our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. * * * A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

This quotation from Monroe's message to the Congress, the same message in which the Monroe Doctrine appeared, clearly shows that the hearts of the American people were with the Greeks in the fight for independence 143 years ago. It also reminds us that the President's hope for a Greek nation as an equal partner in the world community has come to pass. Today, our friend Greece, an excellent example of a responsible member of the international community, is a hard-working, conscientious member of the United Nations, dedicated to the principle that the world must have peace, and that man must not be a slave to any master. As our friend, Greece has joined hands with us in NATO as the free world's Balkan bastion. As a most responsible member of NATO, Greece has kept her military modern, her economy moving and her government stable, while never removing her eyes from the goal of the Atlantic Alliance—world peace. Our friendship must never waiver.

Another heritage that Americans cherish, second only to friendship, is love of liberty and freedom. As the cradle of democracy with the first representative government in the world, it is an irony of history that the land that gave birth to so many democratic concepts would be dominated for almost 400 years. But these are the kinds of cruelties that history plays on nations, and today we rejoice that our friend has been free again for 143 years. More recently Greece has resisted Marxism, and I think it is important to say that communism was never defeated more convincingly. It is a source of great pride to Americans that we had a part in that defeat. It would be wrong to say that Greece is not a Communist satellite today only because of American help. It is closer to the truth to say that American aid helped the Hellenes do what they themselves wanted to do; namely, live in freedom. That they live as a free nation with a common border with three Communist states attests to their bravery and determination to be free from domination.

Greece has also given the world the beginnings of Western civilization. Thousands of years ago saw the first citizens of the Western World living in a highly sophisticated society. Greece's geographical position has been both her fortune and misfortune, and today, as thousands of years ago in that past civilization we know so well, Greece serves to bridge the gap between Europe and Asia. This position at one end of the Mediterranean permitted ancient Greece to absorb and assimilate portions of other civilizations as Greece became the crossroad of the world. It was the same explanation, location, that permitted the Greek civilization to follow the seas and overland routes to the far corners of the earth to serve as the basis of Western civilization.

When we recall that Greece has contributed so much to Western civilization, we almost simultaneously recall that part of her great heritage to us has been defender of Christianity. This becomes clear when we remember that the original New Testament was written in Greek, that the Old Testament was preserved in Greek, and that St. Paul's greatest sermons were to the Athenians. Today, when we hear a great deal about Christian unity, we should remember that Constantine the Great convened the First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea in 325, and from that council came the famous articles of faith known as the Nicene Creed. Indeed, we should remember that the first seven Ecumenical Councils met in Greece.

The world will always be indebted to the Hellenic heritage for its contributions in scholarship. Five hundred years before Christ, Greek scholars, the likes of which the world has never seen, were formulating political and moral philosophies that are the basis of teaching today. Has any nation contributed the equals of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Demosthenes, Pericles, and others? Except in the most modern sense, no people have contributed so much to the sciences—especially medicine, mathematics, astronomy—than have the Greeks. Indeed the Hellenes approaches to these sciences while in their infancy have been the basis of these disciplines for thousands of years.

Greek contributions to beauty and romance and love through the arts is almost unimaginable. So long as man inhabits the earth, ancient, medieval and modern Greek painting, sculpture, drama, literature, language, and architecture will affect the esthetic qualities of man and influence his approach to all other forms of the arts. It is important, I think, to add that these contributions of which I speak are not necessarily confined to ancient Greece. For example, the revolution of 1821, which we celebrate today virtually brought a new era to Greek literature. Since 1821 there has been an abundance of Greek drama of an extraordinarily high quality that is daily praised by the theater community around the world. Greek films have done much to raise moviemaking to a fine communicative art.

Some of the most delicate and breathtaking sculpture in the history of man comes from Greece, and that sculpture continues today to influence that art form. However, we sometimes forget that Greece's modern minor sculpture—woodcarving, furniture, pottery, jewelry, embroidery—is of a remarkably high quality. The 1821 revolution also brought Greek painting and major sculpture back to the world in a profuse manner. The Greek language, one of the most useful and admirable languages ever devised, continues to contribute poetry to the world.

Here in Washington, one the world's most beautiful cities, one is never far from the Hellenistic influence on architecture. Indeed, the magnificent building which houses this Chamber, the Capitol Building, abounds in examples of Greek architecture. The most famous and most popular memorial in this city, the Lincoln Memorial, has a number of authentic examples of Greek architecture.

So it is with pride and pleasure and a sense of humility that I send to our friends the Hellenes our best wishes on their 143d independence anniversary, and a "thank you" for their contributions to our civilization. Our best wishes also extend to the more than 378,000 first and second generation Greeks living in this country, of which 34,000 live in my own State of Massachusetts. Today we salute the Greek nation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Right Reverend Protopresbyter Nikolaj Lapitzki, Whiteruthenian (Byelorussian) Greek-Orthodox Church of St. Euphrosynia, South River, N.J., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. Almighty God and our Father, on this day commemorating the anniversary of proclamation of the independence of Byelorussia we humbly bow our heads and beg Thee to return the freedom to Byelorussia and all other enslaved nations; the freedom, which was taken away by godless power.

O, all generous God and Saviour, we pray to Thee to send Thy blessings to the people of the United States of America, and help through Thy power for the leaders and legislators, gathered here, to bring about peace and freedom for all mankind, so that love and justice would prevail among nations.

So, we all with common united thought and endless love would glorify Thy name.

Thou art Saviour and protector of those who depend upon Thee, now and forever and from all ages to all ages. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make several unanimous-consent requests.

THE SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 6, 1964, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND AND REVISE REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 6, 1964, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the said adjournment.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 8, 1964, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET), 8 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 8 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain tabulations on the current status of the budget.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with practice, we submit herewith, for the information of Members, the regular tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures for the first 8 months of fiscal year 1964, to February 29, with pertinent comparisons to last year and to the latest budget estimates for fiscal 1964.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast to budget expenditures, which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the more usual pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; receipts in the first half—July–December—of the fiscal year are usually not as high as in the second half—January–June.

Budget revenues for fiscal 1964 were officially estimated by the President in the new budget in January at $88,400,000,000 which, if realized, would exceed actual fiscal 1963 revenues by $2,024,000,000. In the first 8 months of fiscal 1964 actual budget revenues amounted to $54,166,000,000—some $2,203,000,000 higher than the corresponding 8 months of last year.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures for fiscal 1964 were officially estimated by the President in the new budget in January at $98,405,000,000 which, if adhered to, would represent an increase of $5,763,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 actual budget expenditure. The $98,405,000,000 includes a tentative estimate of $1,788,000,000 expenditure in 1964 from fiscal 1964 supplementals submitted to this current session.

On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of $8,200,000,000 per month, in contrast with which the expenditures in the first 8 months, July–February, averaged $8,105,000,000 which in turn compares with $7,757,000,000 in the corresponding 8 months last year; the national defense monthly average was virtually the same as a year ago but the monthly average for all other items—nondefense—was $313,000,000 higher.

As in all past budgets, the revised budget expenditure—disbursements—estimate of $98,405,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represents a composite of estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964; first, from unexpended balances of prior year appropriations; second, from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law; and third, from annual appropriations made currently, including amounts associated with supplemental authority requests submitted or to be submitted in the current session for fiscal 1964.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST—AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Messages and statements associated with the original 1964 budget repeatedly emphasized that expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so planned that total proposed administrative budget expenditures for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest were slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as then forecast—for such programs. But in the new budget received from the President this past January, updated estimates for fiscal 1964 show expenditures for such other purpose as being above, rather than below, corresponding fiscal 1963 actual spending—$28,007,000,000 now estimated for 1964 compared to $27,355,000,000 actual for 1963, up $652,000,000 from 1963. And in the first 8 months, such other spending was up from the corresponding period of fiscal 1963 by $950,000,000.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Whether the budget deficit for 1964 turns out to be the $10,005,000,000 foreseen by the President's budget in January, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years—with at least one more, perhaps two more, to follow. In summary, here are the official administrative budget deficit figures of the last 3 years:

Administrative budget deficits

[In millions of dollars]

	From July 1, 1961, to date	For 3 full fiscal years, 1962–64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961)	6,378	6,378
Fiscal 1963	6,266	6,266
Fiscal 1964 (8 months to Feb. 29, 1964)	10,679	----------
Fiscal 1964 (current estimate in President's 1964 budget)	----------	10,005
Total, as above	23,323	22,649

And in total, budget expenditures projected by the President in January in the revised budget for the current fiscal year 1964, compare with certain earlier years as follows:

Administrative budget spending, 1964 estimate

[In millions of dollars]

	Over fiscal 1963	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1954
1964 current official estimate for national defense over	+2,542	+7,803	+8,311
1964 current official estimate for other than national defense over	+3,221	+9,087	+22,557
Total, 1964 current estimate over	+5,763	+16,890	+30,868

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 8 months of budget operations in the current fiscal year 1964 the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at $306,919,421,911.04 and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

Federal public debt, direct and guaranteed

	Fiscal 1954	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964 (at Feb. 29, 1964)
1. The debt at end of period (in billions)	$271.3	$289.2	$298.6	$306.5	$306.9
2. Amount per capita (in dollars)	1,670	1,575	1,600	1,619	1,623
3. Average for a family of 4 (in dollars)	6,680	6,300	6,400	6,476	6,492

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the following table elaborates the receipt and expenditure situation more fully:

Budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), 8 months of fiscal 1964 versus 8 months of fiscal 1963 and comparisons with full-year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 8 months (to Feb. 29, 1964)			President's budget estimates (revised) for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual results for all of fiscal 1963		
	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1963	1964 compared to 1963	Revised budget estimate, 1964 (January 1964)	Actual, 1963	1964 revised budget estimate compared to actual, 1963
1. Budget receipts (net)	54,166	51,963	+2,203	88,400	86,376	+2,024
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National Defense (per official budget classification)	34,878	34,603	+275	55,297	52,755	+2,542
(b) Other than national defense	29,967	27,459	+2,508	43,108	39,887	+3,221
Total expenditures, net	64,845	62,062	+2,783	98,405	92,642	+5,763
3. Net deficit or change	−10,679	−10,099	+580	−10,005	−6,266	+3,739
4. Average monthly expenditure:						
(a) National defense	4,360	4,325	+35	4,608	4,396	+212
(b) Other than national defense	3,745	3,432	+313	3,592	3,324	+268
Total monthly average	8,105	7,757	+348	8,200	7,720	+480
5. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized in original budget for 1964:						
(a) National defense	34,878	34,603	+275	55,297	52,755	+2,542
(b) Space	2,528	1,451	+1,077	4,400	2,552	+1,848
(c) Interest	7,100	6,619	+481	10,701	9,980	+721
(d) All other expenditures	20,339	19,389	+950	28,007	27,355	+652
Total expenditures, net	64,845	62,062	+2,783	98,405	92,642	+5,763

Sources: Budget for 1965 and monthly Treasury statement for Feb. 29, 1964.

TRIBUTE TO GREECE AND BYELORUSSIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as this morning I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, March 25, 1964, I was impressed by the unusual and historic nature of the proceedings in the House.

The bill we debated and passed looked to the future. It authorized the money to finance our effort to reach and land on the moon. March 25, 1964, was an important day.

But so, Mr. Speaker, was March 25, 1918, an important day and March 25, 1821, an important day, and yesterday as we in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States mapped the future of the age of space we did not forget the anniversaries of two countries the history of which stretches back the many centuries.

How long the Byelorussian people have lived in their homeland in northeastern Europe is not clearly established. It has been over a thousand years. Long before the Russians had an independent state the Byelorussians had a strong, proud sovereign government. In the 16th century, however, the country was overrun and became part of the Czar's domain.

Happily, however, independence returned for a brief time after centuries of suffering and yesterday was the anniversary of that March 25, 1918, on which the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. The Byelorussians are a fine people. Many of them have come to our shores and are our worthy and highly regarded fellow Americans. Every American hopes and prays that soon the land of the Byelorussians again will be free and the heel of the Russian oppressors removed.

Yesterday also marked the 143d anniversary since a band of Greek patriots successfully rose up in arms against their Turkish subjugators and began the struggle which was to lead to an independent Greek state. On March 25, 1821, a group of peasants, led by the archbishop of Patras and armed with clubs, slings, scythes, and axes, struck at the Ottoman garrison at Kalavryta. From this town, the rebellion spread rapidly throughout the land. Victory, though, was not rapidly achieved. Turkish troops, aided by the Khedive of Egypt, soon checked the liberators and began a reconquest of lost territory.

Because of the execution of the Greek Orthodox patriarch, Gregorious of Constantinople, and the subsequent massacre of hundreds of Christians, the nations of Christendom became cognizant of the strife and soon began sending aid, both private and governmental, to the beleaguered patriots. From the United States came many volunteers to fight alongside their brothers in democracy. Shiploads of food and medical supplies were also donated and sent by the sympathetic American public.

Only through the intercession of a joint British-French-Russian fleet which proceeded to destroy the blockading Ottoman navy were the Greeks accorded complete victory. Recognized as independent by the Porte in the treaty of Adrianople, September 1829, the Greek nation emerged sovereign and free on May 11, 1832, created and sanctioned by the Convention of London.

Since independence, the Greeks have had to face many dire circumstances, detrimental to their progress. The holocaust of World War II was perhaps the most devastating. Having defied and defeated the invading Italian armies in 1940, the Greek forces were totally outnumbered and overpowered by the Nazi German troops the following year. Then followed 3½ years of brutality, terrorism, massacres, and starvation. Towns were obliterated, cities stripped of industries. And yet, the people fought on, defiant in their action, refusing to submit to the conquering warlords.

When the Germans were driven out by an Anglo-Greek force, the Government looked forward to a peaceful period of reconstruction. External factors, however, disrupted all preconceived plans. Backed by Soviet Russia and its satellites, Communist guerrilla bands began a series of armed raids, eventually seizing much of the countryside and challenging the Government to open warfare. With aid sent once more from the United States, the loyal troops rallied around their late beloved King, Paul I, and totally defeated the terrorists.

Today Greece is enjoying a period of economic development. Vast industrial projects now dominate the city skyline. Tourism, an integral part of the national budget, continues to expand; for the beauties of the Grecian temples, of the Aegean Islands and dramatic presentations of the Grecian poets and playwrights, are always drawing attractions for everyone. The Greek merchant marine is enlarged yearly, carrying tonnage to all parts of the globe. As a member of NATO, the Greek armed services are recognized as an efficient fighting force, capable of defending their homeland and the territories of their comembers.

We in the United States are indebted to the Greeks for many things—for governmental principles, art, science, and plays. But most of all, through the Greek immigrant who came to our shores to find a new life, we have discovered and adopted his customs and incorporated them as contributions to the American way of life. Therefore, I am proud to add my congratulations to the Greek people as they celebrate this patriotic national holiday and wish them continuous success and prosperity for the future.

Among my efficient and dedicated congressional secretaries, a most valuable member of my staff, is American-born Frances Patsoureas, in whose veins courses the proud blood of the land of Plato, Aristotle, Aeschylus, Phidias, and the other immortals of Greece.

THE LATE ANDY FRAIN

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, one of our celebrated native Chicagoans, Mr. Andy Frain, who made ushering a science, died on March 25, in St. Mary's Hospital in Rochester, Minn. He was 59 years old. Mr. Frain was a product of Chicago's "back of the yards" area, at 37th and Lowe Avenue. He came from humble circumstances and a large family—17 children.

It was natural that he learned the basic talents for ushering from his mother who marshaled, guided, and controlled her large brood in unit formation. In his early career, he was employed at the White Sox park, renting seat cushions at 10 cents per cushion—after hours collecting the same, as well as the empty pop bottles lying around the seating area of the park.

Through the influentional interest of Mr. Philip K. Wrigley and Bill Veeck, he was promoted into ushering people at the games. There has not been a major event in any of the sports, religious, cultural, or mass-meeting programs held in major cities where his ushering services were not contracted for. He established offices in 17 major cities, with headquarters at 1817 West Madison Street, Chicago. In his hiring, he emphasized the employment of young men of high school and college age for this work, thereby aiding thousands of young men and young girls to pursue their careers in education through college, by ushering. There are many outstanding and important people in life who are indebted to him for their financial start, including clergymen, physicians, attorneys, government officials, industrialists, scholars, and scientists.

Andy Frain realized the necessity for organized ushering upon witnessing several rioting and milling crowds at affairs where a disciplined, unified programing was lacking. The hundreds of gate crashers who edged their way into the park without tickets, were the cause of most of the trouble, because of their disturbance of the seating patterns.

Dishonest gatemen passed persons through for a little bribe, and timid doorkeepers passed through formidable "toughs" in fear of bodily harm, but Andy Frain changed all of this by teaching a semimilitary organization that saw to it that no one passed who did not hold a bona fide ticket, and no one was seated who did not have the proper ticket for that seat. He realized that the responsibilities were great to best serve the public interest, but his men were rugged and determined that the rules were the same for everyone and must be kept, in order to control the situation for which they were hired.

The greatest problems were experienced at national political conventions, whereat persons presented themselves at the gate with courtesy letters written by a powerful "political," expecting the holder to gain admittance. But to Andy Frain this was only an invitation to be more guarded in his vigilance and that of his men, and the bearers of such requests were denied admittance. Certainly he gained the enmity of some individuals, including leaders; on the other hand, he earned the respect of his employers because of his efficiency and honesty of purpose. Andy Frain's trained corps received its instructions prior to the event and rehearsed their respective duties before the crowds arrived. Their handling of the situation was like clockwork in its precision. A blueprint study of each section was delivered to the individual usher assigned to that area. Andy Frain was a genius in his work and we know that his sons, who have been schooled by him to take over his enterprise, will function with the same perfection as their dad. Andy Frain died of a heart attack, while in Rochester for a physical checkup. There is no question but that he ailed for 4 years and 1 week; since the day that he was waiting for the arrival of his wife by plane at Miami, Fla., when he learned of her death in the plane crash over Tell City, Ind. From that day to the day of his death, his path of life was only a transistory one—a way of being united in her embrace again.

To him, his wife's death ended life's dream. Although his children were a comforting influence, the loss of his lovely wife was too great a sadness to bear—and so, with a lingering weakness of will, he awaited death.

God will be good to this fine, upright man who raised the level of a humble service to that of public admiration, and it provided an avenue of opportunity for the youth of the land to earn moneys to pay their way through college. The fine example he set for youngsters and the advice and guidance that he gave to them contributed much to their later successful careers in life.

We, the members of the Illinois delegation, extend our heartfelt condolences to his daughter, Cornelia Bridget, and to his five sons—Andy, Junior, Michael, Peter, Patrick, and Francis. The Nation and its youth have lost a valuable benefactor and friend.

The high esteem in which he was held is reflected in the following articles appearing in the Chicago Tribune, Thursday, March 26:

ANDREW FRAIN, USHER CHIEF, IS DEAD AT 60; MANY LEADERS STARTED WITH CHAIN

(By George Bliss)

Andrew Thomas Frain, 60, head of the Andy Frain Usher Service and nationally known expert in the handling of crowds, died yesterday morning in St. Mary's Hospital, Rochester, Minn.

Mr. Frain, who was known as Andy to the thousands of young men who worked for him, as well as to sports, political, and other celebrities, died of a heart attack.

WIFE DIES IN CRASH

He had been in ill health since his wife, Mrs. Dolly Frain, died on March 17, 1960, with 62 other persons in a plane crash near Tell City, Ind.

Despite his illness, Mr. Frain remained active in his organization. He directed the handling of the crowd at the Sonny Liston-Cassius Clay heavyweight championship fight on February 25 in Miami Beach. He was making plans to direct the ushering service for the Kentucky Derby in May.

RETURNS FROM FLORIDA

Mr. Frain, who had been staying at his winter home in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., arrived home at 6649 Navajo Avenue, Lincolnwood, on March 12 and went to the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., on March 18.

More than 50,000 young men had worked for Mr. Frain since he formed the blue clad usher organization 40 years ago at Wrigley Field. At one time he had offices in 26 cities but recent years curtailed his operations, continuing services in Louisville, Ky., Minneapolis, Miami, St. Louis, and Cincinnati.

Lawyers, priests, FBI agents, public officials, doctors, dentists, business executives, newspaper and magazine writers, and thousands of others started their careers while working for Mr. Frain and paying their tuition in high school and college.

ONCE EMPLOYED BISHOP

Bishop Cletus F. O'Donnell, auxiliary bishop and vicar general of the Chicago Catholic archdiocese, was one of the young men from Chicago who helped Mr. Frain take over the Kentucky Derby in Louisville in 1934 and 1935. Bishop O'Donnell, who remained one of Mr. Frain's close personal friends, recalled that Mr. Frain helped him and many others receive their education. State's Attorney Daniel P. Ward worked for Mr. Frain during his college days.

Mr. Frain was known to pay the tuition of young men who encountered financial problems with the promise that the payments would be kept secret.

FRIEND OF MAYOR

Mr. Frain, who liked to boast that, "I was born back o' the yards," was a lifelong friend of Mayor Daley. Mr. Frain, Daley, and Stephen M. Bailey, vice president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, were classmates at the Nativity of Our Lord School at 653 West 37th Street. He was 1 of 16 children.

The city council yesterday unanimously passed a memorial resolution honoring Mr. Frain as "a great Chicagoan" and "a man always willing to help someone in need."

Mr. Frain was the first honorary member of the Chicago Newspaper Reporters Association, and in 1960 was honored with a plaque for his "friendship to all members of the newspaper profession."

He was known as Andy to at least four Presidents of the United States and became acquainted with Prince Rainier of Monaco.

STARTED AT 12

He began his career at the age of 12, renting seat cushions at Comiskey Park. He received his start in ushering when William Wrigley, Jr., owner of the Cubs, loaned him $5,000 to buy uniforms.

Mr. Frain is survived by a daughter, Cornelia Bridget, 15; five sons, Andrew D., 30; Michael B., 24; Peter B., 20; Patrick F., 17; and Francis D., 16; five grandchildren; and a sister.

Mass will be said at 11 a.m. Monday in Queen of All Saints Catholic Church, 6280 Sauganash Avenue. The wake will be held in the chapel at 6150 North Cicero Avenue.

ANDY FRAIN

Back in the 1920's during the golden era of sport, a young man from Chicago's back of the yards donned a distinctive blue and gold uniform and started finding seats for spectators at sports events. Yesterday he died in the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., but long before his death Andy Frain had made his name synonymous with ushering as the master manipulator of crowds.

