ellis, Luard L., XXXXXXXXX
 Ellithorpe, Robert C., XXXXXXXXX
 Emerson, Delbert A., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Emery, Eugene E., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Emmons, Tom H., XXXXXXXXX
 Etzel, Gregory A. M., XXXXXXXXX
 Evers, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX
 Evett, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Fair, Gordon H., XXXXXXXXX
 Fair, John C., XXXXXXXXX
 Falzon, Alexander, XXXXXXXXX
 Farnsworth Glenn L., XXXXXXXXX
 Farrell, William H., XXXXXXXXX
 Feil, John A., XXXXXXXXX
 Fenimore, John W., XXXXXXXXX
 Flola, Armand J., XXXXXXXXX
 Fisher, James P., XXXXXXXXX
 Fleitz, Richard A., XXXXXXXXX
 Fluty, William L., XXXXXXXXX
 Foeh, Adolph W., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Foley, James R., XXXXXXXXX
 Folts, Lavens D., XXXXXXXXX
 Ford, Walter J., XXXXXXXXX
 Forsythe, David A., XXXXXXXXX
 Foster, William E., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Fox, James D., XXXXXXXXX
 Fox, Robert W., XXXXX
 Fraga, Thomas Z., XXXXXXXXX
 Fraker, Donald D., XXXXXXXXX
 Francis, James R., XXXXXXXXX
 Franklin, Charles E., XXXXXXXXX
 French, Harold S., XXXXXXXXX
 French, Lawrence R., XXXXXXXXX
 Friedman, Joseph C., XXXXXXXXX
 Frisbee, John A., XXXXXXXXX
 Fry, David C., XXXXXXXXX
 Fulk, James L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Fuller, Hughie E., XXXXXXXXX
 Gage, Robert G., XXXXXXXXX
 Gainer, Harry N., XXXXXXXXX
 Gamlin, Richard A., XXXXX
 Gander, John F., XXXXXXXXX
 Gardner, Patrick J., XXXXXXXXX
 Gardner, Richard A., XXXXXXXXX
 Garner, Mark S., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Garrison, Robert D., XXXXXXXXX
 Gary, Jack W., XXXXXXXXX
 Gaty, Charles L., XXXXXXXXX
 Gavel, Paul, XXXXXXXXX

Gawler, William C., XXXXXXXXX
 Gecewicz, Leo J., XXXXXXXXX
 George, John R., XXXXX
 Gergen, Thomas F., XXXXXXXXX
 Germani, Joseph G., XXXXXXXXX
 Gerzina, Anthony W., XXXXXXXXX
 Gibbons, William J., XXXXXXXXX
 Gideon, Willard S., XXXXXXXXX
 Gilhooley, David P., XXXXXXXXX
 Gill, Edgar A., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Gilliam, Edward L., XXXXXXXXX
 Gillory, Byron M., XXXXXXXXX
 Gioco, Frank C., XXXXXXXXX
 Giuliano, Anthony L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Giovani, Ernest E., XXXXXXXXX
 Glover, John A., XXXXXXXXX
 Godman, Eugene O., XXXXXXXXX
 Gollnick, William H., XXXXXXXXX
 Gomez, Jose F., XXXXXXXXX
 Gomez, Kerry, XXXXXXXXX
 Goodbody, Thomas L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Goodhart, Thomas C., XXXXXXXXX
 Goodrich, Edwin R., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Goodwin, Phillip A., XXXXXXXXX
 Goold, Kenneth C., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Gordon, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX
 Gorman, Charles A., XXXXXXXXX
 Gorton, William A., XXXXX
 Gracheck, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Grant, Robert C., XXXXXXXXX
 Gray, Lawrence C., XXXXXXXXX
 Greco, Joseph J., XXXXXXXXX
 Greene, Charles E., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Gregory, Robert R., XXXXXXXXX
 Griffith, Earl E., XXXXXXXXX
 Griggs, Francis V., XXXXXXXXX
 Grigsby, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Grimsley, Phillip W., XXXXXXXXX
 Grotz, Gerald C., XXXXXXXXX
 Grubb, Robert F., XXXXXXXXX
 Guenther, Gordon P., XXXXXXXXX
 Guilmont, Roy A., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Guin, Bob W., XXXXXXXXX
 Gumbrecht, George E., XXXXXXXXX
 Gunter, Eugene B., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Gurney, Donald G., XXXXXXXXX
 Gustafson, Ronald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Guzik, Francis E., XXXXXXXXX
 Guzman, Miguel A., XXXXXXXXX
 Habr, Joseph G., XXXXXXXXX
 Hackler, Richard L., XXXXXXXXX
 Haeusler, Dean R., XXXXXXXXX
 Hagan, Marion F., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Hagen, Wayne H., XXXXXXXXX
 Hagoood, John M., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Hailey, H. M., Jr., XXXXX
 Haldeman, Robert B., XXXXXXXXX
 Haley, John W., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Hallman, Harvey D., XXXXXXXXX
 Halsted, Benjamin D., XXXX
 Hamby, Carl L., XXXXXXXXX
 Hamel, Norman A., XXXXXXXXX
 Hamm, William D., XXXXXXXXX
 Hanley, Edward E., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Hansen, Alfred G., XXXXXXXXX
 Hanson, Charles A., XXXXXXXXX
 Hanson, Troy L., XXXXXXXXX
 Harbour, Charles R., XXXXXXXXX
 Hardister, Joseph E., XXXXXXXXX
 Hargrave, Charles O., XXXXXXXXX
 Harmon, Robert A., XXXXXXXXX
 Harner, Everett D., XXXXXXXXX
 Harris, Leonard G., XXXXXXXXX
 Hartstein, Frederick C., XXXXXXXXX
 Harwood, Robert K., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Haverland, Bobby H., XXXXXXXXX
 Hawkins, Richard C., XXXXXXXXX
 Hawkins, Van E., XXXXXXXXX
 Hayman, Gary E., XXXXXXXXX
 Haywood, Ronald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Head, Gerald A., XXXXXXXXX
 Heagy, Robert T., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Healy, Charles M., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Heath, Charley W., XXXXXXXXX
 Heberly, Elwood A., XXXXXXXXX
 Hedgepeth, Willis E., XXXXXXXXX
 Hee, Edward K. Y., XXXXXXXXX
 Heffernan, Robert E., XXXXXXXXX
 Heifner, Charles T., XXXXXXXXX
 Helm, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Helmer, Richard G., XXXXXXXXX