Chicago was the Frain home base, the city where he first brought order out of chaos at baseball games and every other sporting event which drew large crowds. But the Frain technique of crowd control extended his enterprise at one time to 25 other major cities and into the arena of national political conventions. His ability to handle the issuance of tickets to hordes of politicians at the 1960 Republican Convention in Chicago established Andy as without peer in this area of nervous sensibilities.

To the public, Andy Frain will always be the dapper young usher who makes sure that the spectator gets to the correct seat in a large arena. To many other Chicagoans—lawyers and doctors, judges and priests, politicians and newspapermen—who once wore the uniform of old Frain U, Andy will be remembered as the kid who never finished grammar school but made it possible for them to go to college.

With the thousands of friends that Andy had, they'll be needing the ushers at his wake.

PRESIDENT SUKARNO OF INDONESIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with some considerable interest I noted on the United Press International Wire Service that President Sukarno of Indonesia has told the United States to "go to hell" with our aid.

I would like to respectfully suggest that the State Department convey to Sukarno our belief that anyone who has had dealings with Sukarno has already been there.

Certainly, he has turned his formerly rich country into a living hell, no longer able to feed its people nor take care of their needs.

While his people go hungry, while his workers look for homes and schools, Sukarno's only answer to these pressing problems is to bully a smaller neighbor, Malaysia, and to waste the labor of his people on weapons and destruction.

At a time when the world needs creative effort, Indonesia's leader is bent only on destroying that which he cannot control.

We have been mollycoddling this minor league Hitler long enough. By his latest words and deeds, Sukarno has confirmed the wise decision of the Congress last year to cut off aid to Indonesia except when the President deems such assistance vital to the interests of the United States.

I was happy to have introduced this amendment and to have it enacted into law.

After Sukarno's latest outburst, I think President Johnson will agree that there is nothing vital to our interests in continuing any aid to Sukarno.

CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express myself as being in wholehearted disagreement with the amazing, incredible, and dismaying remarks regarding American foreign policy of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made on the Senate floor yesterday wherein he has indicated in regard to Cuba that Castro is here to stay; that we will not fight to oust him because it is not worth it, and has implied that such a policy is called "daring thinking" for America, a policy I might say that invites surrender on the installment plan of the rest of the free world to communism bit by bit and piece by piece.

May the Lord help us should this sort of policy be in effect——

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's remarks are directed to a Member of the other body, which is a violation of the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that under the rules no Member may refer to a Member of the other body, or to a speech another Member has made in that body.

The gentleman from New Hampshire will proceed in order.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to violate the rules of the House. The speech is a matter of record. It was made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and I do not know how I could refer to it otherwise. The speech is in the RECORD, and it is before us at our seats.

May I inquire as to how I may now properly refer to the speech and disassociate myself from its views without referring to its author?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated what the rules of the House are. The Chair did not use the word "violate." The Chair did not go that far. The Chair simply says reference to a Member of the other body is not proper, and is not consistent with the rules of the House. The gentleman was recognized to proceed in order.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will, of course, accord with the rule and I will therefore refer only to prominently publicized remarks appearing on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers of last night and this morning.

Mr. Speaker, although I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I feel obliged to express outspoken disagreement with and rejection of certain prominently publicized remarks alleged to constitute "daring thinking" on our Cuban policy. I am amazed to hear coexistence with Communist governments and military buildup in this hemisphere urged upon Americans before the world.

The elimination of Communist control of Cuba and Communist export of subversion from this island throughout Latin and South America should be our number one hemispheric foreign policy objective. In this, there should be no compromise nor equivocation in our determination to strangle the Castro government in Cuba on the vine by an economic quarantine enforced on the high seas against all cargoes except food and medical supplies.

To urge upon our people and to tell the world that Castro is here to stay but it is not too important a matter and that we should proceed with other hemispheric tasks despite the Communist buildup in Cuba is so wrong, so lacking in principle, and so destructive of the national morale that it is incredible to hear. This is not daring thinking at all. It is just plain nonsense if not worse.

A fair question to ask these days is how far must sheer intellectualism destroy America's determination to remain free? How far are we to yield to the concept that because standing firm for freedom may involve confrontations that may risk limited war, which might escalate into nuclear war, that we should just lie down and surrender to Communist evil all over the world since the risk of war in the nuclear age is too great?

Mr. Speaker, if the formula of surrender on the installment plan is to include countries in our own backyard it will undermine the national security, render the hemisphere permanently penetrated by Communist military operations aimed at our destruction, and lose for freedom the remainder of the free world, bit by bit, chunk by chunk, not only in far-off places, but right here in our own hemisphere. This is an invitation to communism to steal the rest of the world and an announcement that we will not fight to prevent this.

On the street, among ordinary good Americans there are more simple phrases to describe such a program for surrender. In this dismay that follows the shock of reading such remarks comes incredulity—disbelief. This is abdication of honor and principle, afraid to risk a confrontation. Americans are not afraid.

Yet, it is impossible to avoid the inference from the mere advocacy of such a policy in relation to Communist confrontation that the United States is either too scared or too "intelligent" to risk a showdown with communism in defense of our way of life. If this is to be American policy and posture, the Communists will go right on stealing the world until the balance of power has shifted to the Communist bloc, and once this happens we can rest assured we will receive an ultimatum to surrender or face nuclear obliteration. I want no part of it.

BEEF IMPORT CONTROL

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a bill I have introduced.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, regardless of many recent statements by the Department of Agriculture and other high administration officials expressing sympathy, and proposing superficial measures supposedly designed to control the ever-increasing flow of meat imports into this country, very little action has been forthcoming to correct this critical problem facing our domestic beef and mutton producers.

Indeed, those of us representing beef and mutton producing areas were surprised and dismayed at the recent proposal made by the Departments of State and Agriculture to curb the onslaught of foreign beef and mutton. This voluntary agreement entered into last month with Argentina and New Zealand would supposedly reduce beef product imports by the United States to 6 percent below the 1963 level. However, the 1963 import level was 110 percent above the 1961 level. Certainly it would seem that when a domestic industry is clearly suffering from imports, as in the case of the meat producing industry of this country, action which pegs the import level at the highest level in the history of the Nation is definitely unrealistic, if not irresponsible.

In the State of Texas alone, during 1962, the returns from the sale of cattle and calves amounted to over $675 million. This was from the sale of 4,675,000 head of cattle. In the past few years, the cash receipts from marketing cattle and calves in Texas has increased by 60 percent, but the profit margins have been on a downward trend. Reliable economic analysis shows that the present level of imports has reduced domestic cattle prices by $2 to $3 per hundredweight. Still, the industry is operating under tariff rates laid down more than 30 years ago, and even those rates have been cut by 50 percent by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Beef importation has been increasing at a dangerous rate for the last several years. In 1956, imports equaled only 1.6 percent of the domestic production, but in 1962, imports had jumped above 12 percent of domestic production. Not only have the present import rates had a depressing effect on the price structure of the industry, but also, the future for cattle prices looks bleak.

Certainly, with the conditions now facing the cattle industry, and with conditions that appear to be steadily growing worse, it would seem that the proper path for the Government to take would be one seeking relief for the domestic livestock industry, not to make permanent a bad situation.

Because of the seriousness of the plight facing the domestic beef and mutton industries, and because of the lack of constructive action on the part of the administration, I am introducing a bill that is designed to establish a realistic set of import quotas for beef, lamb, and goat meat, and pork. These quotas are set up by averaging the imports of these meat products over the last 5 years. The bill will also allow an increase in imports once the market price of the affected products reach or excell the parity price.

The proposed bill:

H.R. 10644

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Meat and Meat Products Import Limitation Act of 1964".

SEC. 2. Subpart B of part 2 of schedule 1 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 19, Aug. 17, 1963) is amended by striking out "headnote" and inserting in lieu thereof "headnotes", and by adding after headnote 1 the following new headnote:

"2. (a) BASIC QUOTAS ON MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS.—Except as otherwise provided in this headnote, the quantity of articles in each category listed in this paragraph which may be entered in any calendar quarter beginning after December 31, 1964, shall not exceed:

"(i) In the case of articles specified in item 106.10 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat), 168,500,000 pounds.

"(ii) In the case of articles specified in item 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (other than lambs)), 12,850,000 pounds.

"(iii) In the case of articles specified in item 106.30 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen lamb meat), 3,200,000 pounds.

"(iv) In the case of sausages (other than sausages in chief value of pork), specified in items 107.20 and 107.25, 550,000 pounds.

"(v) In the case of articles specified in items 107.40, 107.45, 107.50, 107.55, and 107.60 (relating to certain prepared or preserved beef and veal), 28,700,000 pounds.

"(b) ADJUSTMENT OF QUOTAS.—

"(i) BEEF AND VEAL.—If, for any 6-month period ending on September 30 or March 31, the average price received in the United States for cattle (not including calves) equals or exceeds the average parity price for such cattle, then for the second and third calendar quarters beginning after the close of such period the quotas specified in paragraph (a) with respect to the categories set forth in subparagraphs (i), (iv), and (v) of such paragraph are hereby increased. The amount of the increased quota for any such category shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount specified in the applicable subparagraph as the number of pounds of the total commercial slaughter of cattle (not including calves) in the United States during such 6-month period bears to 7,352,000,000 pounds.

"(ii) MUTTON.—If, for any 6-month period ending on September 30 or March 31, the average price received in the United States for sheep (not including lambs and yearlings) equals or exceeds the average parity price for such sheep, then for the second and third calendar quarters beginning after the close of such period the quota specified in subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (a) is hereby increased. The amount of the increased quota shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount specified in such subparagraph (ii) as the number of pounds of the total commercial slaughter of sheep (not including lambs and yearlings) in the United States during such 6-month period bears to 35,000,000 pounds.

"(iii) LAMB.—If, for any 6-month period ending on September 30 or March 31, the average price received in the United States for lambs (including yearlings) equals or exceeds the average parity price for such lambs, then for the second and third calendar quarters beginning after the close of such period the quota specified in subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (a) is hereby increased. The amount of the increased quota shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount specified in such subparagraph (iii) as the number of pounds of the total commercial slaughter of lambs (including yearlings) in the United States during such 6-month period bears to 350,000,000 pounds.

"(iv) DETERMINATIONS.—

"(A) For purposes of this paragraph, the average price received for any article for any 6-month period, and the average parity price for such article for such period, shall be determined by averaging the appropriate figures (as published by the Secretary of Agriculture) for each of the 6 months in such period.

"(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the determination of the commercial slaughter of any article for any period shall be made on the basis of dressed weight and shall be made on the basis of data for the continental United States (excluding Alaska).

"(C) All determinations required by this paragraph shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture and shall be final. All determinations required by this paragraph with respect to any 6-month period shall be made not later than the 35th day after the close of such period. If such determinations result in an increased quota, the Secretary of Agriculture shall immediately certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of such increased quota.

"(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(i) NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.—The operation of this headnote shall be suspended with respect to any period which the President declares to be a period of national emergency.

"(ii) NATURAL DISASTERS TO LIVESTOCK.—The operation of this headnote shall be suspended (or the quota increased) with respect to a category specified in paragraph (a) if the President determines that because of a natural disaster to the livestock in the United States from which articles like the articles specified in such category are produced, the United States supplies thereof are inadequate to meet demand at reasonable prices to domestic consumers therefor. Such suspension or increase shall be for such period, and any such increase shall be in such amount, as may be necessary to meet such demand, as determined and proclaimed by the President. Any determination by the President under this subsection shall be final.

"(iii) SMALL ENTRIES.—For purposes of this headnote, any individual entry having an entry weight of 25 pounds or less shall not be taken into account.

"(d) PRORATION OF QUOTA OVER CALENDAR QUARTER.—If the Secretary of Agriculture determines with respect to any category specified in paragraph (a) that the articles in such category are being imported and placed in the market at such times as to disrupt the orderly operation of such market, he shall so certify to the Secretary of the Treasury. Thereafter, the calendar quarter quota for such category shall be prorated over each such quarter on such monthly (or more frequent basis) as the Secretary of Agriculture determines and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury as being necessary to prevent the disruption of the orderly operation of such market.

"(e) ENTRY WEIGHT.—For purposes of this headnote, the number of pounds taken into account with respect to the entry of any article shall be the number of pounds at which such article is entered for customs purposes."

SEC. 3. No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this Act.

CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, following the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN], with whose remarks I agree completely, I just want to say that the oracle in the other body who made what he thought was a world shaking pronouncement yesterday is probably getting a medal cast for him by Castro in Cuba today.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE OF THE AGED

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, providing adequate medical care for those of our citizens over 65 is of particular interest to me and the people of the 11th District, many of whom are retired and live on small, fixed incomes.

Several proposals have been advanced. Perhaps the most widely known plan provides for an extension of social security contributions to issue mandatory fixed insurance.

The latest social security plan, however, does not assist our older citizens in paying the surgical fees; in short, the doctor bills. The hospital coverage is also inadequate.

There are several other specific areas in which the so-called King-Anderson bill does not provide sufficient medical coverage.

Furthermore, the coverage is rigid and cannot be altered to provide a plan to suit individual needs.

I have today introduced a bill to provide medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance.

I believe this plan is far superior to the King-Anderson approach because it makes possible much greater coverage and less cost.

Furthermore, after this plan becomes effective, the volume of policies issued by the various private insurance companies may well lower premiums and make possible even greater coverage.

PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been granted a special order for 10 minutes today to discuss House procedures.

I was very disturbed yesterday to hear the majority leader in defense of the unwarranted procedure being employed to bring out the cotton-wheat bill and defend it on the ground that the House majority should be able to work its will. I am deeply disturbed whether this defense that the majority leader used came from lack of thinking the matter through, which is almost as dangerous as if he had thought it through, because the essence of representative government is that the majority work its will after study, discussion, and debate. The whole reason for rules of procedure is how a matter shall be studied and debated. It was never intended that the Congress or any parliamentary body that is independent should simply work the will of the majority. Under Hitler and under Stalin the parliamentary system existed, but the difference there was that the majority worked its will without debate and discussion.

WHEAT SALES TO THE COMMUNISTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the East German Government was sending three unarmed U.S. airmen to their graves and three others to the hospital, U.S. taxpayers were financing wheat sales to the same Communist regime to the tune of more than $2,500,000.

On January 28, a T-39 U.S. Air Force transport was shot down by an East German fighter plane over the East German border, and three airmen aboard died.

Within the preceding week—starting January 20—the U.S. Government approved export subsidy payments of more than $1,250,000 on wheat shipments to East Germany.

The criminal act by the East German Communists on January 28 did not slow the subsidy wheels a bit.

Two days later, on January 30, an additional export subsidy payment of over $98,000 was approved for more wheat to East Germany.

By March 5, the U.S. Government had approved export subsidy payments of $2,722,386 on wheat shipments to East Germany totaling 4,063,264 bushels. U.S. flour mills do not get this fancy discount. Quite the contrary, under the farm bill soon to be considered by the House, U.S. flour mills will have to pay a processing tax of 70 cents per bushel. Meanwhile, we provide wheat for the Communists at a discount of 67 cents a bushel.

East Germany replied to this neighborly—and expensive—cooperation on March 10 by shooting down another unarmed U.S. plane—this time sending three airmen to the hospital.

Despite the killing and wounding of U.S. airmen and constant harassments of U.S. military vehicles on access routes to Berlin, East Germany gets the same favored treatment in wheat purchases as friendly countries.

No wonder American prestige has sunk to a low ebb.

Here are the sorry facts, as supplied by the Department of Agriculture:

Date	Class and grade	Tons		Destination
		Metric	Long	
Dec. 16, 1963	No. 2 Red Winter		9,500	East Germany.
Dec. 18, 1963	do		2,500	Do.
Jan. 20, 1964	do		1,500	Do.
Jan. 21, 1964	No. 2 Soft White/Red Winter	12,000		Do.
Do	No. 2 Red Winter		1,500	Do.
Jan. 22, 1964	do		2,000	Do.
Jan. 23, 1964	do		1,900	Do.
Do	No. 2 Red Winter/Soft White	12,000		Do.
Jan. 24, 1964	do	20,000		Do.
Jan. 30, 1964	No. 2 Red Winter		4,000	Do.
Feb. 4, 1964	No. 2 Red Winter/Soft White	22,000		Do.
Feb. 20, 1964	No. 2 Red Winter	6,800		Do.
Feb. 28, 1964	do	6,800		Do.
Mar. 5, 1964	do	7,700		Do.

Total:	
Metric tons	87,300
Long tons	22,900
Converted to bushels	4,063,264
Average rate of subsidy payment per bushel ... about	$0.67
Total estimated subsidy payment	$2,722,386

RETURN OF AMERICAN AIRMEN SHOT DOWN OVER SOVIET-OCCUPIED GERMANY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago three American airmen were shot down over Soviet-occupied Germany. One flier has been released. The other two remain in custody—where we do not know. Last weekend, at the Secretary's level, word was received by the United States that the fliers would be released. Our Government quite rightly regards this as a commitment. But why the delay? The Congress quite appropriately must ask the question—why is the commitment not lived up to and the fliers released forthwith?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to ask the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] to announce the legislative program for the week after next, if he will.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the program for the week of April 6, 1964, is as follows:

MONDAY, CONSENT CALENDAR—SUSPENSIONS (ONE BILL)

S. 1828, authorizing the appropriation of funds for the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, PRIVATE CALENDAR

H.R. 10222, Food Stamp Act of 1964, open rule, 4 hours' debate.

House Resolution 665, providing for concurrence in the Senate amendments to H.R. 6196, a bill to revitalize the American cotton industry.

H.R. 287, including Nevada among States permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for OASDI coverage purposes.

H.R. 1608, providing that aircraft engines and propellers may be exported as working parts of aircraft.

H.R. 2330, providing that antiques may be imported free of duty if they exceed 100 years of age.

H.R. 2652, duty-free importation of certain wools for use in manufacturing of polishing felts.

H.R. 3348, extending time for teachers in Maine to be treated as covered by separate retirement systems for OASDI purposes, and permitting Texas to obtain coverage for State and local policemen.

H.R. 4198, free importation of soluble and instant coffee.

H.R. 4364, free entry of mass spectrometer for Oregon State University and spectrometer for Wayne State University.

H.R. 7480, temporarily suspending the import duty on manganese ore—including ferruginous ore—and related products.

H.R. 8268, to prevent double taxation of certain tobacco products exported and returned unchanged to United States and subsequently reprocessed.

H.R. 8975, providing for the tariff classification of certain particleboard.

H.R. 9311, suspension of duty on alumina and bauxite.

H.R. 9393, extending time for ministers to elect coverage under OASDI, providing full retroactivity for disability determinations, and for other purposes.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, designating "bourbon whiskey" as a distinctive product of the United States.

THURSDAY AND BALANCE OF WEEK

H.R. 10723, 1965 appropriations, legislative.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that any fair reading of the remarks which I made yesterday will make it perfectly clear that the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] were not applicable to what I had to say. In my remarks I summarized by saying:

> I am for majority rule; I am for the rules of the House.

The rules of the House provide not only for majority rule but also for methods to protect orderly procedure and to protect the rights of the minority.

The rule which was requested and the rule which was granted by the Committee on Rules is a special rule identical with special rules of this kind which have been used in this House for many, many years. There is nothing extraordinary about that procedure.

If the gentleman knows anything about the debates which have been held on cotton and wheat bills in this Chamber, covering the identical subject matter covered in the amendments made in order by this rule, he knows that this matter has been thoroughly discussed not only in the Committee on Agriculture but also on the floor of the House many times.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma will remain on the floor at the time I shall speak on this subject. I announce this. We shall have 10 minutes, when we shall have an opportunity to discuss this matter, so that we will not have any more of one man making a speech and refusing to yield and engage in debate. Then we can examine into the depths of whether or not this is an ordinary procedure or, as I have described it, throwing out the window the whole theory of representative government.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor yesterday when the distinguished majority leader made his remarks. I believe he was entirely correct in his explanation of the procedure involved in connection with the consideration of the matter which has been referred to here this afternoon. The majority leader stated the procedure was in keeping with the rules of the House. I believe the gentleman from Missouri has been a Member of this body long enough to understand that the procedure which was announced for the consideration of the rule on H.R. 6196 is entirely within the rules and customs of the House.

FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the remarks which were made on the floor of the House earlier today by the gentleman from New Hampshire and the gentleman from New York. I am not concerned so much about whether their remarks were in violation of the rules of this House as I am concerned about their reaction to the speech to which they were adverting.

Mr. Speaker, I read that same speech about which they were talking, and I believe it is a speech which ought to be read by every American, and certainly by every Member of the House. It was a courageous speech. It suggested that we should reexamine some of the premises upon which we are conducting the foreign policy of this Nation.

I can only say that if we are unwilling to take a careful and critical look at some of the foreign policies of this Nation from time to time, as events and circumstances change—if we are unwilling to examine our own assumptions in order to set ourselves aright, in the manner suggested in the speech made by the Member of the other body—then it seems to me we are losing one of the great values of an open society.

I think that this speech has much to commend it. I do not agree with everything in it, but I certainly do not agree with the reaction of the two gentlemen to whom I referred earlier.

ELECTRONICS RESEARCH CENTER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives voted funds to authorize expenditures for the space program by the NASA. Construction funds were voted for an electronics research center which will be placed at Boston, Mass. It was conclusively demonstrated during the debate yesterday that the Electronics Research Center is necessary to maintain America's preeminence in space. Many times on this floor, along with those who yesterday protested against the disproportionate geographic distribution of NASA contracts, I have also protested against the fact that West Virginia has been shortchanged. However, I would like to point out that Massachusetts made many, many contributions to this Nation, not the least of which are our great Speaker and our beloved former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Above all, Massachusetts gave the 35th President of the United States to our country, the greatest friend that the 35th State, West Virginia, has ever had, the late John F. Kennedy.

SPEECH MADE IN THE SENATE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota has said that he hopes everybody in the country will read the Senator's speech. There is no question that everybody in the country will read the speech. The publicity given this speech in the New York Times and Washington Post makes this clear. The question is, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the people of the country will have an opportunity to read the comments on the speech and to have a real public debate on it. The publicity given this speech suggests this speech may have been written or conceived by some of the people who have done so much to publicize it.

SECTION 371, RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to be very strict in the future with relation to references to speeches made in the other body or to references to Members of the other body. The Chair feels at this time it might be well to read the rule of the House covering this subject:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there; because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POVERTY PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter holidays, every Member of the House of Representatives who swears allegiance to the Democratic Party, will mount a white donkey and set forth to do battle against a new Madison Avenue foe called poverty. They will not actually set lance against this new enemy—the weapons that they use will be that of words. The words will not be of their own making but those of the Democratic National Committee.