Heisten, Charles T., XXXXXXXXX
 Hemmings, Arthur A., Jr., XXXXX
 Hempe, John D., XXXXXXXXX
 Henderson, Jerry L., XXXXXXXXX
 Henkle, Dallas M., XXXXXXXXX
 Henningson, Edwin A., XXXXXXXXX
 Henry, Jay F., XXXXXXXXX
 Herbst, Roland G., XXXXXXXXX
 Hernandez, Robert D., XXXXXXXXX
 Herr, Ronald H., XXXXXXXXX
 Hetherington, James R., XXXXXXXXX
 Hicks, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Higginbotham, Jon D., XXXXXXXXX
 Hill, Ray D., XXXXXXXXX
 Hinterthan, Winfried W., XXXXXXXXX
 Hintz, James G., XXXXXXXXX
 Hoch, John A., XXXXXXXXX
 Hoff, Ray J., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Hokanson, John M., XXXXXXXXX
 Holland, William H., XXXXXXXXX
 Holloway, David H., XXXXXXXXX
 Holmes, Irvin W., XXXXXXXXX
 Holmes, Marlan, XXXXXXXXX
 Hooper, Claren B., Jr., XXXXX
 Horacek, James C., XXXXXXXXX
 Horn, Richard A., XXXXXXXXX
 Horton, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX
 Hossley, Donald D., XXXXXXXXX
 Houck, George F., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Howard, Archer H., XXXXXXXXX
 Howard, George M., XXXXXXXXX
 Howell, Robert M., XXXXXXXXX
 Hubrich, Max L., XXXXXXXXX
 Huffman, Harold J., XXXXXXXXX
 Huffman, Leon W., XXXXXXXXX
 Huggins, Bobby G., XXXXXXXXX
 Hughes, Richard W., XXXXXXXXX
 Hullinger, William P., XXXXXXXXX
 Huls, Robert G., XXXXXXXXX
 Humm, John R., XXXXXXXXX
 Hunn, Van, XXXXXXXXX
 Hunter, Cora D., XXXXXXXXX
 Hunter, Frank E., XXXXXXXXX
 Huson, Albert C., XXXXXXXXX
 Hylton, Robert E., XXXXXXXXX
 Ihle, Bruce R., XXXXXXXXX
 Ikezawa, Michael A., XXXXXXXXX
 Iseman, Billy E., XXXXXXXXX
 Itzen, Donald A., XXXXXXXXX
 Jackson, William A., XXXXXXXXX
 Jacobs, James L., XXXXXXXXX
 Jacobs, John E., XXXXXXXXX
 Jacobs, Max R., XXXXXXXXX
 James, Clifford A., XXXXXXXXX
 James, Don L., XXXXXXXXX
 Jasinski, John M., XXXXXXXXX
 Jayroe, Julius S., XXXXXXXXX
 Jeffords, Jacque M., XXXXXXXXX
 Jennings, Hollis L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Jenrich, Edwin, XXXXXXXXX
 Johns, Arthur L., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Billie H., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Ernest E., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Gayle P., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Larry E., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Paul A., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Ward A., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Wayne M., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Willard F., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, William C., XXXXXXXXX
 Johnson, William J., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Jones, John C., XXXXXXXXX
 Jones, Joseph M., XXXXXXXXX
 Jones, Richard A., XXXXXXXXX
 Jones, Richard W., Jr., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Jones, Rowland E., XXXXXXXXX
 Jorgensen, Royce U., XXXXXXXXX
 Julius, Ronald J., XXXXXXXXX
 Keels, William M., XXXXXXXXX
 Keenan, James C., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Keeter, Carroll D., XXXXXXXXX
 Keith, Chandler, XXXXXXXXX
 Keith, William R., XXXXXXXXX
 Keller, Doyal L., XXXXXXXXX
 Keller, George B., XXXXXXXXX
 Kelly, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX
 Kelly, William E., XXXXXXXXX
 Kenefick, Loren L., XXXXXXXXX
 Kennedy, Patrick J., XXXXXXXXX
 Kennedy, Robert E., XXXXXXXXX