That committee has just prepared complete speeches and news releases for each of the Democratic Members. I said that every Democrat in the House would go forth to do this mission. I should have said "all but one," for one copy was inadvertently left in my office.

Reading these propaganda sheets, one can but come to the conclusion that the new administration is putting a "vocal rubberstamp" policy into effect. This is indeed strange tactics for a political organization that has accused the party of the opposition of adopting some of the remarks of their national chairman—a Member of the Congress.

Certainly the person who prepared this piece of propaganda might well have read the proposed legislation. Many of the measures that he said were part of the program are not even in the legislation.

The opening battle cry on the "ghosted" document states:

The war against poverty has begun.

It further says that President Johnson is leading the attack. I can see how this could be believable to people of other nations. The people of our Nation know full well that our policy is to eliminate every vestige of poverty. This has been the case since our founding days.

I cannot believe that there is any partisanship in this effort. There might have been some differences of opinion as to the best method to achieve the final result but the objective of the President and the Congress has always been for the welfare of all of our citizens.

On this score, I find myself in defense of all of the Members of our 88 Congresses and the Presidents who served since the founding of our country.

The inference is made in the cliche-ridden, mimeographed speech that now for the first time in our history, we have a President with a concern for the impoverished and a man "brilliant" enough to administer such a program. The man who they adorn with the adjective of "brilliant" is Sargent Shriver. Any audience listening to this canned speech, will but come to the conclusion that here is the opening political speech for the Democrat's 1964 ticket.

What, you might well ask, is the great magic that will bring the abolishment of poverty? The great proportion of the legislation in the "new" bill are proposals that have been previously considered by the Congress and found inadequate for the purpose intended.

Within the past few years, legislation was enacted to cope with these very problems. I name vocational education and manpower training as examples. These programs are now in effect. The area redevelopment program is another, but its administration leaves much to be desired.

I have noted that the administrator of the new bureau, that will outrank all other governmental bureaus, says that there is no political objective in the proposed legislation. If that is the case, then we can hardly see why the Democratic committee is dictating the every utterance of their party members on the subject.

I doubt very much that my colleagues of the Democratic Party persuasion are enjoying their new roles as Charley McCarthy to the Democratic National Committee's Edgar Bergen.

Evidently, since the material was sent to me, some Democratic Member has not received his. If this Member would care to come to my office, I would be glad to give it to him.

FUEL AND ENERGY SECURITY OF THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

OHIO RIVER FLOODS: PERFORMANCE OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS REFUTES "PORK BARREL" CHARGES

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] wants to discuss a flood-control project on the Ohio River, and I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia. I know the gentleman has shown great concern with the problem of the recent flooding of the Ohio River, as have colleagues of ours on both sides of the aisle coming from that great river basin, which is one of the largest in the country, covering the States of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, and running all the way down to the middle of the lower Mississippi Valley. I appreciate the gentleman's consideration in yielding me part of his time on his special order.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this House is familiar with the devastating floods which recently occurred in the Ohio River Basin and which have caused such great destruction. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the House Committee on Public Works, I have had a continuing interest in the subject of water resources development and control. The Ohio River and its tributaries is one of the major basins in the country where both navigation and flood control are entwined. I would like to make a few observations on these floods, particularly in view of the fact that Life magazine, in August 1963, published a distorted article on "pork barrel" which immediately drew strong criticism from many Members of Congress and responsible local and State officials.

Now, slightly more than 6 months after this article was written, the recent Ohio River floods spectacularly refute the pork barrel charge. The accusation of unjustified expenditure of taxpayers' funds on flood control, navigation, and other water resource projects were completely overturned by the facts. This is not the first time that this kind of situation has arisen. Articles have been written in the past on the so-called pork barrel even though the arguments presented have been completely discredited by the actual facts. Life should now send its editors to the Ohio Valley in the wake of these floods to get the other side of the story. They would find their sensational charges of pork barrel evaporating in the hard light of the facts. It might not sell as many magazines, but it would exhibit courageous objectivity.

I would like to tell the Members a little bit about these recent floods. Extremely heavy rainfall during the period March 4 through March 10 produced overbank flood stages on the Ohio River and many of its tributaries. These rains which started in the lower basin and extended through the middle and upper portions of the basin totaled between 9 and 17 inches, causing widespread flooding with resultant heavy damages. Yet, even greater losses would have occurred were it not for the many federally constructed flood control projects in operation during this flood. Of the 99 authorized reservoirs in the Ohio River Basin, 39 are operable. Of these 39 reservoirs, 33 were so located as to be effective during the current flood with a total flood control storage capacity of 5.7 million acre-feet with 40 percent of their flood control storage used.

In addition to reservoirs, there are 190 miles of channel improvement and 900 miles of levees and walls planned to protect 137 communities in the Ohio Valley, of which 62 are in service, many of which contributed to preventing flooding in the communities concerned.

Preliminary estimates by the Corps of Engineers indicate that damages may run as high as $100 million. However, the corps also estimated that flood control and related projects have saved Ohio Valley property owners at least $290 million in flood damages. Adding this amount to the approximate $936 million damages prevented during previous Ohio Valley floods, the total of $1.226 billion savings compares favorably to the approximate $500 million expended to date for reservoirs and approximate $200 million spent for local flood protection projects in the Ohio Valley. Not included in these savings are additional beneficial effects in the Mississippi Valley resulting from these Ohio Valley projects.

As an example of the way these Corps reservoirs operated to prevent damages, 8 reservoirs above Pittsburgh cut 6 feet from the crest at Pittsburgh's famous "Golden Triangle" where the Monongahela and the Allegheny Rivers meet to form the Ohio. This 6-foot reduction alone is estimated to have saved $38,327,000 in damages in this area. The Allegheny—Kinzua—Dam, now under construction on the Allegheny River would have reduced the Pittsburgh crest an additional 1.9 feet and would have contributed an additional $2 million to damages prevented. Without the reservoirs, the Ohio would have risen at least 2 feet higher at Cincinnati than its 66.2-foot crest of March 12, the fifth highest on record. This would have been slightly lower than the 69.2-foot crest of the March 1945 flood, the third highest on record.

While the Life magazine article stated that expenditures for flood control, navigation and other water resource developments are a waste of public funds, the critical flood situation in the Ohio Valley points up the need for accelerating flood control work in this area, as well as in other areas of the United States. I am glad to see that studies are now going on as a joint effort of the Federal and State Governments for continued development of the Ohio Valley, not only for flood control, but for navigation and related water resources developments.

The figures I have given you of savings in flood damage are only part of the story. The navigation works on the Ohio River have resulted in a tremendous return to the entire area from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi River.

Some of the key points associated with water resource development on the Ohio are as follows:

First. It is the fastest growing aluminum producing center, thanks to cheap power and river transportation.

Second. The billion-dollar dam and lock program to be completed in the early 1970's with new 1,200-foot locks will result in tremendous economic benefits.

Third. The reduction of flood damage will increase as additional dams, now authorized or in the planning stage, are built.

Fourth. The sewage treatment program is helping 95 percent of the population along the river.

The foregoing points are just a few of the highlights that point out that the development of the water resources in the Ohio Valley have resulted in a tremendous industrial growth making the area one of the great industrial valleys in the world. Within a decade $18 billion has been spent on plants costing a million or more each. They line the river's bank and reach inland, occasionally going far up a tributary such as the Kanawha or Miami. The $18 billion figure was compiled by the Ohio Valley improvement association, an organization devoted to the Ohio Valley waterways and development.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me and many others to understand how a great national magazine can attack water resources development by the Federal Government which has contributed so much in the way of saving lives, reducing property damage, and providing low cost transportation and hydroelectric power.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to the constituents of those Members whose districts are located in the Ohio River Basin, my deepest sympathy is extended for the losses suffered in the recent floods. I assure those Members whose areas have been threatened before, and will be threatened again by floods and where the problem of water resource development is of great importance, that I will certainly do all in my power, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, to carry on the work which has been so efficiently accomplished to date.

At this time I particularly want to state that full credit should be given to the Honorable Clifford Davis, chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, as well as the Honorable Robert E. Jones, former Congressman Frank E. Smith, now a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as well as the other members of this subcommittee for their dedicated, outstanding, knowledgeable work in flood control matters. I want also to commend the chairman of the House Public Works Committee, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, who has given his full support to efforts to solve the problems of water use wherever they may be throughout the country.

FUEL AND ENERGY—THE SECURITY OF OUR NATION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks a number of events have occurred that can vitally affect the fuel and energy security of our Nation, and will inevitably have significant impact on the future economic course our country follows.

We live today in a period of relative national prosperity, and all of us have hopes that this will continue and grow. We have recently voted a reduction in the individual and corporate income taxes in the hope that more money will be made available for consumer purchases and capital expenditures, and thus more jobs and individual incomes will be created.

We are anxiously pursuing other measures, including attempting to hold down on appropriations for unnecessary Government spending, to insure that the economy grows stronger and that we develop sufficient fiscal muscle to wipe out the shameful, inexcusable blots of economic stagnation where jobs are nonexistent and where people are destitute, hungry, and in despair.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I know about these pitiful communities where children cannot attend school because they do not have any shoes to wear, where fathers are desperate and mothers desolate because they have no food to offer their families and no hope to offer the young people growing into manhood and womanhood. I know these blots on our national scene firsthand, because some of them are in my own State of West Virginia. Others are in Kentucky and Pennsylvania, and even, I am told, in New England where once flourishing towns producing shoes, textiles, and many other goods are now battling desperately to combat the competition of cheap foreign goods which are gobbling up jobs and markets.

And the sad and inescapable fact is that these "pockets of poverty," as President Johnson has so aptly termed them, do not need to exist—that if they are allowed to continue, we, and we alone, in the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, will have to bear much of the blame. We have adopted or permitted the continuation of national policies which are chiefly responsible for the unemployment in selected areas of our Nation—and I refer particularly to the great coalfields of the Appalachians with which I am most familiar—and it is our solemn responsibility to our own conscience and to our country that we see that such policies are changed.

I do not propose to discuss or suggest the solutions of New England's textile, shoe, electronic, and similar competitive problems. I sympathize with her citizens.

As a matter of fact, I might say that at the instance of the New England delegation in the Congress they circulated a very well written protest among the Members of the House requesting our signatures, which pointed up the great disadvantage that the shoe industry was experiencing in New England as a direct result of foreign imports. I signed that particular petition and that particular submission to the executive branch of the Government asking relief from the situation that existed in that industry, for the simple reason that I found myself completely sympathetic with the objective which the members of the New England delegation were trying to accomplish and the manner in which they were trying to help the particular industry involved.

However, Mr. Speaker, a number of outbursts concerning this Nation's mandatory oil import program have been made on the floor of the House, which are not in agreement with the record.

Mr. Speaker, I was a member of a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee some 3 years ago, which sat for 7 days in November, going over completely the effects of the mandatory oil import program as it affected the production of domestic crude oil in the United States, as it affected the other energy sources in the United States, coal, and natural gas. We went deep into the problems of imported crude oil and imported residual fuel oil.

Mr. Speaker, the composition of that subcommittee which went very much into detail with reference to the mandatory oil import program, included the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Steed, as chairman of the subcommittee, and made up on the majority side by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Multer, the gentleman from California, Mr. Roosevelt, and the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Alford; on the minority side was the gentleman from California, Mr. Smith, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Harvey, and myself from the State of West Virginia—not a stacked committee by any means and unanimous in their report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the recommendations that that subcommittee made with respect to the mandatory oil import program. It went very much into detail on this subject and heard many witnesses. I say to the Members of the House here today that I was quite religious in my devotion to the work of the committee and in my attendance at these hearings, because of my deep interest in the subject matter. But this subcommittee of the House of Representatives, not made up of Members of coal-producing States, not made up of Members from oil-producing States, made some stern recommendations.

The subcommittee stated:

> If there were not proclaimed some stern rule or program of control by the Congress of the United States over the oil program of this Nation, we at some future time could find ourselves in serious difficulty as a nation.

In addition to residual oil the subcommittee questions the manner in which the production of crude oil in the United States was being seriously hampered by competition which they were forced to meet by the production of foreign crude oil. These recommendations in that report stand out very sternly.

The committee said:

> The import quotas of residual fuel oil to be used solely as fuel should be fixed at a level no higher than the total of such imports in 1961, so as to reduce the threat to the national security which residual oil imports now create, as well as to prevent the further erosion of the coal industry's markets and to alleviate the severe unemployment and overwhelming distress in the coal mining industry. Further, the subcommittee feels that firm assurance should be given by the executive branch that quotas will be maintained at levels no higher than this, so as to eliminate the uncertainties and instability which repeated and unpredictable increases in quotas have created in the domestic coal markets.

In addition, another recommendation of this subcommittee report went on to say:

> A suitable agency of the Government should immediately undertake a survey of essential plants and installations along the east coast, where more than 40 percent of all defense contracts are held and where virtually all imported residual oil is used, to determine the true extent to which they have become dependent on this insecure foreign source of fuel through abandonment of other types of burning and fuel handling and storage equipment and facilities.

The subcommittee was concerned about the national security of the United States when a vast industrial complex was found to be firing the boilers of that industrial complex by bringing into the United States foreign imported residual fuel oil.

The mandatory import control program was put into effect by the executive branch of the Government in 1959. The reason for the implementation of this oil import program was the fact that the Chief Executive of the United States and the Committee that he appointed to look into the matter became concerned, that there was a matter of high national interest involved, and that the national security of this Nation was very much at stake if we allowed this vast industrial complex in New England to be further dependent upon foreign residual oil to meet its energy needs. Therefore, the oil import control program was implemented—national security being the reason for this action.

This program was not put together in the mind of anybody from a coal producing State. The mandatory import program was a direct result of the work of various committees of the Government which had been studying the problem for a long time. The Executive order, based upon committee recommendations, emanated in 1959. The Chief Executive of the United States of America said that the national security of the United States was at stake with such a vast amount of imported residual fuel oil coming into the country. A further statement of concern was made that if this vast industrial complex would be needed by this Nation in the event of war, its use would be restricted if it became wholly dependent upon outside sources for its energy needs.

So this subcommittee made a deep study of the matter. We heard many witnesses testifying largely with respect to the fact that this program was a good program, that it should not be destroyed, that it should not be changed.

We on this subcommittee were surprised, and we in the House from coal producing States, at the action announced by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, on March 5, when he decided to raise the quotas of foreign residual oil by some 23 million barrels of oil coming into this country over and above that coming into this Nation in 1963 and 1964. That alone means some 2,000 jobs in the coal producing States, that alone will displace an additional 2,000 coal miners. It is rather ironic that we got that particular good news from the administration on March 5 at the same time the administration was sending to the floor of this House its message to combat poverty in the same State that will be adversely affected by this decision of the executive department.

One of the most vocal, outspoken, irresponsible—I hesitate to go further—an individual who makes irresponsible statements every time somebody mentions the question of residual fuel oil and the fact this Nation's New England industry is dependent on foreign fuel oil for its energy needs, is a man by the name of James S. Couzins, who heads the Fuel Committee of the New England Council. Every time somebody suggests that the national security of the Nation is involved, as the President found and the subcommittee of this House found, he is quick in print with some sort of rebuttal, either handwritten and given to somebody to say for him.

He usually is very caustic in his remarks about the individuals that live in coal States, that are coal producers, or are associated with the United Mine Workers of America. He accuses those who are in coal States or associated with coal production in America of always crying out loud against the dangers of residual fuel oil, and says that the situation that exists in those States is because of the manner in which the coal miners and coal producers have ravaged the assets of those States.

To those who follow the line of thinking of Mr. James S. Couzins, I say that those in the coal producing States have been fighting residual fuel oil since 1947. For 17 years we have been fighting an ever-increasing amount of residual fuel oil coming into this country. If the conditions in the Appalachian area, some of which are also mining areas of the Nation, are exhibits of poverty today, it is because the coal markets of America have been eroded for 17 years by this policy of permitting foreign residual oil to be brought into this country to take the place of domestically produced coal.

From 1947, when some 54 million barrels came into this Nation, until 1963, when 210 million barrels have been allowed to come in, is the best evidence that every barrel of this oil that comes in creates a further oasis of poverty in the Appalachian area.

Let me simply say to the gentleman who speaks loudly and cries loudly about his concern for residual fuel oil in New England, with the suggestion that these controls inflate the price and cause people in New England to pay a lot more for their energy needs than they would if the program was discontinued, that actually what has occurred is this, that since the program has gone into effect the people in New England have paid less for their residual fuel oil per barrel than they did previous to the time the mandatory oil import program went into effect. So the situation is the reverse, so far as the observations that are made by the New England Council Fuel Committee, for the simple reason that instead of the mandatory oil import control program, as they see it, preventing oil from coming in and therefore pushing the price up, actually the price has gone down in the United States since the mandatory oil import program went into effect in 1959.

As for the price of residual oil, official figures published by the Office of Emergency Planning show that residual oil in 1963 sold at an average price of only $2.02 per barrel in New England. This was 30 cents per barrel less than the New Englanders paid for residual fuel oil in 1958, the last year before import controls were put into effect.

So let us see what this 30-percent reduction in total prices of residual oil meant to New England. The last figures for that region which are reported by the Government, for 1962, showed that New England used some 75 million barrels of residual fuel oil, and presumably it was the same amount last year, since the total east coast consumption of residual fuel oil was little changed. Thus at $2.02 a barrel for oil in 1963 New England users paid $152 million, but under the price structure in 1958, before the mandatory import program, the one they complain about, the one they seek to destroy, was in order, for the same amount of oil it cost them $174 million. Therefore, the import control program has provided New Englanders with the opportunity to meet their oil needs at a savings of $22 million a year less than they would have had to pay under prices in existence prior to price control.

Another thing I want to say with respect to the observation of the gentleman of the New England Council Fuel Committee, reference has been made to a statement by Mr. W. A. Boyle, the international president of the United Mine Workers of America, when he said that the late President Kennedy had made a personal commitment to him that this mandatory oil import program would be handled in such a way that it would not do severe damage to the coal industry of America, and that the program would be operated with the advice and the guidance of the coal industry in America.

That statement has been disputed and it has been said that John F. Kennedy was just as vocal, when he was a Senator from New England, in behalf of increasing the amount of foreign residual oil coming into this country and that that statement is entirely inconsistent with his actions as a member of the Senate and contrary to the statement of Mr. W. A. Boyle, that as President John F. Kennedy said he would use his best judgment in conjunction with the coal industry as he administered this oil import program.

I simply would say this. When they talk about John F. Kennedy's New England, I would remind them that John F. Kennedy talked about his West Virginia until the day he died. He said at every opportunity that West Virginia was the State that provided him the platform to move to the Presidency of the United States. And it was at the pit mouth of a mine in West Virginia where he stood and talked of the situation and conditions in the coal industry and said that this continual raid on the coal markets of America by foreign residual oil was a distinct disservice to the coal miners and to the coal industry, and that the poverty that he observed in West Virginia was something that he was going to try to eliminate. Yes, he said these things because he had a better understanding of the situation, having seen it first hand than when, as a Senator, John F. Kennedy gave his attention to the needs of New England, since it was his New England. I say that if John F. Kennedy grew as a President, he grew also in this aspect, that he had a deeper knowledge and more understanding attitude and more genuine concern for the problems of the coal industry and the other fuel industries of America, and that his interest in these problems as President was not sectional in nature as when he was a Senator, but gave attention to the best interest of the entire country. If he told W. A. Boyle that he was going to administer the oil import program only with the advice and guidance of the coal industry, I believe John F. Kennedy made that representation to Mr. Boyle regardless of what some highly paid public relations man in New England may say now about what John F. Kennedy is supposed to have said and which he can no longer answer.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we in the Appalachian area express our genuine concern about the reckless way in which this administration through its Secretary of the Interior has handled this residual oil problem and the way in which it has gone so far beyond what anyone of us would ever have thought conceivable, so that today 14,000 miners, not to mention railroaders and others, can reasonably be considered to be unemployed as a result of the importation of foreign residual oil.

It is a little ironic to embark upon a vast well publicized program to attack poverty on the one hand and at the same time—and in the same office—just a little further down the hall—permit an administrative act to take place which further erodes and reduces the opportunities for those people who have dedicated their lives to mining coal. Yes, it may not be a very romantic undertaking to mine coal. Perhaps it does not require the best education in the world. But a lot of our people found their way into the Appalachian region of this country and dedicated their lives to digging for that black diamond. They have contributed to a greater America without question. So, Mr. Speaker, I would say when we talk about the mandatory oil import program, it is high time, by reason of the actions of the Secretary of the Interior, to understand once and for all that this administration does not comprehend the problem and does not understand the program and does not realize that the program was originated and implemented for national security reasons. We must realize that the Congress has to act now.

As the subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business indicated in their report of November 1961, this Congress has to set a level at which these imports of residual fuel oil cannot exceed or go beyond. Because the price is so attractive and because the opportunity to make a quick buck is so enticing that it can without question take over the energy needs of this Nation simply because of the competitive position that this residual fuel oil is in since it is a waste oil product.

If they can get a nickel above the regular price on a barrel, bringing it to the United States, they will make a nickel, which is a considerable profit.

Mr. Speaker, there are now pending before this body more than 170 resolutions by 170 Members of the House of

Representatives calling for the mandatory oil import control program to be brought under congressional control, where the pressures of the New England Council Fuel Committee and Mr. James Cousins cannot be exerted, so that the oil community of America cannot exert pressure on some administrator on some fictional basis in an andeavor to have him increase the amount and to further do damage to the intent of the mandatory oil import control program.

Certainly all of the Members of the House are not interested in this problem, and perhaps all do not understand how this works. Last year the amount of residual oil which came into the country was not even entirely used. There was a surplus of it. Even with that fact facing the Secretary of the Interior, he increased the amount of residual fuel oil allowed to come into this country by the greatest amount allowed in any particular year since it has been coming into the country.

We must consider that in connection with permitting great amounts of this residual oil to come in is dangerous in itself. I know well that it has to be heated and it has to be put in boilers in a condition so that the temperatures are at a certain level. But if we permit large amounts of this residual fuel oil to come into this country, not earmarked to a specific industry or to a market area, we then invite an opportunity for those who control this fuel oil to raid market areas not now using the residual fuel oil, and thus further damaging markets devoted either to gas or to coal.

This situation I believe today has reached the point that the Congress must act. Congress must put some backbone in the mandatory oil import control program. We must not forget that the Caribbean area is on fire today. That is where the greatest portion of this residual oil comes from. If a decision were made in Venezuela today to nationalize the oil fields of that country, then the New England industrial complex would be without one drop of residual oil.

Yes, the Caribbean is on fire. It seems to me we ought to be aware that this is a time of international crisis. The forces of communism are on the march in the Caribbean area, regardless of what may be said at one time or another about the situation.

This Nation at some time in the future will have to protect itself, for the benefit of these economic royalists in New England who want to bring in these vast amounts of residual fuel oil. Protection will be needed for that lifeline between South America and New England, with a patrol either of battleships or of submarines, in order to continue to receive the foreign oil that industrial complex needs to operate.

Mr. Couzins does not seem to be worried. He says that the next war will be atomic. I have not seen any atomic bombs exploded yet in the nature of an act of war. Mr. Couzins does not understand. Really, he does not even know what a Polaris submarine is, so how could he be particularly knowledgeable about how New England will get this oil in the event those particular lines of transportation are ever cut off? He is an American that just does not care. Anything for a buck today. He is neither honest or sincere in response to questions posed by Members of Congress in committee hearings.

But I do assert that I am qualified to speak on the question of jobs and the livelihood of the citizens of the coal producing areas of the Appalachians, which includes the First District of West Virginia which I have the honor to represent. I think the time has come—indeed, perhaps it is well past—to set straight a number of false notions regarding this national disgrace which has, either inadvertently or intentionally, been perpetrated.

First, I think it is necessary to put on the record the real facts about the modern coal industry which have been so completely distorted in recent years.

It has almost become a shibboleth for its opponents—including certain persons of influence in Government as well as the international oil people and their ilk—to say unemployment in the coal regions is due solely to automation of the coal mines, and that because of modern mining machines no matter how much you increase coal consumption you would create practically no new jobs in the coal mines.

Let us look at the facts:

Certainly the introduction of modern mining machines in American coal mines meant that fewer miners could produce more coal in a given time. That is probably true in every industry in the Nation. In fact, if the stockholders and owners of coal mines had not been willing to invest the billions of dollars in new machinery and modern mines we would not have been able to lower the price of coal consistently during the past 12 years and would today be able to sell only a very small percent of our present output on the present competitive market.

This mechanization took place with the full cooperation of the United Mine Workers of America, which recognized that either the coal industry must increase productivity in order to lower costs per ton or else lose millions of tons of additional markets and virtually cease to exist. If that had taken place, I shudder to think what would have happened to the energy resources of our Nation, or the price that everyone would be paying for any kind of fuel for heat and energy today.

Fortunately, because of the enlightened leadership of the coal industry and of the United Mine Workers, then headed by Mr. John L. Lewis and now by Mr. W. A. Boyle, its able new president, we have available today our primary steamplant energy fuel at even less cost than it was 12 years ago, and it is produced by a vigorous, sound industry with competent, dependable, and well-trained workers which the Nation can depend on.

But coal is not being produced in the volume that it should be, or providing the jobs that it can, because somewhere in the interim our national policies have shifted way from the dependence on our one great natural steam power energy resource and we have tended to relegate it to a sort of third-class citizenship limbo. And for no reason that makes sense.

Consider these facts:

First. The best information we have—from the U.S. Geological Survey—tells us that America has more than 800 billion tons of coal reserves, in the eastern Appalachians, the great Midwest fields and in the largely undeveloped beds of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and other Western States. Of this, the Bureau of Mines says more than 200 billion tons, or 450 times this year's total consumption, is in seams no more than 2,000 feet deep and recoverable by present mining methods and costs. This means, of course, that America has reasonably priced coal fuel available for many generations.

Second. The price of coal at the mine has dropped from an average of $5.08 in 1957 to less than $4.46 today, and the delivered coal price is constantly being lowered by continuing improvements in transportation efficiency by the railroads, long-line transmission of electricity and other technological breakthroughs. Reductions of $1.50 per ton for freight costs from mine to utility plant are becoming commonplace.

Thus, coal is available for centuries, low in cost and dependable. Further, its contribution to the economy is enormous. It is incredible that the policies of the Federal Government should not be directed toward vastly expanding market outlets for coal, rather than the encouragement of substitute fuels developed through Government subsidy, as in the case of atomic power, or brought in from foreign nations where they create not a single American job. It surpasses understanding that, in the face of these facts, the Secretary of the Interior, who has been designated by the President as our oil czar with full authority on petroleum matters, has just increased the quotas for residual oil to be imported in the next 12 months by 23 million barrels above the past year.

Import controls on residual oil were first imposed in April of 1959, and for the first year or so it seemed that they might be effective. Total imports permitted under the program in 1960 were 17 million barrels less than in 1959, when controls were in effect for the last 9 months. However, each year since then has seen a steady increase in quotas by the Department of the Interior, and the total just announced for the import year starting April 1 is a whopping 233 million barrels—the equivalent in energy to more than 55.9 million tons of coal.

This imported oil can be, and is, sold at whatever price is necessary to undercut the cost of American produced coal or other fuels. It is practically all used on the Atlantic coast where it usurps the market for American coal produced in the hard-hit unemployment areas of the Appalachians, principally West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland. Fifty-six million tons is equal to more than 25 percent of the entire annual production of this region.

But more important, what does a lost market for 55.9 million tons of American coal mean in human terms? In terms of jobs for American miners and railroad workers? In terms of shoes and clothing and food for their families and education and hope for their children? And what does it mean to the hundreds of thousands of other citizens of coal mining communities whose jobs and whose families' livelihood are made possible because of the mining and transportation of coal?

Of course, if all residual oil imports were suddenly shut off—and no one is demanding that—coal probably would not supply the entire 55.9 million tons. Some of it would come from domestic gas and some from residual oil produced in domestic refineries. But it would be supplied by domestic fuels whose production would mean American jobs. Most of this huge market would turn to coal, so for an understanding of what it means to the economy of our country, let us translate 233 million barrels of imported residual oil annually into terms of jobs displaced, using coal production and transportation as a guide.

The U.S. Bureau of Mines reports that in 1962, the latest year for which figures have been compiled, the mining of 55.9 million tons of coal in the Appalachian States required 4,723,922 man-days of work. Since the Appalachian miners worked an average of 198 days in that year, the production of 56 million tons meant full-time jobs for 23,858 mine employees, and they earned $118,098,050 which went into the economy of the mining communities of the Appalachian States where it is so desperately needed. Further, the production of 55.9 million tons of coal in union mines meant adding $22 million to the UMWA welfare and pension fund under the contract, which calls for 40 cents a ton payment for this purpose. This is sufficient to pay the $900 yearly pensions for 24,837 retired miners.

But this is not all that 55.9 million tons of Appalachian coal means in human terms. The transportation of coal is almost as important in jobs created as is its mining. Take the railroads, for example. They haul 75 percent of all U.S. coal. This would mean that of 55.9 million tons produced in the Appalachian region in 1962, the railroads transported 41,913,000 tons. At an average freight rate of $3.32 per ton, this produced rail freight revenue of $139,151,160. The American Association of Railroads reports that 52 percent of all railroad revenues goes into wages, and that the average railroad employee wage in 1962 was $6,659, so it is a matter of simple arithmetic to find that the transportation of 41,913,000 tons of coal—or 75 percent of 55.9 million tons—meant full-time jobs for 10,860 railroad workers in the Appalachian regions in that year.

To simplify these figures, Mr. Speaker: Each 8 million tons of coal produced in the Appalachian coalfields in 1962 provided jobs for 427 mineworkers and 194 railroad employees, or a total of 621 persons. This is only direct employment in the two categories; it does not include the jobs provided for truckers and bargeline workers who hauled the other 25 percent of the coal, nor does it include the many other jobs created by purchases of services, supplies, and equipment by the railroads and coal mining companies. I am certain that it is conservative to say that the production and distribution of 1 million tons of coal directly creates at least 700 to 800 jobs in the Appalachians, where jobs and income are so terribly important to our entire national economy today. These facts are clear, and incontrovertible:

> The alltime high imports of 233 million barrels of foreign residual oil during the next 12 months, just approved by the Interior Secretary Udall to whom President Johnson has designated authority in oil import matters, thus becomes a major catastrophe to West Virginia and other Appalachian States.

In the most conservative terms, the 55.9 million tons of coal which will be barred from finding a market outlet because of these cheap oil imports, would have directly provided at least 35,000 jobs in the mining, railroad and allied fields.

These facts leave no doubt as to the importance of coal to our Nation, and to the jobs of literally hundreds of thousands of its citizens and the need for a continued healthy and growing market for coal. But what is happening to that market and to its growth potential?

Between 1957 and 1962, U.S. consumption of coal on the east coast actually declined by 13 million tons, or 8.3 percent. During the same time, imports of foreign residual oil—which produces not one single U.S. job in either its production or transportation on foreign-flag ships—and very few in its handling once it reaches our shores—increased 46.5 percent, or the equivalent of 14.2 million tons of coal.

Mr. Speaker, I fully recognize that the matter I am discussing must be considered as a national issue. There is no question of the critical damage imported residual oil is doing to my own State of West Virginia, as well as the other great coal producing States such as Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Maryland. There is likewise no question of the great harm that excessive imports of residual oil are causing to the great oil producing States of the West. My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] made that very clear in his masterful and irrefutable statement to this House on February 13.

The question then is, Is any area of our Nation greatly benefited by residual oil imports and would it actually prosper because of a complete elimination of import restrictions? Or, to put it more in terms that are commonly used by opponents of the import control program, is any area really being penalized economically by the nominal restrictions which are now in effect on residual imports?

Certain of my colleagues from New England have consistently contended, most vocally and repetitiously, that this is so. But the facts simply do not bear them out.

They have asserted that, because of import controls, residual oil prices are higher, that there is a shortage of the product in New England and that complete removal of restrictions on residual imports would benefit both New England and the Nation.

The Nation and the Congress deserve to have the facts about these fallacious assertions. I have often been puzzled as to the basis of some of the claims that have been made in the bitter attacks on any restrictions on residual oil imports. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] was quoted in an interview in the Providence Journal a few months ago as saying that, although he had opposed residual import controls, he had had no indication that his constituents were concerned about them. He said that he has merely gone along with the campaign of the New England Council to destroy such controls, and had actually had only one communication from a fuel user in his State who wished them ended.

Of course, the big oil importers would like to see free imports of residual. They could then bring it in such floods as to literally wipe out the market for any competing fuel—and destroy the productive capacity of such domestic fuel—and they could supply the market they had captured and made dependent on residual imports at any price they wished to charge.

Mr. Carl Reistle, chairman of the board of the Humble Oil Co., recently wrote many Members of Congress a personal letter urging that residual import restrictions be removed. Standard Oil of New Jersey, parent company of Humble, is the largest residual oil importer.

Other than Standard Oil of New Jersey and such other major importers, I cannot discover who would really stand to profit from greater imports of residual to the detriment of domestic fuels and the national economy. But, for some reason, certain of my colleagues have taken this issue to heart and are waging a continuing warfare against American domestic fuels and the national security and millions of individual livelihoods dependent on them.

I want to examine some of the statements being made, and I challenge anyone to deny or disprove the facts I shall use.

In a speech before this House on January 28, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] attacked Interior Secretary Udall for failing to recognize that, and I quote:

> This restrictive policy [is] costly to New England's economy—

And referred to—

> a shortage of residual oil.

I do not know on whom the gentleman relied for his information, but he has certainly been misinformed. I suggest that next time he rely on official Government sources from which are available facts which will quickly disabuse any idea that residual oil is in short supply or that the price has increased because of import controls, thereby proving costly to New England or any other users.

The fact is, total consumption of residual oil on the whole Atlantic coast, where practically all the imported residual is landed, and consumed, actually declined by over a million barrels last year. Unused stocks on hand at year's end were a half million barrels greater than they were at the end of 1962. These facts are provided by the U.S. Department of Interior, itself; and yet in the face of them, the Interior Secretary has just increased permissible imports for the coming year by more than 23 million barrels.

Mr. Speaker, on February 10, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] expressed a great surprise to this body that I had in a speech a few days earlier referred to imported residual oil as an "unneeded foreign oil," and particularly, he said, in view of the fact that 1,480,000 barrels of residual oil were used in West Virginia in 1962.

I am happy to relieve the gentleman's puzzlement. I am sure that he did not intentionally mean to mislead this distinguished body, but his reference to residual oil burned in West Virginia was hardly appropriate to my remarks. The residual oil burned in West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, is 100 percent domestically produced oil. Not one barrel of imported residual oil is brought into West Virginia. As I have said many times, I do not challenge the right of domestic residual oil producers to compete for the fuel markets of the Nation. Where they can offer a product in fair competition that, for one reason or another is preferred above coal, they have every right to the market. It is up to the coal industry and the railroads which haul it to compete with them and hold their markets if they can.

However, I do strenuously object to an official Government policy of encouraging the ever increasing imports of a cheap, foreign oil, which, as I said, is unneeded to supplement our own vast resources of fuel, and against which domestic coal and oil cannot compete because of the ridiculously low price at which it can be sold.

I can only add that I am more than puzzled by the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] that electric light bills, hospital bills, and taxes in New England are too high because of the restrictions on residual oil imports. All I can say is that with imported residual oil coming in in the greatest volume in history, with the price of residual now 30 cents less per barrel than it was even before import controls were begun, I suggest that he look further to find out why bills and taxes in New England are too high. It cannot be because of the price, or any shortage of supply, of residual oil.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and encouraged to find that my deep concern over the serious damage to the American economy and the jobs of so many people caused by excessive residual oil imports is shared by so many of my colleagues of both political parties in both Houses of Congress.

On March 9, the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, a member of the majority party and chairman of the important House Foreign Affairs Committee, told the House that 170 Members of this body are now on record in support of legislation which would establish a fair formula by law to limit residual oil imports to an equitable share of the domestic residual market. Representative MORGAN declared that 130 Members have signed a letter to the Speaker publicly asserting their backing of the legislation. In addition, the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, 40 other House Members have introduced bills to accomplish this, of which I am proud to be one.

We should also take note that a companion measure introduced in the Senate has been cosponsored by 30 Members of that body. These 200 Members of the two Houses represent 35 different States and are well balanced between the two political parties. Thus, support for this legislation is not a partisan matter, but it is a matter of extreme economic importance to a great many areas of our Nation.

But believe me, there are elements at work in the Caribbean area today to cut off this flow of foreign oil. Once the flow is cut off, the people of New England, who have foolishly converted their energy sources to the point that they cannot now reconvert to the use of gas or to the use of coal, will simply have to shut down. I believe the situation merits the immediate consideration of the Congress.

I, therefore, offer my sincere commendation to all Members of Congress who have thus publicly pronounced their support for the establishment by law of a reasonable, fair, and continuing level of quotas to insure equitable competition between domestic and imported fuels. I urge on the leadership of the House prompt action of this legislation, both in the committees and on the floor.

I have taken this time simply to call the attention of the House to what I feel and how difficult I feel this situation is and also to bring to the attention of the House the views of members of the subcommittee, not oil minded and not coal minded but who recommended this program ought to be brought under congressional control, and I respectfully submit it for the consideration of the House.

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

Mr. MOORE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to congratulate our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, who also serves with distinction on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality and the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. He has the habit of mastering the facts in all matters to which he devotes his many talents. His deep and abiding concern is the general welfare and security of our Nation.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much.

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

Mr. MOORE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WHARTON. I have been greatly impressed with the gentleman's knowledge of this subject. I know he is thoroughly familiar with conditions in West Virginia. I am wondering if he would give us a few words on the situation in which research finds itself. We have appropriated several millions of dollars at various times for coal research to find new uses for fuel of this nature. I wonder what activity you have to report on in West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. With respect to research projects which devote themselves to finding further uses for coal, I say to the gentleman that we just had the Department of the Interior appropriation bill on the floor last week, and there was earmarked in that appropriation bill the sum of $6 million for the Office of Coal Research, specifically to permit them to engage in two specific research projects in the State of West Virginia. One of them has to do with Operation Bootstrap and the other Project Gasoline. In one instance the research is being undertaken to see whether or not a conversion method cannot be arrived at where coal can be converted into gasoline.

I would say to the gentleman there is major progress being made in that particular area, and we hope that a pilo, plant will be constructed in the not too distant future to hurry along the research in that area. There are some research projects, may I say, which have been undertaken by the major coal companies of America and, as a matter of fact, Project Gasoline was initially begun by one of the major coal producers of America. So there is a great deal of research, a lot of which has been encouraged by the Federal Government. May I say to the gentleman that in addition to the research projects, coal mined by automation has attempted to make itself more competitive. The price of coal today is less per ton than it was in 1947. All of the factors along the line economically with respect to coal have been rather stable, but when we continually lose great market areas such as New England—and I for one would not for 1 minute say that we have to turn all of New England back to the private domain of coal; I do not suggest that at all but simply say in my remarks we ought to have a level which this should not go beyond. In other words, the continual raiding of markets, no matter how swift our research might be or how vastly improved automation in the mining of coal becomes, makes it hard for us to keep pace when they take the markets away from us in such an unfair competitive situation.

Mr. WHARTON. Then, the gentleman would say these programs are definitely worthwhile in making the statement from your own personal experience?

Mr. MOORE. With respect to research, I hold out great hope for the fact that the programs which are now undertaken and the various contracts that the Office of Coal Research has engaged in, will make a major contribution which would encourage a greater use of coal in many areas of the country.

Mr. WHARTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

CIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important agencies of our Government, particularly during this period of international uncertainties and anxieties, is our Central Intelligence Agency.

The time has long since arrived when someone should take cognizance of the baseless criticism that has been and continues to be heaped upon it. That is my purpose here today, as a member of the CIA Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services since its establishment. I do not purport to speak as an authority on all the functions and activities of the CIA. But I do presume to speak with some factual knowledge about the CIA as an organization and how it functions.

I do not mean to imply that the CIA should be above criticism. No agency of Government should be above criticism. Constructive criticism makes for improvement, and there is always room for improvement.

But much of the criticism directed at the CIA is not constructive. It cannot possible be, as it is not based on facts. It is based on half-truths and distortions. Indeed, some of it constitutes complete untruths, with no foundation whatever in fact or in reason. This is what concerns me. Something once said, however false, is readily oft repeated and in time is accepted as a fact although an outright falsehood. And we know there are those who would, if they could, discredit the CIA. Others of us, having no such intention, unwittingly become their victims.

Let me present one illustration. I refer to the much publicized, much discussed case of the Polish defector, Michal Goleniewski. I refer to the irresponsible series of articles concerning the CIA that has been recently published in the New York Journal American.

Among these wild accusations is that the CIA has attempted to prevent Michal Goleniewski from appearing before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. They go so far as to charge that the CIA has quashed subpenas. That simply is not true. A simple telephone call to the chairman of that subcommittee would have brought forth the information that going back to last August, when the first subpena was served on this man, the executive branch of the Government has been cooperative with the Senate subcommittee throughout.

Contrary to what has been reported in the press, the postponements of Michal Goleniewski's appearance before the Senate subcommittee were at the request of the man himself. And the subcommittee agreed to his request.

I might add that the CIA subcommittee, of which I am a member, went into every aspect of this case. I am personally satisfied that the publicized statements purported to come from Michal Goleniewski are not correct. The information as reported in the press is not in agreement with the information Michal Goleniewski has made available to many departments of Government.

Stories such as have been circulated on this case display a reckless regard of the truth. They can be harmful, and those who circulate them do a great disservice to maintaining public confidence in the CIA.

Before commenting further with respect to the CIA and unfounded criticisms of it, perhaps I should first take cognizance of the criticism of the CIA Subcommittee, of which I am a member. It is quite understandable that some Members of Congress might feel we are not as well acquainted with the operations of the CIA as we should be. No one, except members of the subcommittee itself, has any knowledge of just how extensively and intensively we inquire into the activities of this intelligence agency. We hold no public hearings. We issue no reports. We cannot do otherwise and preserve the effectiveness of the CIA as a secret fact-gathering agency on an international scale. We can only hope that the House has sufficient confidence in our subcommittee, as individuals and as a committee, to accept our assurances that we are kept well informed and we have no hesitancy of keeping a close eye and ear on CIA operations.

I was very much distressed to read an article in Esquire magazine, written by a distinguished Member of Congress—one of the best and one of my good friends—in which he says:

> The members of four subcommittees themselves, by definition, have relatively low status.

Not because I am a member of one of those subcommittees, but for the other members of our Armed Services Subcommittee on CIA, I must take exception to the implication of that statement as to their status.

The membership of our subcommittee is comprised of the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]; the distinguished ranking majority member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]; and another distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. Serving with them are the other very distinguished members: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

I am not at liberty to announce the members of the other subcommittees in the Congress dealing with CIA matters; but I can assure the House they are not "by definition, of relatively low status."

The article to which I refer goes on to state:

> But even had those subcommittees both status and time, the difficulties involved in dividing jurisdiction among the four would, I think, be insuperable.

This point deserves analysis. Since the proposed solution to the matter of low status and little time would be to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, several questions arise.

In addition to CIA, there are other intelligence activities which are component parts of the Department of Defense, the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission. I do not believe that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Armed Services Committee or the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would be likely to relinquish their responsibilities for legislative oversight of the components of those departments which are presently under their jurisdiction. We would thus be establishing a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence that would, in fact, be superimposed on the existing committees and subcommittees. This brief analysis does not begin to delve into the jurisdictional problems that would thus be raised within the congressional committee structure and the Congress itself.

In the same Esquire article it is asserted in connection with the Bay of Pigs situation, and I now quote, "Not only was CIA shaping policy—perhaps understandable because of the absence of direction from policymaking organs of the Government—but that policy was patently at odds with State Department thinking." The author of the article then adds that he does not wish to fully rehearse the events which preceded the Bay of Pigs, nor do I. This accusation, however, is not founded in fact but, on the contrary, is flatly inconsistent with the truth. It will be recalled that the White House issued a statement on April 24, 1961, saying:

> President Kennedy has stated from the beginning that as President he bears sole responsibility for the events of the past few days. He has stated it on all occasions and he restates it now so that it will be understood by all. The President is strongly opposed to anyone within or without the administration attempting to shift the responsibility.

To assume or assert that CIA shaped policy and then executed it when that policy was at odds with the official policy of the Department of State not only demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the coordination and control procedures in the executive branch but further implies that the Director of Central Intelligence or other officials of the CIA are violating their oath of office by willfully disregarding the views and instructions of the President. Based on my knowledge, the assertion and implications of the statement are false.

The Esquire article indicates the author's recognition that a high degree of secrecy is essential to the workings of the intelligence community and with this I agree. But the article continues by saying there are dangers if public confidence in the intelligence establishment erodes. The article continues by stating:

> [Such erosion] is less likely if a body of the people's representatives properly constituted and carefully chosen by the leadership of the two Houses of Congress remains continuously aware of the activities of the intelligence community.