Kerr, John C. G., ██████████.
 Kessler, Alan, ██████████.
 Kibler, Ronald F., ██████████.
 Kielcheski, Carlin J., ██████████.
 Kimber, Bruce, ██████████.
 King, Donald L., ██████████.
 Kinney, James S., ██████████.
 Kinsley, Otho V., Jr., ██████████.
 Kirk, Harris W., ██████████.
 Klausner, William W., ██████████.
 Kline, Gerald D., ██████████.
 Kline, Wilson J., ██████████.
 Klopfer, John T., Jr., ██████████.
 Knapp, Thurston F., ██████████.
 Knedlik, Donald E., ██████████.
 Kogge, Henry J., ██████████.
 Koontz, Esco G., ██████████.
 Kopsick, John, Jr., ██████████.
 Kothanek, John F., Jr., ██████████.
 Kowalczyk, Edward A., ██████████.
 Kral, Ralph J., ██████████.
 Kraus, Jon P., ██████████.
 Krause, Keith E., ██████████.
 Krueger, Douglas W., ██████████.
 Krug, Earl E., ██████████.
 Kuhn, Edward F., ██████████.
 Kuhns, James K., ██████████.
 Kunc, Fred V., ██████████.
 Kwortnik, John C., ██████████.
 Labernik, Theodore J., ██████████.
 Lacasse, Richard E., ██████████.
 Laffey, Thomas P., ██████████.
 Lakey, Harvey L., ██████████.
 Lamb, Clendon V., ██████████.
 Langford, Albert R., Jr., ██████████.
 Larj, Vladimir, ██████████.
 Larson, Edward, ██████████.
 Lasater, John R., ██████████.
 Law, Richard O., ██████████.
 Lawrence, Robert, ██████████.
 Lawrence, Stanley A., ██████████.
 Layton, Robert F., ██████████.
 Leahy, Robert E., ██████████.
 Leal, Lupe S., ██████████.
 Ledbetter, Ray H., ██████████.
 Lee, Robert E., ██████████.
 Lemke, Clyde W., ██████████.
 Lemley, Roy, ██████████.
 Lemon, John A., ██████████.
 Leslie, John W., Jr., ██████████.
 Lester, Roy F., Jr., ██████████.
 Levine, Alexander A., ██████████.
 Levine, Edgar G., ██████████.
 Lewandowski, Dale J., ██████████.
 Lewis, Julian R., ██████████.
 Lewis, Merrill, R., Jr., ██████████.
 Lilly, Carter H., ██████████.
 Lilly, Ira B., Jr., ██████████.
 Lindsey, John C., ██████████.
 Lindsey, Walter L., ██████████.
 Lineberger, Jason R., ██████████.
 Linn, Edward M., ██████████.
 Linn, Russell R., ██████████.
 Lisko, James R., ██████████.
 Livers, Francis D., Jr., ██████████.
 Lloyd, Edward A., ██████████.
 Lloyd, William H., Jr., ██████████.
 Long, Raymond N., ██████████.
 Long, Warren L., ██████████.
 Lopes, George A., ██████████.
 Lott, James S., ██████████.
 Lowrey, Keith W., ██████████.
 Lustig, Charles L., ██████████.
 Lutz, Norman M., ██████████.
 Lydon, John J., ██████████.
 Lyle, William W., ██████████.
 Mackall, Frederick T., ██████████.
 Mackinnon, Donald S., ██████████.
 Macklin, Paul R., ██████████.
 Madden, Robert W., ██████████.
 Maddox, Robert A., ██████████.
 Magliocca, George J., ██████████.
 Mahrholz, Fritz, ██████████.
 Mahrt, Martin H., ██████████.
 Malley, James E., ██████████.
 Manning, John F., ██████████.
 Marble, Vern L., ██████████.
 Marrs, Robert J., Jr., ██████████.
 Martin, Bobby J., ██████████.
 Martin, Bobby L., ██████████.