Based on my long-term membership of the CIA Subcommittee, I again can assure the House that the subcommittee has been continuously aware of agency activities. I must reemphasize that this subcommittee in fact is properly constituted and carefully chosen by the distinguished chairman of this committee.

The statement has been made that CIA meddles in policy. This is an often heard allegation about the Agency, but the facts do not support it. CIA is an indirection from the policymakers. The late President Kennedy commented on this in October 1963 when irresponsible sources were alleging that CIA was making policy in Vietnam. He said:

> I must say I think the reports are wholly untrue. The fact of the matter is that Mr. McCone sits in the National Security Council. I imagine I see him at least three or four times a week, ordinarily. We have worked very closely together in the National Security Council in the last 2 months attempting to meet the problems we face in South Vietnam. I can find nothing, and I have looked through the record very carefully over the last 9 months, and I could go back further, to indicate that the CIA has done anything but support policy. It does not create policy; it attempts to execute it in those areas where it has competence and responsibility.

The President went on to say:

> I can just assure you flatly that the CIA has not carried out independent activities but has operated under close control of the Director of Central Intelligence, operating with the cooperation of the National Security Council and under my instructions. So I think while the CIA may have made mistakes, as we all do, on different occasions, and has had many successes which may go unheralded, in my opinion in this case it is unfair to charge them as they have been charged. I think they have done a good job.

This was President Kennedy's statement.

It has been asserted that there are no effective checks on the Agency's activities. The facts are that every activity the Agency engages in is approved in advance at the appropriate policy level. It is also said that "Crucial decisions are made for us and in our name of which we know nothing." This is not true. The subcommittee, of which I am a member, is kept informed on a current basis of the activities of the Agency and, as I mentioned before, this organization is not a decisionmaking body but one which carries out the instructions of others.

The magazine article I mentioned speaks of the personnel in the Agency, and acknowledges that CIA officials are among the most distinguished in the entire Federal establishment. With this I would readily agree. But the author of the Esquire article is in error when he says that CIA is "served by only one politically responsible officer." Both the Director and Deputy Director of the Agency are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and I would note that all other employees of the Agency can be terminated by the Director on his own authority. The implication that they are not responsible is beneath reply. He says that CIA relies heavily on the services of retired military officers. The facts do not support this as there are very few retired military officers in the Agency. Of the top 46 executives in the Central Intelligence Agency, only two are retired military officers, and the proportion of retired military officers to professionals throughout the Agency is even smaller. He says that the Agency relies heavily on services of political refugees. It is true that it does on occasion use political refugees, but a misimpression is given here. These individuals are used when their expertise and area knowledge is required and the information they provide is extensively cross-checked against a great variety of other sources.

I would note also that my esteemed colleague in one paragraph indicates that the daily chore of coordinating and cross-checking intelligence data is the responsibility of the Defense Intelligence Agency. According to the National Security Act of 1947, the Central Intelligence Agency is actually charged by law with the coordination of intelligence. The law reads:

> For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the sereval Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security.

As a matter of actual practice the responsibility for coordination over the years has been that of the Director of Central Intelligence, who has been supported in this regard by the CIA.

The magazine article also makes the statement that CIA is both the chief fact gatherer and the chief agency for coordination. As I have just mentioned, the Agency is charged by law with coordination, and it is also charged, and I quote:

> To correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government.

In effect, what this means is that the CIA takes intelligence from all different sources, departments and agencies and produces the national intelligence required by the policymakers.

During the years that I have served on the CIA Subcommittee I have sat many hours questioning the Director and other Agency officials about their activities and how they go about their work. On many occasions this subcommittee has quietly looked into some of the then current accusations against CIA.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we have always received the information needed. Also, we have been privileged to learn of many events in the secrecy of our meetings before the events have happened.

The CIA officials who have been before our committee have at all times been responsive and frank in their discussions with us.

I do not believe that baseless charges against the CIA are serving the national interest. If there are those who have information which they believe would be of assistance to the CIA Subcommittee in its review of Agency activities let them come forward—we would welcome such information. Let me make it clear, however, that those who would expect the subcommittee then to report on its findings will be due for disappointment. By the very nature of the Agency's mission, revelation of its activities will truly destroy it.

It is my view that the establishment of CIA in 1947 by the Congress was extremely wise and showed amazing foresight into the problems that would face this country in the years to follow. The wisdom of the Congress in establishing this Agency to provide the President with the necessary information on which to base our foreign policy has been borne out by the performance of the Agency. I do not claim that the Agency has been 100-percent correct. But I do believe it has provided the President and our policymakers with the tools that they must have.

Certainly the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee of both Houses have been enabled to judge more correctly our defense needs on the basis of the information CIA has been able to provide. While the Agency is a newcomer in the history of the Nation and among its foreign counterparts, I wish to state now that it probably is the finest intelligence agency in the world today. I believe that the Congress and the country should applaud the dedicated and highly professional career officers of CIA for the magnificent job they have performed over the years.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me at this moment for a few remarks, and I hope he will answer a few questions.

I was the first one to introduce a resolution in this House in 1953 for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. During my first year on the Committee on Foreign Affairs I found the need for such a committee, and in 1953, together with two of my colleagues, Congressman ZABLOCKI and Congressman Judd, I introduced a resolution to accomplish this. The purpose of my resolution was not to make charges against the CIA, or to criticize the CIA. It was an endeavor to make sure that the CIA operate properly, coordinate intelligence gathered by the various Government agencies, evaluate it, and get it to the President. I also felt that a joint committee of the Congress was the most appropriate instrument to accomplish this task and make sure that our Chief Executive receives total and full information based on the data gathered by all intelligence agencies of the Federal Government.

In 1961 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 3 and by now I think there are several dozen Members of Congress who have introduced similar resolutions.

I want to ask the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Armed Forces, several questions. I am not satisfied with the performance of the CIA. I realize that all agencies of Government have problems and do not at all times meet with success in all their efforts.

When I was in Europe some years ago, Secretary of State Dulles was there at the Geneva Peace Conference, and a revolution took place in Hungary. At the same time we had an arms deal with Russia. Many people in our Government did not seem to be on top of the situation in those instances, and our Ambassador to Hungary was not there at the time.

Cuba, South Vietnam, the information that has come out of these countries in some instances, and the developments then, took the country by alarm. I think the need for a joint resolution is more important today than it ever was. I feel that had we had that resolution back in 1954 and a committee like this formed, many of these instances would not have happened. But the problem involved is that they do not trust the Members of Congress to receive this information.

I thought that in 1962 we might have a revision, because the then President, when he was a Member of the other body, had accepted the same resolution. Many others had done it. Now, when they get into the executive branch they feel there is no need to inform the Members of Congress on what is going on to insure that the proper information is collected and sent to the proper agencies of Government.

Mr. ARENDS. I will try to answer the gentlewoman. There is a great deal of difference of opinion about that matter. The gentlewoman stated there are shortcomings in the CIA, which I mentioned in my speech, and that certainly is true. They are human beings. I am talking of the overall picture of the value of the CIA. But in this particular respect you would have a joint committee set up between the Senate and the House, and there would be a certain number of people on that committee. I do not know how you would go about getting the information disseminated to the Members of Congress, because we will never get to the place where every Member of Congress knows exactly at all times exactly what is going on.

Then we finally get to the place where I think we have to be like the fellow who when he was asked if he could keep a secret replied, "Don't worry about me keeping a secret, you have to worry about the people I tell it to."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the statements of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], I must say that I have seldom read an article so misleading and so replete with errors as the article to which he refers.

The Central Intelligence Agency is not a policymaking agency. It has no control or oversight of military programs. It is purely a factfinding service.

I may also add that after years of close association with the present personnel of the Agency and those who have preceded them, I do not believe there is another group of men more dedicated to duty or of higher integrity or more effective in the discharge of their assignments, than those who constitute and have constituted the personnel of this important service.

So far as its budget is concerned, it is perhaps more carefully scrutinized than any other of the estimates processed by the committee.

Necessarily, its relations to the committee and the Congress are executive. For the same reason it is not at liberty to answer the many irresponsible inuendos carried in the press and contributed to periodicals seeking the headlines.

In conclusion, may I express appreciation of the statement just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and at the same time may I take advantage of the opportunity to express my appreciation and warm regard for the CIA, individually and as a whole.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE CIA AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be good enough to yield before he proceeds with his main speech?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has introduced a resolution similar to the one I have sponsored. I have asked the gentleman to yield at this time in order to comment on the remarks of the previous speaker. We are dealing with a problem which relates to intelligence activities that affect our national security—to the coordination and utilization of such intelligence by various departments and agencies of the Government. I do not propose that the Congress of the United States as a whole be kept fully informed on each intelligence operation, on each and every "cloak and dagger" activity, and I am sure there are many Members of the Congress who would not want to know these details. I have never sought classified information from the Atomic Energy Commission, for example, and I know there are many others among my colleagues who have likewise never sought such information. We put our trust in these matters and respect the judgment of those of our colleagues who sit on the duly constituted committees which have jurisdiction and oversight over these activities. By the same token, we feel that there should be a duly constituted congressional "watchdog" committee to oversee the affairs of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the intelligence community in general.

I thank our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], for yielding to me and I am very appreciative of the fact that he has had articles published pointing out the need for the establishment of such a committee.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement and I should like to associate myself with her remark when she says that there is not any Member of the Congress who wants to uncover even for themselves the secrets of the CIA. Congress need not know the details of clandestine operations, the names and numbers of the players. The gentleman from Illinois in his remarks on that point entirely misses the point.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois did not ask for more time than 20 minutes as I had hoped he would which would have permitted me, while he was in the well of the House, to submit to questions from the floor, instead of just reading his prepared text. It is for this reason that I asked for 30 minutes of my own, in order to permit proper debate to take place on the floor of the House on the merits or demerits of the question. The question is whether it is desirable to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence.

I hope the gentleman from Illinois will remain on the floor while I discuss this subject as I will have some comments to make about the speech he just made and will point out areas of disagreement and also areas of error, in my judgment.

The gentleman referred to an article that appeared in Esquire magazine which he said was written by a "distinguished Member of the Congress" and "one of the best" and "one of my good friends." He did not identify the Member of Congress. I am the Member of Congress who wrote that article. It was based on an hour-length floor speech that I gave in the well of this House 7 months before the article appeared. It was a condensation and simplification of that floor speech. Most everything that was stated in the article had been stated on the floor of the House by me and by other Members of the Congress.

I regretted at the time that I spoke, 7 months ago, that so little attention was paid to it. I did not hear the gentleman from Illinois make any comment with respect to it and I think a debate at that time, as now, would have been a very healthy thing.

As the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] pointed out, this proposal for a joint congressional committee on the subject of intelligence community, comparable to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has been sponsored by 19 Members of the House of Representatives—14 Democrats and 5 Republicans—which makes it bipartisan. The gentlewoman from New York introduced the proposal long ago. She is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and knows a good deal about this subject. Other members who have introduced this resolution are the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI]; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO]; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]; the gentleman from New York, [Mr. RYAN]; our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], who is on the floor today and who has taken a leadership position on this whole question; also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS]; the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING]; the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG]; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS]; and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

This proposal came to a vote in the Senate, in 1956, and was defeated. It was sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD, now the majority leader. Among those who voted for the bill was the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. John F. Kennedy.

So I disagree with the implication made by the gentleman from Illinois, who, I am sorry to say, has left the floor and is no longer present, that there is something radical or irresponsible about this proposal and our reasons for being for it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I commend the gentleman for his previous speech on the floor and for his action in sponsoring this vitally needed legislation to form a Joint Committee on the CIA and its intelligence activities. He joins a responsible group concerned about this problem.

The Hoover Commission first looked into this problem and recommended that a special committee be formed. I do not believe anybody would say that the Hoover Commission was an irresponsible body. This Commission, after great study, considered it a necessary thing to have a watchdog committee on the CIA.

Furthermore, former President Truman, in an article in 1963, stated that he was the one who really formed this Agency and he now saw the need for it to be looked into. He said:

> But there are now some searching questions that need to be answered. I, therefore, would like to see the CIA be restored to its original assignment as the intelligence arm of the President, and that whatever else it can properly perform in that special field—and that its operational duties be terminated or properly used elsewhere.

He further said:

> We have grown up as a nation, respected for our free institutions and for our ability to maintain a free and open society. There is something about the way the CIA has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position and I feel that we need to correct it.

Furthermore, the Washington Post, in an editorial, commented on the need for this joint committee and the fact that something needed to be done, because of the concern all of the American people have for this Agency acting without any bridle at all.

I believe it is interesting to note that one could term the Washington Post "a most liberal paper," in its viewpoints, yet it also suggests something should be done. The editorial stated:

> The proposal for a congressional watchdog committee paralleling the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is neither novel nor rash. The Hoover Commission strongly urged the creation of such a committee. The chief proponent in Congress in years past was Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, who on three occasions introduced the needed legislation. And the idea is alive again in Congress, as it should be.
>
> No other intelligence agency in the free world has the scope and nonaccountability enjoyed by the CIA. In Great Britain, the CIA's counterpart is directly answerable to Cabinet officers, who in turn must face the scrutiny of Parliament. In addition, the British separate the intelligence and operational functions, whereas the CIA has responsibility in both areas. This has been at the root of much criticism of the Agency's activities.

Furthermore, it says that Congress has given it a perfunctory supervision.

Senator SALTONSTALL has been one of those whom the Post called nominal watchdogs, and Senator SALTONSTALL said:

> The difficulty in connection with asking questions and obtaining information is that we might obtain information which I personally would rather not have.

That was his attitude. Of course, according to Senator SALTONSTALL, they have questioned Mr. McCone perhaps only once or twice a year.

So there is a vital need for the Congress to be aware of the actions of this Agency and to establish a joint committee, so that Members can be kept informed and know what the Agency is doing. This has been called for widely from many sources, from sources of leadership, and from the very President who founded the Agency. I believe that the gentleman is on most sound ground in his proposal.

Certainly he did the public a service in his speech and in sponsoring the legislation, and I think also in the very fine article that he wrote.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. He is an expert on national security affairs. He has made it his personal duty to see to it that national security affairs are checked by Congress. I thank him for his knowledgeable contribution.

I wish to point out to the House that at the conclusion of my remarks I will ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the Esquire article I wrote. It has already been put in the Appendix of the RECORD by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], but I would like to have it reappear at this point because of the attack made on it by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Also I want to make reference to the floor speech I made upon which the article is based. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 11, beginning at page 15079. I urge Members to read it.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] began by attacking the remarks I made on the floor and in this article with respect to the level of supervision provided by four subcommittees of the Congress in respect to the CIA. In addition to that he protects or defends the present jurisdictional setup and says:

> I do not believe that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Armed Services Committee, or the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would be likely to relinquish their responsibilities for legislative oversight of the components of those departments which are presently under their jurisdiction.

Referring to the intelligence arms of various departments in the Government.

I am surprised to find the gentleman defending the status quo on such narrow grounds. Are we so petty that we have to hold onto these little empires of jurisdiction, or are we willing to take a look from time to time at where we stand? The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is a ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The gentleman from Florida, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is a member, and so is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]. And yet they want this new proposal. If they were jurisdictionally jealous they might, quite appropriately, argue that the Foreign Affairs Committee or at least one of its subcommittees should be named. This problem has more to do with foreign policy than with the armed services.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois seems to take personal offense at my suggestion that the level of watchdog supervision is too low. Really, now, it should be obvious that this is not to the point. Our point is that this subject requires a nearer full-time attention, high status and coordination. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does a good job. It watches matters of great sensitivity. But I doubt if the job would be done properly if it were divided up rather haphazardly among four subcommittees of other committees.

I want to stress again that what is chiefly needed is a high level committee that will examine the relationship between the CIA and other departments and agencies of Government, intelligence gathering and special operations, personnel, intelligence evaluation and relationships between departments and agencies abroad. We are not talking about details of operations overseas although from time to time that may be included. The CIA has always insisted, and the gentleman from Illinois insists that nothing is withheld from the authorized subcommittees. I am sure that is so. But, as I pointed out in the article, apparently the notion exists that if the whole matter is kept on the lowest possible level of congressional concern, secrecy will receive a higher degree of respect. There is no logic in the notion. I should think just the opposite would be true.

The other day the press reported that in the Committee on Rules a member of the Rules Committee asked one of the most high-ranking and distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services, who is also on the CIA Subcommittee, the question, "Do you know how many employees the CIA has here in Washington?" The member answered that he did not. That he had never had occasion to ask. I should have thought he would be interested in knowing. If he did, his answer of course would have been "Yes I do." Period. He would not have been expected to answer further, nor would he have in a public session, or even in a private session with members only present. I would like to recall to you, also, that several other high-ranking Members of the Congress have referred to the little time that is spent on this subject. The gentleman from Florida mentioned the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. When I made my speech on the floor in August 1963 the second ranking member on the minority side of the Committee on Armed Services said as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think we should have had a joint committee to monitor the CIA when it was first established. I have had a little experience in the matter as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. As you may know, we have a subcommittee on the CIA. I was a member of that committee for either 2 or 4 years. We met annually—one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing. I think a proposal such as you have made is the answer to it because a part-time subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, as I say, which meets for just 2 hours, 1 day a year, accomplishes nothing whatsoever. I want to compliment the gentleman on his proposal.

It may be, I am sure, that more time is in fact spent; and it may be that there has been some jacking up. But the fact also remains that CIA has become a very important aspect of our governmental establishment and it can, and sometimes has, played an important role in the execution of foreign policy. I claim that it has at times shaped it. The great importance of the CIA in the governmental establishment is symbolized by the very large, very expensive, white building erected on the banks of the Potomac. It symbolizes the degree to which this agency of Government has been brought to the surface and elevated in the governmental establishment. Isn't it about time that we elevated our practices a little bit too?

I was surprised to hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], defending the governmental mishmash surrounding the Bay of Pigs fiasco. He says that the policy lines were clear. Even the people chiefly responsible will admit that this is not true. The gentleman might try asking the Secretary of State. He supports his argument by recalling that the President later took full responsibility for the errors of the Bay of Pigs. Of course, he did.

The President is responsible for everything that happens in Government, or does not. But why did the President find it necessary immediately to appoint the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Robert Kennedy, and Gen. Maxwell Taylor to find out what went wrong and why he was so badly served by agencies of Government? Their first stop was the CIA. And, remember the little tale never denied by the President, about the battle between the hawks and the doves? Meanwhile the Pentagon was waiting for someone to tell it to fly or not to fly. If there was clear policy here, I would hate to think what kind of shape we would be in if policy became really confused.

I made very clear in the speech that I made and in the article that I wrote, that the foreign policymaking organs of Government, just by an absence of clear policy, or by not asserting it when it does exist, can cause other agencies of Government to occupy the field. Operations abroad may snowball themselves. The CIA, or the Pentagon for that matter, may be bootstrapped, even unwillingly from a headquarters point of view, into the position of making policy as they go along. The failure of the State Department to give clear direction and to dominate can cause this.

The CIA is not a policymaking organ and should not be, nor does it want to be. This much is agreed by all. But from time to time the fact of the matter is that there has been no clear policy from Washington. The result has been in at least one instance that operations have snowballed themselves into policy.

The gentleman from Illinois defends the mishmash of Vietnam. I think even the most careful of the public commentators and foreign policy experts, in analyzing what happened in Vietnam during the Diem regime have recognized that separate agencies of the U.S. Government were at times pulling in separate directions; and, in fact, as you will recall, the President found it necessary in the middle of all of this, to reassert the supremacy of the foreign policy organs of Government over other agencies of Government which have no business making foreign policy.

Unless there is clear direction from Washington, this kind of fiasco is going to happen. And unless Congress is willing to take the responsibility for being the double check on questions of policy, including the question of who is making policy, the press attention given to the problem is going to get worse. I do not think it is a healthy thing to have the press of this country increasingly being the only institution that is the watchdog over the difficult problem that we have of trying to separate intelligence and intelligence gathering and operations from the making and shaping of foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time we pulled ourselves together in the Congress and reorganized ourselves as necessary in order to be true representatives of the people, and responsible ones.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the present machinery is performing satisfactorily. I don't think it can, because it is structurally unsound. This has nothing to do with the caliber of the gentlemen involved, which is of the highest. It has everything to do with the structure of the institution. We are charged with the responsibility in seeing to it that that structure is correct and proper.

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

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

Mrs. KELLY. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me at this point. I want to join him in the thoughts which he has just expressed.

Would the gentleman agree with me that with the speed of communications that we have today there is great need for us to have this evaluation ahead of time, if possible, in order to insure that our President receives the coordinated intelligence from all sources from which to formulate policy? I do not want the CIA to carry out policy. All we want in this joint committee is to be sure that the proper department of Government in the executive branch receives for evaluation and determination the intelligence in order to make a policy decision with as much speed as possible, and for us as Members of Congress to have an agency on which to depend to insure us that we can legislate on that policy and to be sure that we can carry it out.

Mr. Speaker, I have many examples that I could cite on this point. However, I do not want to take the precious time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] who has been so kind to yield to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the big items of concern today is the fact that our policy in Vietnam—and as it did without any question, and right at this point, at this moment, as witness the remarks of the Secretary of Defense yesterday before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in challenging Congress for not giving the proper amount of authorization and appropriations to defend our national security—is something which I find wanting.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentlewoman for her constructive comments.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left and I want to make it once again clear that what many of us suggest to the Members of Congress is that a joint congressional committee be established on foreign intelligence and information. It should have status, staff and coordination. It should look into some of the very important questions, including:

First. The relationship between the CIA and the State Department, especially overseas.

Second. The relationship between intelligence gathering on the one hand and special operations on the other hand.

Third. The selection and training of intelligence personnel.

Fourth. The whole question of intelligence evaluation.

We should not forget that contrary to the Pentagon, where there are levels of political appointees responsible to the President, in the CIA there is only the Director who is a political appointee, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Right here you have lost your double check. There is the possibility of massive bureaucracy, unchecked. The most important aspect of our Military Establishment is its political control by civilians—by the President through his civilian appointees, and by the Congress.

Unless the Congress is willing to assert its own jurisdiction in the vast area of intelligence work, which includes many things in the operational sense, then we are abrogating our responsibility.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is making a very important and significant statement, and I should like to congratulate him on it. I am particularly impressed with his concern over the fact that this agency is making policy. I would be much more impressed if we in this Congress recognized that this is a joint tendency. All of our executive agencies are setting down policies that the Congress never intended. You will find that in every agency we have in the Government today. They take the laws that we pass here and stretch them to mean what they want these laws to say, and very frequently in the determination of policy set down by the agencies they are, in fact, contrary to the very intent and spirit of the laws passed by the Congress.

So it would seem to me that the Congress when it reconvenes next year should give serious thought to giving the committee a greater appropriation so that it can develop topnotch staffs of its own in order that the Congress may run its own legislation instead of going to the agencies every time a bill comes up. The gentleman knows very well that a lot of legislation is written by some bureaucrat who does not have to stand up against the voters. We have been passing legislation, yet they do what they want with it.

I congratulate the gentleman particularly on that aspect of his statement.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I come to the conclusion of these remarks I would like to read to the Members of the House the last two paragraphs of the article that was made the subject of today's speech by the gentleman from Illinois.

Finally, I would observe that such a joint congressional committee would perform a useful, perhaps an indispensable, service for the Intelligence community itself. There has been a tendency to assign the burden of blame to the CIA when some foreign undertakings have gone bad or failed altogether. Whether the blame has been justified—as in some cases it may have been—or whether unjustified, the liability to blame is apparent, and the CIA, unlike other less-inhibited agencies, can do little to defend itself. A joint committee could do much to maintain the record fairly.

As the Central Government grows in size and power, and as the Congress, like parliaments everywhere, tends to diminish in importance, the need for countervailing checks and balances becomes all the more important. The shaping and implementation by secret processes of some part of foreign policy is an extremely serious matter in a free society. It cannot be shrugged off or stamped as an inescapable necessity because of the dangers of the time and the threat from present enemies of democracy. To do so is to deny our history and to gamble dangerously with our future. There are internal as well as external dangers. Free political systems and individual liberties can be swiftly undermined. Confidence in the systems and liberties can be lost even more swiftly. And when that happens to a free society, no foreign policy, however well conceived, will protect its highest interest, the continuation of the free system of government and the society on which it rests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of Congress and those who read the RECORD at a later time to refer to the remarks that many of us have made on this subject from time to time. I was shocked and disturbed to discover that some of the people who took issue with me for writing an article on this subject had not even taken the trouble to read the article before taking issue.

I must say that when the day comes when we cannot debate these things intelligently and have an exchange of views and ideas about matters of importance, such as this, then we really are in trouble. If this happens in the Congress, then perhaps everything that is being said about the Congress—its procedures, its part-time Members, its failure to move, its failure to organize itself properly—is the truth. We Members of Congress have an obligation and a responsibility to take note of the existing facts. The speech I just heard made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], on this important and complicated subject pretends that nothing has happened; that all is well; that nothing is wrong; that the governmental machinery is the same as it was 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, unless we Members of Congress are willing to assert ourselves with respect to difficult subjects, unless we are willing to do the check and balance job we are supposed to do under the separation of powers doctrine, then we will be justly criticized, and other institutions of our society, like the press, will step into the vacuum and do it for us.

[From Esquire Magazine, March 1964]

AN INQUIRY INTO THE DARKNESS OF THE CLOAK, THE SHARPNESS OF THE DAGGER

(By Rep. JOHN V. LINDSAY)

Two major reversals in our foreign policy within the last 3 years have shaken the poise of the intelligence branch of the United States Government to its underpinnings: the abortive adventure at the Bay of Pigs, and the blinding miasma of United States policy that arose in South Vietnam during the Diem era.

The immediate dangers past, commentators have sought to unravel the confusing web of influences in both situations. The full truth is not yet known, and may never be. Nonetheless, it seems indisputable that in both cases the three principal instruments of U.S. foreign policy—the State Department, the military, and the Central Intelligence Agency—were at crucial times pulling in separate directions.

The criticism most frequently heard is that the CIA was meddling in policy, undertaking functions that were not its proper responsibility. The charge has been made that the CIA was combining intelligence gathering with active "operations," a course which carries the risk that intelligence may be used to support prior operational decisions. It has been alleged over and over that in Vietnam, as in the Bay of Pigs, the CIA, with or without direction from higher authority, became enmeshed in its own intrigues. In the Bay of Pigs, the CIA was found supporting a collection of Batista refugees, apparently without clear direction from the State Department. In Vietnam, it became clear that the CIA was closely alined with and subsidizing the special forces run by the late Ngo Dinh Nhu, an elite military force that raided the Buddhist pagodas. Responsible representatives of the press have reported strong disagreements between the State Department and the CIA with regard to policy in Vietnam, and these reports must stand even beside the exaggerations of less responsible press accounts. The evidence was overwhelming that U.S. policy was confused and that the divisions within agencies were being hung on the public washline. When later our Government's support swung to the insurgents who ousted Diem, this very possibly meant an about-face on the part of the CIA. The extent of our involvement even then is unknown, but that we were involved must seem quite possible.

Almost every qualified outsider who has examined the history of the Bay of Pigs blunder has concluded that it was founded on a haphazard jumble of foreign policy, intelligence gathering, and military operations. The CIA appears to have organized and conducted the attempt and also to have gathered the intelligence data on which the prospects for the attempt were judged. Not only was CIA shaping policy—perhaps understandable because of the absence of direction from policy-making organs of the Government—but that policy was patently at odds with State Department thinking. Without fully rehearsing the baleful events that preceded the Bay of Pigs, it is perfectly clear, to understate the matter, that the President was badly served by the agencies involved.

These premises, like all of my remarks in this article, arise only from material and information available to the public. In respect to such material and information I am in the same position as other representatives of the people in Congress, with very few exceptions. All the more reason for such a representative to speak out.

To state the danger posed by the intermingling of intelligence gathering and operations is not to say it is unrecognized by responsible officials. Able men throughout the intelligence community are well aware of and deeply concerned by dangers arising from the absence of clear distinction between intelligence gathering and operations. The trouble may often start, as Allen Dulles, the distinguished former head of the CIA recently said, from lack of clear-cut operational policy in Washington. When a policy vacuum occurs, men in the field are almost involuntarily propelled into operational activities which are not their proper responsibility. Sherman Kent, the head of the Board of National Estimates—one of the most influential elements of the intelligence community—makes the point this way:

"Almost any man or group of men confronted with the duty of getting something planned or getting something done will, sooner or later, hit upon what they consider a single most desirable course of action. Usually it is sooner; sometimes, under duress, it is a snap judgment off the top of the head. I cannot escape the belief that under the circumstances outlined, Intelligence will find itself right in the middle of policy, and that upon occasions it will be the unabashed apologist for a given policy rather than its impartial and objective analyst."

The failures of CIA covert operations are well-known. Less well-known, and of equally sobering magnitude, are the successes. The CIA, for example, played a key part in the ousting of the Mossadegh regime in Iran in 1953, paving the way for eventual reform of the pro-Western government of the Shah. Both British and American vital interests had been threatened by the capricious Mossadegh policies, the major threat being to Britain's necessary supply of oil. The successful coup which unseated Mossadegh was of great benefit to the United States and the West.

The following year the virulently anti-American Arbenz regime in Guatemala was overthrown. The CIA was widely believed to have engineered the coup. But for the success of that coup, Soviet-directed communism in Latin America would presumably be far more deeply entrenched than it is today.

Each of these episodes demonstrates, for good or ill, the explosive nature of the CIA's operational involvement in international politics. It is not at all improbable that it will be similarly involved in the future. The cold war will be with us for a very long time; so will the CIA. Accordingly, our democratic government, unused to secrecy, has within it an immensely powerful and extremely expensive secret organization, for the past few years housed in a very large permanent building on the banks of the Potomac. That building represents the institutionalization of the CIA in the government establishment. More exactly, it marks its positive elevation in status, always important in government. And yet there is no effective check on its activities now. And there were none in 1961.

Few can deny the actual and potential power of the CIA, however carefully it may be held in check by the skillful men who run it. Ours is supposed to be a government of laws, not of men. At stake are questions of war and peace, as the two Cuban crises so clearly demonstrated. All of us at that time took a look into the atomic pit. Decisions can be made at such times and actions taken about which the public is totally in the dark. So be it. As much as we may abhor government by secrecy, as much as it threatens fundamental liberties, we must understand its limited and necessary application in particular circumstances of hot or cold war. Nevertheless, crucial decisions are made for us and in our name of which we know nothing. And all too often secrecy which is necessary breeds secrecy which is unnecessary, at which point the danger becomes nothing less than a threat to democratic institutions, a marginal one at the outset, but potentially a most serious one.

The Bay of Pigs fiasco occurred despite efforts by Secretary of State Christian Herter and CIA Director Allen Dulles to sort out the relations between their two Agencies so that the making of foreign policy would be removed from the CIA, and the command of policy kept firmly in the hands of ambassadors in the field at all times. The Herter-Dulles agreement was reaffirmed by Secretary Rusk. More recently, following events in Vietnam during the Diem regime, the President found it necessary to reassert publicly his authority and that of the Secretary of State and the National Security Council over the intelligence community. Collaterally the Secretary of State sought to assure the primacy of ambassadors in the policy area overseas.

Particular persons and particular situations may seem to define problems of this sort. But it is also the case that, as long as both the State Department and the CIA are responsible for the collection of information, and—perhaps most important—as long as CIA continues to be responsible for "special operations"—the support of anti-Communist elements and the fomenting of opposition to hostile governments—the problem of integrating the Central Intelligence Agency into our general foreign-policy apparatus will continue to grow in scope and potential danger.

For a time the Maxwell Taylor Committee, appointed by the President to inquire particularly into the Cuban question, appears to have considered the possibility of transferring the bulk of CIA's special operations to the Defense Department. But this solution would have had the obvious disadvantage of ensuring that the uniformed military—and hence the authority and prestige of the U.S. Government—would be identified with any paramilitary operation as soon as it became a matter of public knowledge.

In any event, it seems that the Taylor Committee has left routine covert operations in the hands of the CIA, with control to be transferred to the Pentagon only if a particular project becomes so big as to warrant open military participation. Mr. Hanson Baldwin in The New York Times summed up the matter thus:

"The general rule of thumb for the future is that the CIA will not handle any primarily military operations, or ones of such size that they cannot be kept secret. However, each case will apparently be judged on its merits; there is no hard-and-fast formula that will put one operation under the CIA and another under the Pentagon."

Now surely this is an area in which neither hard-and-fast formulas nor organizational gimmicks can solve the major difficulties. Much depends on the particular situations. The people who are in the most favorable position to gather information are sometimes the best equipped to engage in clandestine political activities. But largely because the problem eludes organizational formulas, because it is a problem to which there is no simple solution, it must be recognized as such and held in check as much as possible. Problems unwatched and unattended tend to multiply.

CIA is served by only one politically responsible officer: the Director himself. All others are career officials. In comparison, the President keeps ultimate control in the Pentagon by his political power to appoint all the top civilian officers there. These officials are entrusted with clear political responsibility, for which there is no parallel in the CIA.

There are in fact questions repeatedly raised about the CIA. Is it wise, for example, to rely to the extent the CIA seems to on the services of retired military officers? One would suppose that retired service officers, though almost always men of great ability, would have an instinctive tendency to take a rather narrow, strictly "operational" and "efficient" view of the problems confronting them. I hope I will not be misunderstood. CIA officials are among the most distinguished in the entire Federal establishment. The leadership of the Agency comprises men of great gifts and dedication—and I include the former military men in the Agency. But recruitment of high-caliber men in large numbers is a problem in the Federal Government, especially in agencies whose work is international.

It is also fair to ask whether the CIA should rely heavily on the services of political refugees. It seems reasonable to suppose, for example, that an exile from his homeland, especially one who has passionate convictions about the course of events there, may not be the best person to assess these events. Again, I hope that I will not be misunderstood. I do not mean to impugn in the slightest the enormous amount of valuable work done by exiles and refugees in the CIA. Without their help, as in the case of the ex-military men, the organization simply could not function as it should. Neither do I mean to suggest that CIA should be staffed with "soft-liners" or people who have had no personal experience with the countries in question. That would be absurd. But I do think that by every recommendation of common sense we must be certain of the objectivity and breadth of our intelligence.

This raises the question of the structure of the intelligence community and of intelligence evaluation—the question of how best to organize the interpreting of the enormous amount of material collected daily by all agencies of the intelligence community.

The phrase "intelligence community" embraces the numerous agencies within the executive branch which are concerned with intelligence collection and evaluation: the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the intelligence branches of the armed services, the National Security Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and others. The daily chore of coordinating and cross-checking daily intelligence data is largely in the hands of the Defense Intelligence Agency. The long-range estimates are prepared under the direction of the Board of National Estimates, which presides as a kind of general planning staff for the intelligence community. Estimates prepared by this group are submitted to a committee known as the U.S. Intelligence Board. If the Board of Estimates is the planning board for the community, the Intelligence Board is its board of directors. It is the final forum for the professional intelligence community; its judgments go to the National Security Council.

Two aspects of this system in particular are worth noting. The first is the preeminence of the Central Intelligence Agency. A high proportion of the intelligence community's fact gathering is done by CIA. The Board of National Estimates functions as a part of CIA. The Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board is the Director of the CIA. And the intelligence community's spokesman on the National Security Council itself is that same CIA Director.

The second aspect worth noting is the duality of CIA's role. Under the National Security Act this agency is not only one participant in the intelligence community; it is also the chief agency responsible for coordinating it. In other words, at many points in the process of evaluation, CIA is both player and umpire, both witness and judge. This ambiguity is implicit in the title of the Director, who is formally not the "Director of the Central Intelligence Agency," but simply "Director of Central Intelligence."

The problem this raises is clear. It is that the Central Intelligence Agency, being not merely central but dominant in the intelligence community, is in an extraordinary position, so long as it is left unchecked to carry its special institutional tendencies into the shaping of American foreign policy.

I believe that these difficulties of unchecked power in the intelligence community can be alleviated only by the Congress, which has the constitutional responsibility to oversee the functions of the executive branch on behalf of the American people. Therefore, I propose the establishment in the Congress of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. I propose that such a committee be constituted along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and that it have its own funds and staff. It should continuously inquire into our foreign information and intelligence programs, including: (1) the relations between the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department, especially overseas; (2) the relations between intelligence gathering on the one hand and so-called special operations on the other; (3) the selection and training of intelligence personnel; and (4) the whole question of intelligence evaluation.

The proposal of a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence is not new. In one form or another it has been introduced into the House in each of the last 10 sessions, though it has not been debated on the floor. In the Senate, a bill to establish a joint committee, sponsored by Senator MANSFIELD in 1956, was debated for two days on the floor of the Senate and defeated.

Nor is the proposal partisan. At time of writing, there are 14 Democratic and 5 Republican sponsors in the House. In 1959 resolutions were sponsored in the House by 12 Democrats and 5 Republicans. In the Senate in 1956, Members on both sides of the aisle voted for Senator MANSFIELD's resolution—including the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late President Kennedy.

It is most often argued against the establishment of a watchdog committee that the secrecy of our intelligence system would be endangered. The argument does not stand up. No one denies that the CIA and other intelligence agencies must conduct a very high proportion of their work in secret; secrecy is of the essence in their work. But what is true of the intelligence community is also true in many other areas of government—in the fields of atomic energy, weapons development, and, in some respects, foreign policy. But does this mean that Congress is to have no effective authority in those areas? Of course, it does not, for Congress has such authority. It has always asserted its right, indeed, its constitutional duty, to oversee even the most sensitive areas of Government. And where matters of the highest secrecy have been involved, Members of both Houses have shown themselves capable of exercising the utmost restraint. This was never more clearly demonstrated than during the Manhattan Project in World War II, when members of the two Appropriations Committees were kept apprised of work on the atomic bomb without breaking security. The record of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in this connection has been impeccable.

Moreover, the CIA is even now monitored, in theory, by four small subcommittees of the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and House. Not even the most experienced and security-conscious officials of the intelligence community would deny these subcommittees—had they time to apply for it— access to the pertinent information that might enable them conscientiously to provide the vast sums of money that are requested year after year. But apparently the notion exists that if the whole matter is kept on the lowest possible level of Congressional concern, secrecy will receive a higher degree of respect. There is no logic in the notion. I should think just the opposite would be true.

I find myself in even less sympathy with another argument advanced frequently in discussions of this question—namely, that the intelligence community exists solely to serve the President and the National Security Council, and that therefore we in the Congress have no right to exercise jurisdiction in the matter. But clearly the executive and legislative branches of our Government are not watertight compartments separated by steel bulkheads; the material between them is flexible and porous. There are any number of congressional committees which keep a watch over the executive agencies. And, as I have already said, it is not only their right to do so; it is their duty under the Constitution.

These arguments concerning secrecy and the exclusively executive nature of the intelligence function are, though unpersuasive, at least consistent. But strangely enough, those who opopse the idea of a joint committee insist as well that congressional surveillance is already more than adequate. This contention was made by Allen Dulles in his recent book and by President Kennedy in answer to a question at his October 9 press conference.

What, in fact, is the present extent of congressional surveillance over intelligence activities? As mentioned, in both the House and Senate the bodies responsible for overseeing the intelligence community are subcommittees of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. Neither the House Foreign Affairs Committee nor the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has jurisdiction in this area despite their obvious interest in intelligence matters. This might not matter were it not that the surveillance exercised by the four existing subcommittees is both cursory and sporadic.

At the time I introduced the resolution proposing the Joint Committee and spoke on the floor of the House in favor of it, Congressman WALTER NORBLAD of Oregon, the second-ranking minority Member of the House Committee on Armed Services, had this to say:

"Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think we should have had a joint committee to monitor the CIA when it was first established. I have had a little experience in the matter as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. As you may know, we have a subcommittee on the CIA. I was a member of that committee for four years. We met annually—one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing. I think a proposal such as [Mr. LINDSAY has] made is the answer to it because a part-time subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, as I say, which meets for just 2 hours, 1 day a year, accomplishes nothing whatsoever. I want to compliment the gentleman on his proposal."

The reasons for the lack of adequate check and examination are almost self-evident: the members of the four subcommittees themselves, by definition, have relatively low status. But even had those subcommittees both status and time, the difficulties involved in dividing jurisdiction among the four would, I think, be insuperable.

It should be clear from what I have said that the bipartisan proponents of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence are fully aware that a high degree of secrecy is essential to the workings of the intelligence community. Neither I nor any legislator wishes to see the legitimate secrets of the intelligence community reported in the press and on the air. Indeed, this seems far more likely to occur under present conditions because the press, sometimes called "the fourth branch of the Government," may turn out to be the only effective check on intelligence activities—and that check could be dangerous as well as disruptive. But danger and disruption are certain if public confidence in the intelligence establishment erodes. It is less likely if a body of the people's representatives, properly constituted and are carefully chosen by the leadership of the two Hosues of Congress, remains continuously aware of the activities of the intelligence community. The performance of this function is nothing less than their duty to the American people, whose lives and liberties are profoundly involved in the intelligence activities of our Government.

Finally, I would observe that such a joint congressional committee would perform a useful, perhaps an indispensable, service for the intelligence community itself. There has been a tendency to assign the burden of blame to the CIA when some foreign undertakings have gone bad or failed altogether. Whether the blame has been justified—as in some cases it may have been—or whether unjustified, the liability to blame is apparent, and the CIA, unlike other less inhibited agencies, can do little to defend itself. A joint committee could do much to maintain the record fairly.

As the Central Government grows in size and power, and as the Congress, like parliaments everywhere, tends to diminish in importance, the need for countervailing checks and balances becomes all the more important. The shaping and implementation by secret processes of some part of foreign policy is an extremely serious matter in a free society. It cannot be shrugged off or stamped as an inescapable necessity because of the dangers of the time and the threat from present enemies of democracy. To do so is to deny our history and to gamble dangerously with our future. There are internal as well as external dangers. Free political systems and individual liberties can be swiftly undermined. Confidence in the systems and liberties themselves can be lost even more swiftly. And when that happens to a free society, no foreign policy, however well conceived, will protect its highest interest, the continuation of the free system of government and the society on which it rests.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the full text of an article I wrote which appeared in the March issue of Esquire magazine, entitled "An Inquiry Into the Darkness of the Cloak and the Sharpness of the Dagger.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD, following the remarks I have just made on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in support of a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence.

For the past 10 years I have introduced into the Congress resolutions calling for the creation of such a committee. Only yesterday I once again wrote the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], asking that hearings be scheduled as soon as possible on my bill, House Congressional Resolution 2, which would create a "watchdog" committee on intelligence matters.

It is my hope that some action may be initiated on this measure during the current session of Congress.

There is, in my opinion, a pressing need for the establishment of this committee. There are several reasons which have prompted me to propose the creation of this committee.

The foremost reason lies in the tremendous importance of intelligence activities conducted by the executive branch of our Government. Since the end of World War II and the advent of the nuclear age, our need for adequate and timely intelligence has intensified greatly. Such intelligence is necessary if we are to survive as a free nation and the leader of the free world.

Are we getting the high quality intelligence we need in these times of peril? Are our present intelligence operations efficient and effective?

There is ample reason for doubt. For example, the Hoover Commission, in 1955, reported that there were at least 12 major departments and agencies engaged in intelligence of one form or another.

These included the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and five agencies within the Defense Department.

Since 1955 there have been some organizational changes within the Department of Defense toward consolidating the intelligence operations of the separate services within the Defense Intelligence Agency. At the same time, however, intelligence activities seem to be proliferating as the cold war grows older and more complex. For example, it recently has come to my attention that the Air Force Systems Command is operating a semiautonomous intelligence-gathering agency and wishes to expand its operations.

Other agencies in this field are the U.S. Intelligence Board, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The multiplicity of agencies operating in the area of intelligence gives rise to many questions about the efficiency of our activities.

What is, for example, the relationship between the CIA and the DIA? Are they working toward a unified end, cooperating together? Or do their efforts overlap and conflict?

The latter seem to have been true in Vietnam last year where it was reported that the CIA personnel in the country were supporting and assisting the Diem regime, while the DIA personnel were known to be seeking the overthrow of President Diem and his family.

After examining similar instances of our intelligence-gathering agencies working at cross-purposes, the Hoover Commission, in 1955, recommended that a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence be established, patterned after the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Another reason for a "watchdog" on intelligence activities is the rising amount of money our Nation is spending on such operations.

The CIA alone has been called a "billion dollar operation" by many reliable sources. Certainly, the combined intelligence activities of our Government would reach well over a billion dollars annually.

The budgets of these agencies must be given the closest possible scrutiny in order to do away with waste and duplication of effort. Congress must have a special committee with the time and knowledge to do this effectively.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize once again three things that we who advocate the Joint Committee on Central Intelligence do not mean to imply.

First, we are not in any way casting doubt on the loyalty or patriotism of our CIA and other intelligence employees. For the most part they are doing an excellent job which often receives too little recognition.

Second, we do not wish to "investigate" the CIA or any other agency. The committee would not pry into the secrets of the intelligence-gathering agencies. It would simply obtain enough information on the operations of the intelligence community to enable the Congress to make a reasonably sound judgment on its budget and its effectiveness.