Martin, Glen R., ██████████.
 Martin, Paul A., Jr., ██████████.
 Martin, Paul W., ██████████.
 Martinez, Gilbert, ██████████.
 Mason, Robert C., ██████████.
 Mateik, Daniel G., ██████████.
 Mathias, Duane M., ██████████.
 Mathis, Harvey J., ██████████.
 Matters, Duane H., ██████████.
 Matthes, Frank H., ██████████.
 Matthews, Charles A., ██████████.
 Matthews, Stephen C., ██████████.
 Mattison, David D., ██████████.
 Mattoon, Harry E., ██████████.
 Mauser, William T., ██████████.
 Maxwell, Donald J., ██████████.
 May, Ronny J., ██████████.
 May, William T., ██████████.
 Maynard, Byron D., ██████████.
 McAllister, Karl D., ██████████.
 McAuliffe, Francis G., ██████████.
 McBratney, Robert M., ██████████.
 McCarty, William S., ██████████.
 McClaine, Richard E., ██████████.
 McClellan, Paul E., ██████████.
 McConnell, Herbert E., ██████████.
 McCoy, Ronald T., ██████████.
 McCulloch, Donald O., ██████████.
 McCulloch, Gerald L., ██████████.
 McCullough, Mario G., ██████████.
 McDaniel, Kenneth E., ██████████.
 McDonald, Dale E., ██████████.
 McEwan, Ronald J., ██████████.
 McGee, Gerald E., ██████████.
 McGovern, John F., ██████████.
 McGowan, Patrick T., ██████████.
 McIntire, Eugene R., ██████████.
 McKenzie, Larry W., ██████████.
 McKnight, George G., ██████████.
 McMillen, Paul S., ██████████.
 McMullen, Gerald W., ██████████.
 McNeer, Charles J., ██████████.
 McNeill, Robert E., ██████████.
 McPherson, John W., ██████████.
 McQueen, James E., ██████████.
 Means, William H., Jr., ██████████.
 Meine, Frederick G., ██████████.
 Meinert, Ronald E., ██████████.
 Meisinger, Kenneth R., ██████████.
 Meissner, Rudolph J., Jr., ██████████.
 Melody, James P., ██████████.
 Mellor, Fredric M., ██████████.
 Messick, David T., ██████████.
 Meyer, Albert D., ██████████.
 Meyer, George R., Jr., ██████████.
 Meyer, William M., ██████████.
 Meyers, George H., III, ██████████.
 Meyers, Thomas R., ██████████.
 Michaud, Normand, ██████████.
 Miller, Clifford, ██████████.
 Miller, Donald D., ██████████.
 Miller, Duane A., ██████████.
 Miller, Edward P., ██████████.
 Miller, George M., ██████████.
 Miller, James R., ██████████.
 Miller, Paul B., ██████████.
 Miller, Richard W., ██████████.
 Miller, Roger E., ██████████.
 Miller, Thomas D., ██████████.
 Miller, Wayne D., ██████████.
 Million, Harry L., Jr., ██████████.
 Mobley, Billy M., ██████████.
 Montemayor, Daniel A., ██████████.
 Montgomery, Richard D., ██████████.
 Mooney, Melton J., ██████████.
 Moore, Harry W., ██████████.
 Morales, Rafael, ██████████.
 Moran, Edward J., ██████████.
 Morelli, Anthony, ██████████.
 Morgan, Charles E., ██████████.
 Morgan, Harold I., ██████████.
 Morgan, Herschel S., ██████████.
 Morgan, Hugh M., ██████████.
 Morris, Eugene C., ██████████.
 Morrison, Franklyn C., ██████████.
 Mosley, Bruce H., ██████████.
 Mourning, John R., ██████████.
 Muck, Donald I. J., ██████████.
 Mueller, Robert K., ██████████.