Third, we do not intend any criticism of the committees and Members of Congress who currently handle CIA activities and appropriations. They are doing the best possible job.

Unfortunately, the result of the present system is all too often a piecemeal, hit-and-run examination of the policies and activities of our intelligence-gathering agencies by Congress.

The remedy is a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence. It is my earnest hope that the House Rules Committee will soon report this measure favorably to the floor of the House, so that the Members of this body may work their will.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEMS: ADEQUATE STUDY REQUIRES TIME

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the result of two statements on Panama-United States relations by President Johnson, March 16 and 21, 1964, the crisis over the Panama Canal has received increased world attention.

In the first, made under dramatic circumstances before a meeting of the Organization of American States, the President refused to agree to commit his administration in advance to renegotiate the basic 1903 Panama Canal Treaty as a prerequisite for Panama's resumption of normal diplomatic relations with the United States, which President Chiari of Panama severed on January 10. It was President Johnson's knowledge of how President Chiari tried to blackmail the United States with mob assaults on the Canal Zone led by Castro agents and of how Panama's chief envoy to the United Nations attacked the United States with threats to take the Panamanian case before this international body which accounts for President Johnson's refusal to yield under the presence of Panamanian blackmailers.

The second statement by President Johnson on March 21, in a conciliatory effort to end the crisis, was specific in calling for a solution that "protects the interests of all the American nations in the canal" as well as of Panama.

Officials of our Government know that a claim behind the insistence of Panama for a renegotiation of the 1903 treaty is the Panamanian assertion that this treaty is null and void. This must be clearly understood, for were our Government to agree to such a basis for diplomatic discussions it would put itself on the defensive by telling the world that it has been wrong in dealing with Panama. The delay thus far occasioned affords an opportunity to review the Panama crisis in the light of the overall interoceanic canals problem. Certainly the recurring mob invasions of the Canal Zone and the resulting slaughter of U.S. soldiers and citizens there constitute powerful arguments for the continuance of U.S. sovereignty over the zone.

As stressed in my address to the House on March 9 on "Panama Canal: Focus of Power Politics," the January 1964 Panamanian outbreak has aroused the interest of the Nation in the interoceanic canals question to a degree not equaled since the dramatic dash of the *Oregon* in 1898 to join our fleet off Santiago. In my March 11 statement, "Panama Canal: Formula for Future Canal Policy," I summarized the problems that must be considered in its formulation. Such policy, Mr. Speaker, must be determined before there can be intelligent discussions of diplomatic questions with any country, especially Panama, where, according to an editorial in the March 11 Estrella de Panama, the garbage collection situation, if not soon solved, will become a national calamity. Moreover, Panama is in the midst of a heated presidential campaign, with candidates vying with one another in presenting programs to the electorate for driving the United States off the isthmus or, at least, for wringing absolutely unjustifiable and destructive concessions and benefits from the United States.

Until our Government, by means of an adequately constituted and independent Interoceanic Canals Commission, develops what our future canal policy should be, there can be no basis for important negotiations with any country, least of all with Panama where we have a workable treaty which would permit the modernization and increase of capacity of the existing Panama Canal to meet future needs without a new treaty.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the present deplorable situation on the isthmus, much of which was caused by our own pusillanimous conduct of policy matters in contemptuous disregard of the Congress, I believe that I reflect the views of informed Members of the Congress and many leading canal experts in various parts of the Nation when I urge that nothing be done in the way of serious diplomatic discussions not only until after the Panamanian election in May but until after the necessary independent Interoceanic Canals Commission is created, put to work on the overall canal question, and indicates the site and type of the required solutions.

Our country must become more realistic in its approach to Latin America. Certainly there is no imperialism or colonialism in the exercise by the just and indispensable sovereignty over the Panama Canal enterprise; and such exercise is best for Panama itself, its radical politicians and Castroites notwithstanding.

The two indicated statements of President Johnson follow; also an editorial in the Evening Star commending the President on the first statement and an article by William S. White supporting a realistic approach in dealing with Latin American questions:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1964]

REMARKS BY JOHNSON ON PANAMA SITUATION

(The White House transcript of President Johnson's remarks on Panama, during his Alliance for Progress speech.)

Let me now depart for a moment from my main theme to speak of the differences that have developed between Panama and the United States.

Our own position is clear and it has been from the first hour that we learned of the disturbances. The United States will meet with Panama anytime, anywhere, to discuss anything, to work together, to cooperate with each other, to reason with one another, to review and to consider all of our problems together, to tell each other all our opinions, all our desires, and all our concerns, and to aim at solutions and answers that are fair and just and equitable without regard to the size or the strength or the wealth of either nation.

We do not ask Panama to make any precommitments before we meet, and we intend to make none. Of course, we cannot begin on this work until diplomatic relations are resumed, but the United States is ready today, if Panama is ready. As of this moment, I do not believe that there has been a genuine meeting of the minds between the two Presidents of the two countries involved.

Press reports indicate that the Government of Panama feels that the language which has been under consideration for many days commits the United States to a rewriting and to a revision of the 1903 treaty. We have made no such commitment and we would not think of doing so before diplomatic relations are resumed and unless a fair and satisfactory adjustment is agreed upon.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1964]

L.B.J. STATEMENT ABOUT PANAMA

(Following is the statement by President Johnson, which he read personally to newsmen yesterday on the dispute with Panama:)

The present inability to resolve our differences with Panama is a source of deep regret.

Our two countries are not linked by only a single agreement or a single interest. We are bound together in an inter-American system whose objective is, in the words of the charter, "through mutual understanding and respect by the sovereignty of each, to provide for the betterment of all."

ALLIED IN STRUGGLE

Under the many treaties and declarations which form the fabric of that system, we have long been allies in the struggle to strengthen democracy and enhance the welfare of our people. Our history is witness to this essential unity of interest and belief. Panama has unhesitatingly come to our side, twice in this century, when we were threatened by aggression. On December 7, 1941, Panama declared war on our attackers even before our own Congress had time to act.

Since that war, Panama has wholeheartedly joined with us, and our sister Republics, in shaping the agreements and goals of this continent. We have also had a special relationship with Panama, for they have shared with us the benefits, the burdens, and trust of maintaining the Panama Canal as a lifeline of defense and a keystone of hemispheric prosperity. All free nations are grateful for the effort they have given to this task. As circumstances change, as history shapes new attitudes and expectations, we have reviewed periodically this special relationship.

We are well aware that the claims of the Government of Panama, and of the majority of the Panamanian people, do not spring from malice or hatred of America. They are based on a deeply felt sense of the honest and fair needs of Panama. It is, therefore, our obligation as allies and partners to review these claims and to meet them, when meeting them is both just and possible.

READY TO REVIEW ISSUES

We are ready to do this.

We are prepared to review every issue which now divides us, and every problem which the Panama Government wishes to raise.

We are prepared to do this at any time and any place.

As soon as he is invited by the Government of Panama, our Ambassador will be on his way. We shall also designate a special representative. He will arrive with full authority to discuss every difficulty. He will be charged with the responsibility of seeking a solution which recognizes the fair claims of Panama and protects the interests of all the American nations in the canal. We cannot determine, even before our meeting, what form that solution might best take. But his instructions will not prohibit any solution which is fair, and subject to the appropriate constitutional processes of both our Governments.

I hope that on this basis we can begin to resolve our problems and move ahead to confront the real enemies of this hemisphere—the enemies of hunger and ignorance, disease and injustice. I know President Chiari (of Panama) shares this hope. For, despite today's disagreements, the common values and interests which unite us are far stronger and more enduring than the differences which now divide us.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 23, 1964]

BID TO PANAMA

President Johnson's latest comment on the Panama issue is an energetic attempt to break the logjam which has been blocking settlement of the canal dispute.

Mr. Johnson made his move in an "impromptu" appearance at a conference held late Saturday by George Reedy, who has replaced Pierre Salinger as White House press secretary. The President proclaimed his readiness to name a special representative to seek a solution of the Panama Canal differences—a solution which "recognizes the fair claims of Panama and protects the interests of all the American nations in the canal." He also said, "We are well aware that the claims of the Government of Panama, and of the majority of the Panamanian people, do not spring from malice or hatred of America."

The first is a reasonable statement of what has always been the position of the United States, as we understand it. The second, while obviously intended to be conciliatory, ignores certain facts which are clearly spelled out in the record. One of these is that it was the President of Panama who broke off diplomatic relations with the United States. A second is that it was Panama's Ambassador to the United Nations who falsely accused our forces in the Canal Zone of "bloody aggression" against the people of Panama.

The President, however, may be justified at this stage in glossing over the difficulties. He is trying to repair the damage resulting from last week's misunderstanding with the OAS committee and to clear the way for a settlement with Panama. In striving to attain such objectives, little harm can result from generous statements—provided always that the essential interests of the United States are not neglected. We do not think that Mr. Johnson means to neglect them.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 23, 1964]

THE PASSING SCENE: UNITED STATES STIFFENS ON LATIN AMERICA

(By William S. White)

The Johnson administration is moving on every front toward a more realistic approach to Latin America—an approach in which the legitimate interests of the United States will be the final test of every policy.

There is not the slightest intention to be tough or arrogant with the Latins. There is not the smallest purpose to be ungenerous with American aid or unsympathetic to the poverty and the fierce national and cultural pride which make the Latins perhaps the world's most sensitive people.

There is, however, the firmest of determination here to end a long era of well-intentioned but undue submissiveness in Washington to every wind of disapproval of us, however unjustified, which may blow up from south of the border.

In a word, the U.S. Government is casting off the moldy hair shirt which for decades it has worn. It is saying goodby to an absurdly extreme sense of American guilt. For these same decades this guilt feeling has assumed that the United States is automatically and inevitably to blame for every difficulty in the Western Hemisphere simply because half a lifetime ago this country sometimes practiced "gunboat diplomacy" in Latin America.

GOOD NEIGHBORS

We intend to be good neighbors in the true and adult and self-respecting sense. We do not intend, however, to be simply Uncle Sap good neighbors forever, saying we are wrong when we are right, and forever remorseful because some President Coolidge of the dim past sent the marines to Nicaragua.

All this is one columnist's interpretation of the direction in which the U.S. Government is turning under two men whose human connections with and personal understanding of the Latins are facts of lifelong experience—President Johnson and Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann.

They know the Latin mind. Mr. Johnson knows it because of 30 years of mutually cordial political association with the Mexican-Americans of Texas. Mr. Mann knows it through much service as perhaps the most skilled diplomat of his generation in Latin American affairs.

Each man's awareness is intimate and factual; not bookish and theoretical. Each man truly likes the Latins; but neither man is filled with purely academic assumptions that are foreign to human reality.

They know, for illustration, that while the Latins naturally like a United States which bows to every demand, the Latins at bottom respect only those officials who are "muy hombre" (very manly) and frankly prepared to uphold their own rights. This must be done with grace and good humor; but also with dignity and resolution.

COMMUNIST CUBA

Thus, this country now sees honest American efforts to settle difficulties like that in the Panama Canal Zone with full respect for the right and feelings of the Panamanians—but also with full insistence on the right and feelings of the United States of America.

Thus, this country will later see powerful and tireless Washington efforts to do more than talk about the menace posed by Castro Cuba. This Government will expect its Latin friends to realize that we are attempting to excise the cancer of communism in Cuba not so much for our own sake as for theirs. And this Government will expect the true cooperation of those it is trying so hard to save.

The round sum of the developing policy of the United States toward Latin America might be thus expressed: Mr. Johnson did not come to the Presidency to preside over liquidation of free governments in this hemisphere to suit the world's Fidel Castros, nor to waive every American interest in the doctrinaire notion that the United States is always wrong.

Mr. Mann did not undertake perhaps the toughest job in American diplomacy simply to solicit hurrahs from those who still think that every criticism of the United States—and every thrust at American business abroad—must be met with instant American concessions and instant American breast beating.

OUTSTANDING FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR FOR 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce to this honorable body that one of my constituents, Dr. O. C. Williams, was named "Outstanding Federal Administrator for 1963."

Presentation of the plaque and certificate, which is awarded by the Federal Business Association of Detroit, will be made on April 2.

Dr. Williams is the medical officer in charge at the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Detroit, Mich. A graduate of the University of Kansas Medical School, Dr. Williams has served 34 years in the Public Health Service.

In 1939, he was assigned to the Detroit Public Health Service Hospital as Chief of Surgery and remained there until 1944. Dr. Williams has operated on as many, if not more, Federal employees than any other surgeon in the Public Health Service during his many years as Chief of Surgery.

The good doctor came back to Detroit in 1957 to serve as medical officer in charge. As a part of his administrative duties, he supervises 26 outpatient and designated physicians' offices throughout the States of Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

He has served on the board of directors for the Federal Business Association of Detroit and has taken an active part in the various community campaigns, such as the United Foundation, March of Dimes, Crusade for Freedom, et cetera.

I sincerely wish Dr. Williams many more gratifying and rewarding years in the field of public health service.

H.R. 10618: A BILL TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF DOMESTIC BEET SUGAR AND MAINLAND CANE SUGAR WHICH MAY BE MARKETED DURING 1964, 1965, AND 1966

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill which I introduced yesterday is to provide immediate relief from excessive inventories of beet and mainland cane sugar and to buttress the presently existing Sugar Act by eliminating its inequities for the duration of its present existence; that is, from now until December 31, 1966.

The present beet area quota of 2,600,000 tons would be increased to 3,350,000 tons for 1965 and 1966 and would be 2,850,000 for 1964; the mainland cane area on the other hand would have its present quota increased from 900,000 tons to 1,150,000 tons in 1964, and to 1,650,000 tons for 1965 and 1966. The beet area production for calendar 1964 is set at approximately 3,100,000 tons and the mainland cane area production at 1,200,000 tons. The ability of both industries to meet these increased quotas and accomplish the purposes of this bill has already been demonstrated.

The past year's fluctuating price of sugar to the U.S. consumer, largely occasioned by our dependence upon foreign suppliers for a considerable portion of our sugar needs points up the advisability of relying more heavily upon our domestic producers who stand ready, willing, and able to satisfy a greater part, if not all, of our domestic requirement.

The cane-sugar industry with its long-range constancy of production, more efficient utilization of farmlands not easily maintained in other crops, and its function as a source of supply readily and continually available to meet the varying demands of the cane sugar refiners is prepared to, and should, provide an increased proportion of our ever increasing annual sugar consumption.

This bill will serve to enable the accomplishment of the foregoing aims by providing a more realistic division of the market between the beet processors on the one hand and the cane processors and refiners on the other.

Under the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended, as this House is well aware, about 1½ million tons of quota was allotted to Communist Cuba with the proviso, however, that so long as our country was not maintaining diplomatic relations with Cuba this tonnage would be purchased from other foreign countries. In view of Cuba's supplying better than 3 million tons of sugar to the United States in 1958, its last full year of participation in the U.S. sugar market, and the present state of disrepair and highly diminished productive capacity of the Cuban industry as well as the great length of time required to restore this industry to its former productive levels, it is highly unrealistic any longer to maintain any quota whatsoever, primarily set up for Cuba.

Both the beet and mainland cane sugar areas of our domestic industry have responded to the necessity of meeting the void occasioned by Cuban nonsupply with an increase of capacity which has resulted in a production in both areas considerably in excess of the marketing allotments for such areas. The present anomalous situation of having an oversupply of sugar in our domestic producers and an undersupply of marketing allotment occasioned by maintaining the fictional Cuban quota should be eradicated. This bill proposes to do that.

The refiners of cane sugar whose industry has long been dependent upon offshore sugars not now available must be provided with adequate raw material to assure their continued and undiminished position in fulfilling our domestic requirements. This is the primary reason why the increase of quota should be divided equally between the beet and mainland cane areas rather than upon the basis of division presently existing under the act for the basic quota of marketing allotments.

The instability of governments of many areas of foreign sugar supply with the consequent uncertainty of the availability of this supply magnifies the necessity of affirmative action to protect the American consumer of sugar from price gyrations such as those to which these consumers have recently been subjected. The surest and most effective method of doing this is to provide for the domestic industry to produce a greatly enlarged percentage of our annual sugar consumption. This bill does that.

LET'S GET THE FACTS STRAIGHT ON THE WHEAT PROGRAM—PART 2

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, this statement is made in connection with my statement contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday on page 6335. There will be further statements along these lines on April 6 and 7.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called your attention to the fact that wheat producers and most farm organizations want the wheat program which is a part of H.R. 6196.

Today, I want to clear up two more common misconceptions; first, that because it involves the use of certificates the wheat program in H.R. 6196 is a complicated program. Second, I want to correct the misconception that this program was not studied in detail by the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this is the simplest, most flexible price support program that has ever been offered wheatgrowers.

Under this program each wheat producer is notified of his wheat acreage allotment and the number of certificates he is entitled to if he plants within his allotment.

What could be simpler than this?

All the producer has to do is advise his county committee that he plans to cooperate. At the appropriate time the committee will inspect his farm to verify the fact that he has planted within his allotment. When this has been done, the county committee may mail him the wheat marketing certificates to which he is entitled.

He may sell his wheat from the combine, or he can place it in storage. No marketing card is required to sell his wheat as under the old program.

If he wishes, he can take his wheat marketing certificates to the local elevator with his wheat. The elevator will pay him the face value of the certificates and may sell them to the local or regional office of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Or, the producer himself may take or send the wheat marketing certificates to the local or regional Commodity Credit Corporation office and receive their face value.

A wheat producer who does not wish to cooperate by planting within his wheat acreage allotment has no forms to fill out. No one will check on his excess plantings. He may sell his wheat freely in the market and, for the same quality wheat, should receive the same market price as the cooperator. He simply is not entitled to any marketing certificates if he has overplanted his wheat allotment.

It is as simple as that.

The wheat program authorized in H.R. 6196 has a new feature in it which gives wheat producers more flexibility in their planting plans than ever before. It is the so-called substitution clause. Under this clause, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, a producer may substitute wheat on a part of his feed grain acreage base or plant feed grains on a part of his wheat acreage allotment and still be in compliance with both programs.

This provides a flexibility to farmers who produce both wheat and feed grains that was never before available to them.

The new wheat prorgam is equally simple and free of administrative headaches for the wheat trade and the domestic millers. All wheat will move through the usual channels of trade, being bought and sold on the basis of its quality and geographic location. High quality wheat will command its usual premium in the marketplace.

Domestic millers will know in advance the value of the marketing certificates they must purchase to go with all wheat utilized for domestic food uses. There is no uncertainty or difficulties involved in this. They know that with every 1,000 bushels of wheat purchased and utilized for domestic food products they must purchase the equivalent number of wheat marketing certificates at the price set for the entire marketing year by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The wheat marketing certificates can be obtained from the nearest Commodity Credit Corporation office.

What could be simpler?

Now, I want to set the record straight on the long hours of hearings and study which my subcommittee put in on this wheat program.

I know of no recent bills which have come before the House of Representatives with a longer record of hearings held on them—unless, perhaps, it was the tax cut or civil rights bills.

Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 23, and 26 the Wheat Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, held hearings on 39 wheat bills. At that time the proposal for a voluntary certificate plan similar to the one incorporated in H.R. 6196 was presented to the subcommittee by a former Member of this body, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, from the important wheat-growing State of South Dakota.

The voluntary certificate plan and many other proposals were widely discussed by wheat producers and by farm leaders in the late summer and fall months.

On December 11, 12, and 16, the Wheat Subcommittee again held open hearings and heard some 14 witnesses representing many State organizations of wheat producers, the National Association of Wheat Producers, the Millers National Federation, and representatives of national farm organizations.

Most of these witnesses favored a voluntary certificate plan of the type authorized in H.R. 6196.

Mr. Speaker, I take my responsibility as chairman of the Wheat Soubcommittee seriously. I continued open hearings on all the various wheat plans proposed on January 7, 8, 9, 17, and 22.

After these extensive hearings, I introduced H.R. 9780 on January 28. H.R. 9780 authorizes a voluntary certificate plan very similar—in fact almost identical—to the provisions of H.R. 6196.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9780 and the other alternative wheat bills were discussed by the Wheat Subcommittee in executive session on February 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 24, and 27. At that time, the subcommittee voted to send it to the full committee. The House Agriculture Committee held two meetings on this bill and reported it favorably on March 17.

Mr. Speaker, that is the record of the study made by the Wheat Subcommittee in 1963 and in the past few months. But I ask any Member of this body who has been told he will be asked to vote on a wheat program that has not been given adequate study to look at pages 8 and 9 of House Report No. 1239—the report to accompany H.R. 9780—"A Voluntary Marketing Certificate Program for Wheat."

Mr. Speaker, the wheat program authorized in H.R. 6196 is an updated version of the wheat certificate plan introduced by Congressman Stockman, of Oregon.

In years past, Clifford Hope, of Kansas, took the leadership in sponsoring this type of a program for wheat producers. Many outstanding Members of this body have introduced and supported legislation of this type in past years. In addition to former Congressmen Stockman, Hope, Smith of Kansas, Johnson of Colorado, and Breeding, Congressman Albert, Berry, Horan, and others have introduced and supported similar legislation in earlier years.

Mr. Speaker, when we vote on H.R. 6196 we will be voting on a wheat program that has had not hours, not weeks, not months—but years of study.

It is the best wheat program a majority of the Wheat Subcommittee could agree on.

It is the best wheat program a majority of the Agriculture Committee could agree on.

It is recommended by President Johnson and Secretary Freeman.

It is a program which should be approved by the Members of this body when they have an opportunity after the Easter recess.

HELLER QUERIED ON PRICE-WAGE GUIDEPOSTS

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal indicated that the administration has 15 major industries under special scrutiny as part of its early warning system for price increases. According to the article, planned price boosts will get quick top level attention with individual dissuasion efforts following where necessary. One official is quoted as saying, "We'll jawbone, armtwist and needle."

Because of the importance of this matter, I have written Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, asking whether this report is true and, if so, asking what industries have been placed under scrutiny, what procedures have been set up under the early warning system and what form will individual dissuasion efforts take.

I have also asked Dr. Heller whether individual collective bargaining situations that may lead to a wage spiral are also being put under scrutiny. This is particularly pertinent in view of the announcement of the United Auto Workers that it will ask for a 4.9-percent increase in wages and fringe benefits this year, a figure far exceeding the limits set by the wage-price guideposts.

Under unanimous consent, I insert a copy of my letter to Dr. Heller as well as a copy of the article from the Wall Street Journal of March 20 in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 23, 1964.