Mulligan, Robert G., ██████████.
 Mullins, Donald W., ██████████.
 Mumford, Willard R., ██████████.
 Munch, Samuel A., Jr., ██████████.
 Mund, Harold H., ██████████.
 Murphy, Charles H., ██████████.
 Murphy, Eugene, ██████████.
 Murtough, John K., ██████████.
 Muscatello, William R., ██████████.
 Nagle, Bruce A., ██████████.
 Nash, James F., ██████████.
 Navarro, Lloyd T., ██████████.
 Neal, Guy W., ██████████.
 Neal, James D., ██████████.
 Needham, Richard C., ██████████.
 Neill, Frank D., Jr., ██████████.
 Nelson, Eugene R., ██████████.
 Nelson, Fred E., Jr., ██████████.
 Nichols, Joseph P., ██████████.
 Nichols, William P. J., ██████████.
 Nickerson, Ronald E., ██████████.
 Nicks, William L., ██████████.
 Nixon, Paul P., ██████████.
 Nolan, James W., ██████████.
 Nolan, John F., ██████████.
 Nolan, Richard A., ██████████.
 Noonan, Richard A., ██████████.
 Notman, William R., III, ██████████.
 O'Brien, Robert J., ██████████.
 O'Connell, Arthur J., ██████████.
 O'Connor, Thomas H., Jr., ██████████.
 O'Day, William J., ██████████.
 O'Dell, Donald E., ██████████.
 O'Hanian, John P., ██████████.
 Ohlson, Nils A., ██████████.
 O'Keefe, John P., ██████████.
 Olimb, Curtis A., ██████████.
 Olman, Lothar A., ██████████.
 Olson, Neale E., ██████████.
 Olson, Robert E., ██████████.
 O'Malley, Edmund P., Jr., ██████████.
 Osborne, Clement D., ██████████.
 Oswaldo, John H., ██████████.
 Ottman, Willard G., ██████████.
 Overland, Richard M., ██████████.
 Overly, James D., ██████████.
 Owen, William R., ██████████.
 Owens, Max G., ██████████.
 Pace, Edward L., ██████████.
 Pack, Boyce G., ██████████.
 Page, Lawrence F., ██████████.
 Painter, Richard G., ██████████.
 Palmberg, Roger V., ██████████.
 Palumbo, Guy L., ██████████.
 Paoletta, Benjamin P., ██████████.
 Park, Richard D., ██████████.
 Parker, Pasco, ██████████.
 Parker, Paul A., Jr., ██████████.
 Parker, Vernon H., ██████████.
 Parrotte, Irwin E., ██████████.
 Partin, James A., ██████████.
 Patrick, Paul C., ██████████.
 Patton, Bruce P., ██████████.
 Pedersen, Howard M., ██████████.
 Pehr, Frank J., ██████████.
 Pemberton, Robert G., ██████████.
 Penland, William A., ██████████.
 Perrine, Elton L., ██████████.
 Perry, Theron M., ██████████.
 Perry, Walter O., ██████████.
 Perry, William R., ██████████.
 Petersen, Richard S., ██████████.
 Peterson, Charles D., ██████████.
 Peterson, Robert A., ██████████.
 Peterson, Wayne K., ██████████.
 Petitjean, Robert W., ██████████.
 Phillips, Keither E., ██████████.
 Phillips, Robert S., ██████████.
 Pickering, Harold, ██████████.
 Pickett, Thomas J., Jr., ██████████.
 Picking, Franklin W., ██████████.
 Pilkinson, Corinne G., ██████████.
 Pillsbury, Walter E., ██████████.
 Pittard, David H., ██████████.
 Pitts, Verdell V., ██████████.
 Podlesnik, Frank A., Jr., ██████████.
 Polson, Harold O., ██████████.
 Pool, Jimmy B., ██████████.
 Poole, George W., ██████████.

Poore, Donald W., XXXXX
 Poppert, Richard E., XXXXX
 Porch, Roger D., XXXXXXXXX
 Porter, Rogers A., XXXXXXXXX
 Porter, William C., XXXXXXXXX
 Poskie, David L., XXXXXXXXX
 Postgate, John W., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Potter, Dale L., XXXXXXXXX
 Powers, Winston D., XXXXXXXXX
 Pruet, Leland H., XXXXXXXXX
 Pryor, James A., XXXXXXXXX
 Pulham, Thomas D., XXXXX
 Pulliam, Guy E., XXXXXXXXX
 Pung, James C., XXXXXXXXX
 Purvine, Bruce M., XXXXXXXXX
 Putney, Robert F., XXXXXXXXX
 Quast, Emil T., XXXXXXXXX
 Rainey, Charles A., XXXXXXXXX
 Raitt, William W., XXXXXXXXX
 Raup, Karl A., XXXXXXXXX
 Raymer, Irvine K., XXXXXXXXX
 Rea, Arthur M., XXXXXXXXX
 Reamer, Frank P., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Redding, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX
 Reed, Donald D., XXXXXXXXX
 Reed, Joseph L., XXXXXXXXX
 Reese, Robert D., XXXXXXXXX
 Regan, Maurice D., XXXXXXXXX
 Remsburg, Clark L., XXXXXXXXX
 Renko, Thomas M., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Repp, Robert M., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Revello, Pete A., XXXXXXXXX
 Reyes, Edward D., XXXXXXXXX
 Reynolds, Richard C., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Richards, Malcolm E., XXXXXXXXX
 Richardson, Edward F., XXXXXXXXX
 Ring, Richard L., XXXXXXXXX
 Rios, William, XXXXXXXXX
 Ripley, Roy L., XXXXXXXXX
 Ritchie, Welton C., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Robb, Jon M., XXXXXXXXX
 Robel, Richard F., XXXXXXXXX
 Robey, William L., XXXXXXXXX
 Robichaud, Robert P., XXXXXXXXX
 Robinson, George D., XXXXXXXXX
 Robinson, Richard D., XXXXXXXXX
 Robinson, Richard O., XXXXXXXXX
 Robinson, Zane H., XXXXXXXXX
 Rogers, Travis O., XXXXXXXXX
 Rogers, William J., XXXXXXXXX
 Rohrlick, Myles A., XXXXXXXXX
 Rollins, John O., II, XXXXXXXXX
 Roney, Billy J., XXXXXXXXX
 Roos, Herbert L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Rose, Samuel R., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Rosko, Edward F., XXXXXXXXX
 Ross, Russell L., XXXXXXXXX
 Rossacci, Pasquale Jr., XXXXXXX
 Rouze, Donald L., XXXXXXXXX
 Royston, Craig, XXXXXXXXX
 Ruppenthal, Freddie E., XXXXXXXXX
 Rushton, Norman H., XXXXX
 Rushworth, Ralph, XXXXXXXXX
 Rustvold, Clarence A., XXXXXXXXX
 Rutherford, Alan K., XXXXXXXXX
 Rutter, Harry W., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Ryan, James C., XXXXXXXXX
 Sadler, Harry R., XXXXX
 Samay, Raphael S., XXXXXXXXX
 Samson, Dale D., XXXXXXXXX
 Sanchez, Gloria L., XXXXXXXXX
 Sandberg, Jack L., XXXXXXXXX
 Sanner, Joseph L., XXXXXXXXX
 Sawicki, Raymond S., XXXXXXXXX
 Saxton, Robert M., XXXXXXXXX
 Saylor, William T., XXXXXXXXX
 Scabavea, Andy S., XXXXXXXXX
 Schacker, Ralph A., XXXXXXXXX
 Schamens, Kenneth W., XXXXXXXXX
 Schartman, Paul A., XXXXXXXXX
 Schatz, Lloyd O., XXXXXXXXX
 Scheloske, John J., XXXXXXXXX
 Schlosser, Martin G., XXXXXXXXX
 Schmidt, Gerald A., XXXXXXXXX
 Schnaiter, Thomas P., XXXX
 Schnell, Charles R., XXXXXXXXX
 Schoonover, Donald J., XXXXXXXXX
 Schuh, Fred, Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Schuler, Larry L., XXXXXXXXX

Scott, Jackson K., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Seals, Billy R., XXXXXXXXX
 Searby, Peter H., XXXXXXXXX
 Secret, Fred M., XXXXXXXXX
 Seely, Richard R., XXXXXXXXX
 Seif, Carl V., XXXXXXXXX
 Seirer, Willie L., XXXXXXXXX
 Semler, Philip A., XXXXXXXXX
 Sessions, Jerry L., XXXXXXXXX
 Setlow, Andrew D., XXXX
 Sevin, Daniel J., XXXXXXXXX
 Shaleski, Reginald W., XXXXXXXXX
 Shattuck, Lewis W., XXXXXXXXX
 Shaw, Thomas A., XXXXXXXXX
 Shelton, Charles E., XXXXXXXXX
 Sherling, Andrew M., XXXXXXXXX
 Shermer, Ace E., XXXXXXXXX
 Sherrill, Haskell B., XXXXXXXXX
 Shields, Edwar R., II, XXXXX
 Shifflett, Donald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Shinemann, Francis L., XXXXXXXXX
 Shumbera, August L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Sihler, Edward A., XXXX
 Simmons, William P., XXXXXXXXX
 Simon, Jerry, XXXXXXXXX
 Simon, Roy A., XXXXXXXXX
 Simpson, Gus H., XXXXXXXXX
 Simpson, Paul L., XXXXXXXXX
 Simpson, Richard J., XXXXX
 Singleton, Lonnie A., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Siniuk, Joseph S., XXXXXXXXX
 Skelton, Charles B., XXXXXXXXX
 Skinner, Owen G., XXXXXXXXX
 Skowron, Edward R., XXXXXXXXX
 Skutack, Daniel E., XXXXXXXXX
 Skvorak, Richard A., XXXXXXXXX
 Slade, Clyde M., XXXXXXXXX
 Slattery, James M., XXXXXXXXX
 Slaughter, Ernest H., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Carl W., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Chauncey D., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, David L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Donald R., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, James S., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, John H., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Mark A., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Samuel F., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Smith, Scott W., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Sneed, John R., XXXXXXXXX
 Sneary, Richard L., XXXXXXXXX
 Snelling, John H., XXXXX
 Snowden, Wendell, XXXXXX
 Soto, Benigno, XXXXX
 Sparkman, Jimmy R., XXXXXXXXX
 Spearman, Jerry D., XXXXXXXXX
 Spears, Richard D., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Sprick, Duane R., XXXXXXXXX
 Springer, Robert D., XXXXXXXXX
 Squire, Boyd E., XXXXXXXXX
 Stafford, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX
 Stalnecker, Howard G., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Stamschror, Charles J., XXXXXXXXX
 Stathopoulos, Anthony, XXXXXXXXX
 Steele, John W., XXXXXXXXX
 Stephenson, Edgar L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Stevens, Jerry E., XXXXXXXXX
 Stewart, Altha M., XXXXXXXXX
 Stewart, Ellis C., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Stewart, James A., XXXXXXXXX
 Stewart, John K., XXXXXXXXX
 St. Martin, Roy L., XXXXXXXXX
 Stoffel, Francis B., XXXXXXXXX
 Stokes, Marion O., XXXXXXXXX
 Stone, James E., XXXXXXXXX
 Stone, Ralph E., XXXXXXXXX
 Storz, Ronald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Stricker, Richard J., XXXXXXXXX
 Stubberfield, Robert A., XXXXXXXXX
 Suther, John A., XXXXXXXXX
 Sutton, Everett M., XXXXXXXXX
 Swanson, Ronald E., XXXXX
 Swendner, William J., XXXXXXXXX
 Sweeney, Allen L., XXXXXXXXX
 Tait, Sereno R., Jr., XXXX
 Tanner, James L., XXXXXXXXX
 Tapman, Thomas F., XXXXXXXXX
 Tatro, Eugene C., XXXXX
 Telshaw, Bradley R., XXXXXXXXX
 Teskey, Harland E., XXXXXXXXX
 Thelen, Boyce C., XXXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Leland C., XXXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Ewing M., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Thompson, James E., XXXX
 Thompson, John W., XXXX
 Thompson, Richard W., XXXXXXXXX
 Thompson, William W., XXXX
 Thornton, Ralph H., XXXXXXXXX
 Thorpe, William H., XXXXXXXXX
 Thorsness, Leo K., XXXXXXXXX
 Tibbs, John W., XXXXXXXXX
 Tice, Robert K., XXXXXXXXX
 Tidwell, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX
 Tindall, J. D., XXXXXXXXX
 Tinney, Jack S., XXXXXXXXX
 Tolstead, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX
 Totten, David K., XXXXXXXXX
 Trottier, William B., XXXXXXXXX
 Tschetter, Timothy, XXXXXXXXX
 Tucker, Ronald J., XXXXXXXXX
 Tucker, Roy E., XXXXXXXXX
 Tumulty, Frank J., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Turley, Morvan D., XXXXXXXXX
 Turner, Hiram G., XXXXXXXXX
 Twalt, Francis J., XXXXXXXXX
 Ulmer, Stiles C., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Underwood, William E., XXXXXXXXX
 Urschler, Regis F. A., XXXXXXXXX
 Ussery, Bobby J., XXXXXXXXX
 Vandrew, Woodrow L., XXXXXXXXX
 Vanhoosen, Milford L., XXXXXXXXX
 Vanness, Charles R., XXXXXXXXX
 Vaughan, James L., XXXXXXXXX
 Vaught, Wilma L., XXXXXXXXX
 Villines, William F., XXXXXXXXX
 Vincent, Oakley G., XXXX
 Vineyard, John R., XXXXXXXXX
 Vollmer, Albert C., XXXXXXXXX
 Volpe, John M., XXXXXXXXX
 Vondersmith, William M., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Waggoner, Robert F., XXX
 Wagnon, Jerry R., XXXXXXXXX
 Walker, Donald C., XXXXXXXXX
 Walker, Edward P., XXXX
 Walker, Leonard S., III, XXXXXXXXX
 Walker, Wallace J., XXXXXXXXX
 Walker, William L., XXXXXXXXX
 Walkowski, Raymond J., XXXXXXXXX
 Wallace, Richard S., XXXXXXXXX
 Ward, Robert L., XXXXXXXXX
 Warinner, Algernon S., II, XXXXXXXXX
 Warner, Ronald L., XXXXXXXXX
 Watson, Robert J., XXXXXXXXX
 Watson, Ronald W., XXXXXXXXX
 Waugh, Jimmie G., XXXXXXXXX
 Wayland, Henry T., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Weaver, Robert L., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Weaver, Ronald E., XXXXXXXXX
 Weber, Paul L., XXXXXXXXX
 Webster, Fate L., XXXXXXXXX
 Weege, Ernest J., XXXXXXXXX
 Weir, James C., XXXXXXXXX
 Weiss, Anthony G., XXXXXXXXX
 Welch, Loren E., XXXXXXXXX
 Wellington, Raymond, Jr., XXXX
 Wellons, Phillip R., XXXXXXXXX
 Wells, Harold L., XXXXXXXXX
 Wells, Norman L., XXXXXXXXX
 West, Charles G., XXXXXXXXX
 Westcott, Lawrence P., XXXXXXXXX
 Wetzel, Wilbert J., Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Whalen, James P., XXXXXXXXX
 White, Joseph, Jr., XXXXXXXXX
 Whitfield, Marvin C., XXXXXXXXX
 Wickwar, Richard N., XXXXXXXXX
 Wierman, Frank S., XXXXXXXXX
 Wiersma, William E., XXXXXXXXX
 Wigal, Ralph E., XXXXXXXXX
 Williams, Cleveland D., XXXXXXXXX
 Williams, Perry, XXXXXXXXX
 Williams, Philip P., XXXXX
 Williams, Richard L., XXXXXXXXX
 Williams, Robert R., XXXX
 Williams, Walter C., XXXXXXXXX
 Willis, Robert E., XXXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Bobby J., XXXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Burke L., XXXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Edward N., XXXXXXXXX

Wilson, Wayne F. XXXX
 Wimberly, Johnie H. XXXX
 Winner, Don C. XXXX
 Winter, John R. XXXX
 Wojcik, Joseph J. XXXX
 Wood, Charles J. XXXX
 Wood, James E. XXXX
 Woodhead, Robert E. XXXX
 Woods, Edwin P., Jr. XXXX
 Woods, Ronald D. XXXX
 Woodworth, Richard D. XXXX
 Woolington, Gerald L. XXXX
 Wray, Billy E. XXXX
 Wright, Arthur L. XXXX
 Wright, Duggins F. L. XXXX
 Wright, Gene T. XXXX
 Wright, Jerdy A., Jr. XXXX
 Wright, William H. XXXX
 Wyrick, Carl A. XXXX

Wywick, Donald M. XXXX
 Yamada, Hisao XXXX
 Yarrington, Arthur XXXX
 Yeager, James A. XXXX
 Yeatman, Robert E. XXXX
 Yenke, William H. XXXX
 Yiskis, Norman L. XXXX
 Yohe, Robert S. XXXX
 York, Thomas P., Jr. XXXX
 Young, Edward D., Jr. XXXX
 Young, John F. XXXX
 Younkin, Robert J. XXXX
 Yovin, Joseph A., Jr. XXXX
 Zacharias, Jon E. XXXX
 Zani, Robert C. XXXX
 Zaretsky, Michael G. XXXX
 Zeitler, Frank J. XXXX
 Ziman, Robert L. XXXX
 Zwack, Edward W. XXXX

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 14, 1967:

U.S. COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Michael Baron, Jr., to be chief warrant officer (W-4), and ending Ted B. Bryant, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 25, 1967.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The nominations beginning John R. Plaggmier, to be captain, and ending Kenneth W. Sigley, to be ensign which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 27, 1967.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of the general public in the Anticrime Act and the recently passed Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my newsletter on this subject.

The newsletter follows:

HOUSE OVERWHELMINGLY PASSES ACT TO ASSIST CITIES IN COMBATING CRIME, QUELLING RIOTS, AND MAINTAINING LAW AND ORDER
 (Capitol comment by JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee, August 14, 1967)

The House this week passed a second measure designed to assist local law enforcement agencies in combatting crime and violence. This latest action will provide Federal assistance in strengthening and building up local police departments and law enforcement agencies. Called the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act, this measure provides that funds will be administered and allocated to local law enforcement agencies by the governors of the states.

The measure, recommended by President Johnson in his State of the Union Message to the Congress, will provide \$75 million for this fiscal year to assist in the training and equipment of local police departments and other law enforcement agencies.

The measure also provides that emphasis will be placed on riot control techniques and training. The bill earmarked \$25 million in this fiscal year for this specific program.

"In the development of plans," the bill provides, "the highest priority shall be given to the detection, prevention and control of

riots and violent civil disorders, and of organized crime."

The enactment of this bill came a week after enactment of a tough anti-riot act by the House, calling for a fine of \$10,000 and a federal prison sentence of five years upon conviction of traveling across state lines to incite riots.

These measures form a pattern of Congressional action and reaction not only to this summer's riots and insurrections in some of our major cities but also to the increasing incidence of crime and lawlessness.

As enacted by the Congress, the measure will provide for grants based on population to local law enforcement agencies through state law enforcement planning agencies for training and purchase of equipment—and for a National Institute to train police officers. This institute will be patterned after the FBI Academy for police officers but will be independent and separate from the Academy. States must adopt comprehensive crime plans to become eligible for the grants.

This Anti-Crime Act and the previously passed Anti-Riot Act are now pending in the Senate.

Correct Jack Anderson Intentional Misrepresentation of Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that Jack Anderson, who works with Drew Pearson, has printed in his syndicated column that Mr. George Hall worked with me for 4 months during 1943 and approximately 7 months in 1946.

Anderson further states in his column, which I understand has appeared in

several newspapers, that no one knew of Mr. Hall and that he passed away in Marion, S.C., his hometown which is located in my congressional district, in 1938.

My administrative assistant, Major McGee, and Mr. Clayton Gasque, who is staff director with the District Committee, are both acquainted with Mr. Hall and knew of his part-time work with me here in my office on two occasions.

This information was given to a Washington Post reporter before Jack Anderson sent this unadulterated lie to the newspapers.

Mr. Hall was born in Marion, S.C., November 25, 1900, and on several occasions between 1939 and 1960, I assisted Mr. Hall in securing work with several private industries here in the city of Washington. I employed him to assist me on two occasions as a part-time worker in sending out material from my office. The exact dates were June 1943 until November of 1943 and June 1946 until February 1947.

Mr. Hall was admitted to the George Washington General Hospital for a hernia operation in 1957 and was again admitted to the George Washington Hospital for treatment in 1959 and suffered a heart attack in 1963.

Mr. Hall passed away at the rooming-house where he was making his home, 2700 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C., on August 8, 1966. He was buried at Washington National Cemetery, 4101 Suitland Road, Suitland, Md.

It is rather difficult to understand why any so-called newspaper columnist or reporter should want to originate and create a lie such as was presented in Jack Anderson's column, recently published in numerous newspapers.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, as we rejoice in the gift of another day, may its hours be made luminous by Thy presence, who art the light of all our seeing. In everything we are called to face may we do our best and so be worthy of our high calling.

Undergird us with Thy might to exercise the potent ministry to all the world to which, in Thy providence, we believe

Thou has called us in this age on ages telling.

In the crises of our times join us with those, who across the waste and wilderness of human hate and need, preparing the way of the Lord, throw up a highway for our God.

As Thy servants in this temple of democracy, give us courage and strength for the vast task of social rebuilding that