Dr. WALTER W. HELLER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HELLER: I noted in the Wall Street Journal of March 20 that a price-wage early warning system is going into high gear, with 15 major industries under special scrutiny. According to the Journal, planned price boosts are getting top-level attention faster, with the possibility that individual dissuasion efforts on the part of administration officials will follow.

Is this report true? If so, I would appreciate knowing the 15 major industries reportedly under scrutiny. I would also like to know the procedures set up under the early warning system and the action which the administration intends to take in cases where it considers that particular wage and price decisions have violated the guideposts.

It has also been noted in the press recently that the United Auto Workers have announced that they will ask for an increase in wage and fringe benefits of 4.9 percent, which certainly exceeds the administration's guideposts. Can you tell me if the administration also has under scrutiny individual collective bargaining situations that could lead to a wage spiral this year?

Because of the importance of this matter, I hope you will reply to this letter at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 20, 1964]

WASHINGTON WIRE: A SPECIAL WEEKLY REPORT FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL'S CAPITAL BUREAU—JAWBONE ATTACK AGAINST PRICE AND WAGE INCREASES HEADS INTO FULL CRY

Johnson adviser Heller, speaking Monday to the Detroit Economic Club, will hammer on the need for restraint; big auto executives will be listening. Hodges, tax collector Caplin strum the same theme. Some seldom-involved officials begin to talk up anti-inflation efforts; signs of prices inching up add to the urgency.

An early warning system goes into high gear, with 15 major industries under special scrutiny. Planned price boosts get top-level attention faster; individual dissuasion efforts may follow. "We'll hit every part of the anatomy," vows one official. "We'll jawbone, arm-twist and needle." Labor-management attacks on Johnson's wage-price guidelines only convince some officials the idea is right.

There's no sign now of any plan for compulsory controls. A line in a Caplin speech last week, seeming to warn of compulsion, was not intended to sound as it did.

WHO ARE THE AMERICAN POOR?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, now that President Johnson has issued his poverty message, every Member of Congress should study it critically and analytically and without regard to the emotional generalities which often cloud a discussion of poverty.

As my Republican colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee and I have been pointing out for the past few weeks, before a strong and effective program can be developed, it is important to know exactly who are the American poor. The administration claims that any family with less than $3,000 annual income is living in poverty, but many well-known economists dispute the relevance of this figure.

A recent article in the March issue of Fortune magazine examines in detail the various statistical measures available to define the American poor. The article points out that money income alone is not a sufficient standard of poverty, but that other variables such as age, family size, geographical location, and family assets, must be considered.

Because this article makes a valuable contribution to moving forward the national debate on poverty, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

WHO ARE THE AMERICAN POOR?

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

It is not difficult to demonstrate, by means of some fairly convincing statistics, that in today's "affluent" America tens of millions of people live in great hardship. But to measure the number of poor with any precision is quite another matter, for the tools to do it are lacking at present. One runs immediate, for example, into the problem of definition. "Poor" is a relative term whose meaning varies with time and place: by the standards of the America of 1850 or of Calcutta today, poverty has already been eradicated in the United States. But few present-day Americans would settle for such standards. Neither would they avert their eyes from some rather unseemly statistics: that in March 1964, more than 6 million people live in families whose incomes are so low that they qualify for free food from the Federal Goverment, that 7,300,000 Americans live in housing classified as dilapidated, and that there are nearly 2 million families who scrape by on cash incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

Obviously, these numbers exclude a multitude of shattered lives lived out in fear, boredom, and despair. No effort to play down such hardship is intended here. Nevertheless, the poverty in the United States must be put into some sort of perspective before we can know how to deal with it. President Johnson, declaring all-out war on poverty, speaks of a "forgotten fifth" of the population, and Michael Harrington, in his best-selling book, "The Other America," talks of 40 to 50 million poor—"a fourth of the population." Are those estimates realistic? And what do they mean?

As a glance at the chart [not printed in the RECORD] on the opposite page shows, the low-income segment of the population has shrunk greatly in the last 35 years. Will the decline continue or are we approaching a bedrock of disadvantaged citizens forever condemned to live on the dole? What sort of people now make up the group called the poor? Poverty is not a homogenous phenomenon but a complex of different conditions with different causes, such as school dropouts, racial discrimination, the growing number of old people in the population, the farm problem, and economic stagnation in the Appalachian Mountains. Each situation may call for a different remedy.

Such figures as do exist contain many surprises. In depressed Harlan County, Ky., for example, half the homes lack inside toilets and many children suffer from malnutrition. But according to a new book by Herman P. Miller of the Census Bureau entitled "Rich Man, Poor Man," 59 percent of Harlan County's families have a car—more than in West Germany—and 88 percent have washing machines. The figures also suggest strongly that most of America's poor are not lazy—the majority work hard for their low incomes—and that they do not like to live on handouts. A study of Federal aid to families with dependent children—a program that mainly assists households in which the father is dead, is permanently disabled, or has deserted the family—shows that even Negro cases are generally closed within 2 years. The U.S. poor are by no means limited to minority groups. While nonwhites, mostly Negroes, make up more than a fifth of the total, the majority of the poor are white Protestants. But these are only indications, not the basic data of poverty.

A MAKESHIFT APPROACH

One of the first tasks facing Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver, recently named by President Johnson to lead the attack on poverty, is to produce some refined data. Such statistics as exist today come primarily from two agencies of the Commerce Department, the Bureau of the Census and the Office of Business Economics. The two work quite separately, and poverty, as such, is not a direct and major concern of either. Their data on income distribution are incomplete and are not directly comparable. The Federal Government has no yardstick of poverty agreed upon among its own various agencies. The Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics once worked out minimum subsistence budgets, but stopped doing it long before World War II. A few years ago it produced some estimates of what sort of pretax income is needed to maintain a modest but adequate standard of living for a family of 4 in 20 key cities. Converted to 1964 prices, these budgets range from about $6,000 a year in Atlanta to $7,000 in Chicago. But this is way above the poverty line by anybody's definition. As the BLS itself takes pains to point out, the figures represent a cutoff point for deprivation, which it regards as the next stage above poverty. The BLS has not worked out the boundary at which deprivation becomes poverty.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers, which devoted considerable space to poverty in its recent economic report, was forced to use makeshift methods to measure the problem. What it did was to select a cutoff line of $3,000 a year for a family and $1,500 for a person living alone—roughly in line with most off-the-wall estimates. Then it applied this quantitative definition to the Census Bureau's population survey for 1962 to see how many people fall below these figures. The answer: between 33 million and 35 million people in 1962 or just under a fifth of the population. But these rough figures include some people who should not be considered poor and exclude millions who probably should be. An elderly couple, living alone in a small town in Ohio in a paid-for house, might manage tolerably well on $3,000 a year. But in a New York City family of eight, living in rented quarters, would be in severe straits even at $4,000 a year. Such figures do not permit an accurate inventory of the Nation's poor. "Refined analysis," the council confessed, "would vary the income cutoff by family size, age, location, and other indicators of needs and costs. This has not been possible."

OLD FOLKS AND FARMERS

There is another difficulty. The Census Bureau's annual population surveys—not to be confused with the decennial census—understate family incomes and thus, in effect, overstate poverty. Money income in these interim surveys is underreported by as much as 15 percent; many of those interviewed overlook such things as part-time earnings. Furthermore, the Census Bureau does not include nonmoney income, such as the "imputed rent" that homeowners don't have to pay or the food that farm families can grow for themselves. Such income is only about 3 percent of the gross national product, but the "imputed rent" and food would be a much larger percentage on small farms. Thus the council's roster of poor contains not only too many old people but too many farmers.

The Office of Business Economics, measuring the GNP, tries to include all family income. Using data from Federal income tax returns, it adds in its own estimates of imputed rent and food eaten on the farm. With income thus estimated in full, the proportion of the population below the $3,000 and $1,500 cutoff points shrinks to 15 percent, on the basis of 1961 data. Gone from the total poor are a substantial number of small farmers whose nonmoney income can sometimes exceed $1,000 a year. Some argue that these cutoff points are too low. Unfortunately, the agency's tables are in $1,000 increments, and the next figure of $4,000 may err on the high side. Using $4,000 for families and $2,000 for individuals, the estimate of the poor swells to 23 percent of the population. No serious effort has been made to reconcile the OBE's data with the Census Bureau's.

A SLIDING SCALE WOULD BE BETTER

The OBE figures have other defects. For example, they make no provision for variations in the size of families. Instead of a rigid cutoff point of $3,000, a sliding scale might better be set up, that would consider, say, $2,000 "adequate" for a family of two, $2,500 for three, $3,500 for five, and so on. To compute the number of poor in this way, we would have to go back to the Census Bureau data, whose shortcomings have already been noted. Nevertheless, the results are illuminating. Using the same 1962 survey, we wind up with 2,600,000 more poor people than the estimate given by the Council of Economic Advisers. They are not the same collection of people, however. Gone are some 4,800,000 persons in small families, most of them elderly couples and young married people with no dependents. But joining the group are 7,400,000 people in large families, mostly children, making a net addition of 2,600,000.

What about local variations in living costs, which none of these figures allow for? Herman Miller of the Census Bureau has had a go at that problem. In an unpublished study based on 1959 data, he has attempted to take both family size and geography into account. His cutoff points are those used by individual States to determine eligibility for federally aided public-assistance programs. One drawback is that the States do not use standardized criteria for constructing their minimum budgets—some are stingy and others are more liberal. The cutoff points are low in any case, ranging from $1,566 in Arkansas to $2,909 in Maine for a family of five. The result is a rockbottom figure of 23,500,000 poor, or 13 percent of the population in 1959. Miller himself, who concedes that all poverty yardsticks are arbitrary, nevertheless believes these figures understate the problem.

No wonder all sorts of figures are being tossed around in the poverty discussion. They do not necessarily conflict; they are based on different definitions. Several years ago Robert J. Lampman of the University of Wisconsin, in a study for the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress, showed that the number of poor might range between 9 and 36 percent of the population, depending on which assumptions and definitions were used. Lampman settled for 19 percent, and most current estimates cluster around this figure.

None of the figures given thus far tells us how many people were only temporarily poor at the time the count was made. Some family incomes, because of the father's prolonged illness, may dip for a year below the poverty line and then return to the previous level. A 1959 study by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research suggests that most—but not all—of the poor have always been poor. Some 60 percent of the poor families who responded to the question said their income had never exceeded $3,000, and only 14 percent had ever earned more than $5,000.

WHY THEY ARE POOR

If we assume that something approaching a fifth of the population is poor, then the next question is, Who are these people and what are their prospects? Relying mainly on the Council of Economics Advisers figures—but making adjustments where necessary in view of their imperfections—we can list the main causes of continued poverty in the United States. For simplicity, most of the data refer to the seven-eighths of the poor who live in multiperson families. The numbers add up to more than 35 million because most poor people have more than one handicapping characteristic. In order of importance, they are:

Low educational level: Some 61 percent of the Nation's poor families, with about 21 million people, are headed by people who did not get beyond the eighth grade. For the population as a whole, only 35 percent fall in this low-education group. These ill-equipped breadwinners must compete for the dwindling portion of unskilled, low-paying jobs.

Residence in the South: With 30 percent of the country's population, the South, despite its recent strides, still contains 47 percent of the country's poor. Out of 3,072 counties in the United States, 648 have median family incomes under $3,000 a year—and 90 percent of the 648 poor counties are in the South or in adjacent areas such as southern Missouri. The Appalachian region, much of which lies in the South, contains 15 million people, of whom 5 million are classed as poor.

Residence in rural areas: Despite the decline in the farm population, there are still 1,500,000 families, with perhaps 6 million people, living on marginal farms with cash incomes under $3,000 a year. This overstates rural poverty somewhat because, as already noted, it does not take into account nonmoney income. In addition to the poor classed among farm families there is a large group of nonfarm families who live in rural areas, some of whom work on farms as hired hands. Approximately 27 percent of America's nonfarm rural families, containing about 9 million people, fall below the poverty line. The figure includes virtually all of the country's migratory farmworkers and their families, or about 2 million people—a figure that, incidentally, has remained fairly stable in recent years.

Race and discrimination: According to the Council of Economic Advisers, 44 percent of the country's nonwhite families, with about 8 million people, are poor. Most of these people are Negroes, but the figure also takes in the majority of the country's 552,000 Indians, particularly the two-fifths who live on reservations. In the latter, the unemployment rate typically runs between 40 and 50 percent.

Old age: In 1900 only 4 percent of the population was 65 or older. Today the figure is 9.2 percent and creeping ever higher. Thanks to social security and other income sources, an increasing number of these old people live apart from their grown children. In 1961 some 78 percent of them maintained their own households compared with only two-thirds a decade earlier and a far smaller portion in the depressed 1930's. By the $3,000 annual-income yardstick, 47 percent of the families headed by a person over 65 are poor. If the poverty line is lowered to $2,000 only 27 percent of these elderly couples, or about 4,500,000 people, would fall in the group considered poor. If unattached individuals with incomes under $1,500 are added in, the total number of aged poor would be about 7 million.

Broken homes: When a father dies or simply runs away, the family can sink below the poverty line almost at once. Only a tenth of the Nation's families are headed by women, but 48 percent of those, by the Council's reckoning, have incomes under $3,000 a year. About a fourth of the Nation's poor live in such homes.

Early marriage: Not only are old folks splitting off from their families, but young people are doing so, too, by marrying earlier. Families headed by a person under 24 years old are still not large in number, but some 31 percent of them, with perhaps 2 million people, are classed as poor. This probably overstates the problem because many of them have no children and, unlike the aged, can look forward to higher earnings in the future. A significant minority, for example, are undergraduate and graduate students whose poverty, one supposes, is temporary.

Unemployment: Surprisingly, this ranks low on the list of poverty's causes. Only a sixteenth of the pool families, with perhaps 2 million people, were headed by an unemployed person in 1962. Indeed, only a third of all U.S. families with unemployed heads are classed as poor in the Council's figures. These figures provide dramatic evidence of the temporary nature of most U.S. unemployment and the contribution made by working wives and unemployment insurance. But the statistics are not so comforting as they seem. The poor make up the bulk of the hard-core unemployed, whose unemployment benefits have run out. And the Council's figures, because they include too few large families, unquestionably err on the conservative side. A more important contributor to poverty is underemployment—the low productivity of marginal farmers, for example, and the sporadic nature of many jobs held by unskilled workers. But statistics on underemployment are very sketchy.

IN BRITAIN 75 PERCENT ARE "POOR"

If nothing else, the figures above on the various categories of the poor refute the notion expressed in John Kenneth Galbraith's book, "The Affluent Society," that poverty is no longer general in America but is limited to "insular" and "case" poverty—i.e., depressed areas and handicapped persons. Galbraith used a cutoff figure of $1,000, which is way too low. When a higher poverty line is used, some poverty turns up in almost every area of the country.

In another sense, though, Galbraith is quite right. Poverty is no longer the basic human condition in America, as it has been throughout most of human history. As late as 1929, two-thirds of Americans would have been called poor by definitions now in use. And even in 1929, it should be remembered, America's living standard was higher than Western Europe's is today. If the $3,000 yardstick were applied to present-day Britain, for example, three-quarters of the population would be considered poor.

Economic growth has been the main force lifting over a third of the citizenry above the poverty line since 1929. Measured in constant dollars, average family income after Federal taxes has risen more than 50 percent in the last 35 years. The growing number of working wives has helped somewhat, since more families now have two wage earners. These two factors together are much more important than the "redistribution of income." As to the latter trend, studies have shown that the poorest two-fifths of the country's "consumer units," after payment of Federal taxes, got 16.5 percent of total family income in 1961 compared with only 12.5 percent in 1929. (Consumer unit is a term that embraces both multiperson families and persons living alone.) The welfare state has also played a role. Transfer payments of all types, primarily from social security and public assistance programs, have risen to 6 percent of the GNP from only 1 percent. While small in the aggregate, these now account for 43 percent of the income of the poorest fifth of consumer units.

What of the future? Most forecasts based on recent trends suggest a slowdown in the rate at which poverty is being reduced. Between 1947 and 1962, the Council of Economic Advisers says, the percentage of poor families in the population—leaving aside individuals—declined from 32 percent to 20 percent. However, three-quarters of this shrinkage took place prior to 1957, and since then the decline has slowed to about half a percent a year. Slower economic growth and higher unemployment are chiefly to blame, says the Council, which warns that "if the decline in poverty proceeded at the slower rate achieved from 1957 on, 13 percent of our families would still have incomes under $3,000 in 1980." For this reason, it says, new antipoverty programs are needed. "We cannot leave the further wearing away of poverty solely to the general progress of the economy."

FEWER DROPOUTS

This type of forecast is subject to all the inherent weaknesses of numerical projections. A better idea of what lies down the road can be gained by looking at poverty's separate causes as given above. While such an approach doesn't necessarily refute the slowdown hypothesis, it indicates that we are nowhere near bedrock yet and that a lot of favorable trends will continue to thin the ranks of the poor even if no new Government programs are started.

The biggest single cause of poverty, as already indicated, is the lack of a high school education. But the U.S. population is becoming better educated all the time, and the trend will continue. Today 66 percent of schoolchildren get through high school, twice the proportion of a generation ago. Even Negroes, who suffer from environmental handicaps that dull the incentive to learn, are raising their educational level somewhat. This is true particularly in the North. In New York City, for example, the average adult Negro male has had 9.5 years of schooling, only a year less than his white counterpart. All but about 3 percent of the population—the mentally retarded portion—is theoretically educable through high school, and there is no reason to believe that the percentage of dropouts will not continue to decline toward this figure.

The South, where so much of U.S. poverty is concentrated, will continue its advance. According to the Council of Economic Advisers, 49 percent of southern families were poor in 1947, but by 1962 the figure had fallen to 32 percent. Rural poverty, in the rest of the United States as well as in the South, should continue to decline, too, mainly from the closing of marginal family-type farms. The number of farm-operator families in the United States declined from

6,500,000 to only 3,200,000 between 1947 and 1962. Curiously, the percentage of such families below the poverty line has remained fairly constant—it is now about 43 percent—but even if this ratio stays the same, the absolute number of poor farmers will drop. As for southern farms, the National Planning Association, a nongovernmental group, has forecast that another third of the South's farm operators, most of them poor, will get out of agriculture by 1975.

THE NEGRO'S STEADY ADVANCE

Even the racial problem, another of the main causes of poverty, gives some grounds for optimism. In one sense, the Negroes appear to be getting nowhere. In 1949, according to census figures, the average male Negro earned 53 percent as much as a white male. Ten years later, following a narrowing of the gap during the Korean war boom, he was slightly worse off, with only 52 percent (the gap, it should be noted, is narrower in the North). Nevertheless, the absolute growth in pay has lifted most Negroes above the poverty line in the last 5 years. In 1947 two-thirds of nonwhite families were poor; by 1962 the figure was down to 44 percent. Much of this reflects continued migration out of the South, where 60 percent of the Negroes still live—a trend that will continue. And Negroes will stay in school longer because education pays. This is true even though a college-educated Negro stands to earn no more during his lifetime than a white who stopped at the eighth grade—a stark measure of discrimination's penalty.

Some of poverty's causes, to be sure, may remain just as persistent in the years ahead. No one can predict, for instance, that the percentage of broken homes will decrease. The portion of the population over 65, which has a high incidence of poverty, will continue to grow. But in both these cases there are alleviating factors. As to broken homes, the average monthly payment under the aid to families with dependent children program (AFDC) has nearly doubled since 1939 in terms of 1961 dollars. Many mothers of broken families work, and rising wages should help them. As for the aged, many are poor because, as Michael Harrington points out, they are not covered by social security. Legislation already on the books will improve this situation considerably. Currently, more than 90 percent of the labor force is covered, and the number of retired workers receiving payments will climb toward this figure in the decades ahead. Meanwhile, social security benefits, including minimum benefits, are being liberalized. Even when figured in constant prices, the average payment of $127 a month to a retired worker and his aged wife is now 66 percent higher than in 1940. Ironically, it is just this increase in benefits and in other income that has tended to swell the statistics on "poor" elderly people. When they stayed with their children in homes with substantial incomes, the aged were not counted among the poor. But when they moved out and tried to maintain a household on less than $2,000 a year—more than they have received before—they became "poor," statistically speaking, even though a separate residence represents a rise in their living standard. Unquestionably, many aged live in dire straits, and these will be chronic welfare cases. But the group as a whole, as a 1963 report by the President's Council on Aging conceded, has scored "astonishing" gains in the last decade.

For most of the poor, however, the future is somewhat bleak. For example, they can expect little help from any further leveling of incomes. For the bottom two-fifths of the country's "consumer units," the social revolution largely ended with World War II. The poorest fifth's share of total family income, for example, is 5 percent—about the same as in 1944. The redistribution of incomes in recent years has mainly benefited the middle income groups at the expense of the topmost twentieth of the population.

Some major uncertainties cloud the future, too. Because of automation, the proportion of unskilled jobs in the labor force is shrinking. It remains to be seen whether the number of high school dropouts competing for these jobs will decline as fast. Thus, a race is on between two important trends, automation and the rising level of education. Poverty will be reduced only if the latter trend keeps ahead of the former—only if a growing proportion of the country's youth receives enough schooling to be employable, at adequate wage levels, in an increasingly technological era.

There is another imponderable: the rate of economic growth in the years ahead. More education will lift Americans out of poverty only if there are more skilled job available. For even skilled jobs are being eliminated in many industries by rising productivity and automation. With fewer workers needed to produce the same output, total production must grow fast enough to absorb workers replaced by machines and simultaneously to provide new jobs for the growing numbers of youth now entering the labor force. Growth is also essential if the migration to cities from poor rural areas is to reduce poverty. Without it, marginal farmers who move to cities will find only low-paying jobs, or no jobs at all.

The figures on poverty raise a number of questions of future public policy, particularly in such matters as aid to depressed areas, minimum-wage legislation, and Federal aid to education. About a third of the people in the Appalachian region are poor, largely because of declining employment in coal mines and farming. Industry should be brought in, but poor roads have discouraged industrialization, especially in southern Appalachia. Should the rest of the country be taxed to build better access roads into this rugged area? Or should we simply let present trends run their course? The Appalachian problem, after all, is slowly being "solved" by out-migration; some 2 million people departed from the region in the last decade. And some industry has moved in, enough to hold the decline in jobs to 1 percent. But this is slow progress indeed, if it can even be called that. Meanwhile, the Federal Government is spending large sums merely to alleviate distress in the area. Subsidized economic development might cost taxpayers less in the long run.

A HIGHER WAGE FLOOR?

Some argue that a lot of poverty could be eliminated overnight if legal wage minimums were raised or if the Federal minimum-wage law were extended to the 16 million workers not covered by it. The latter step alone, it is sometimes said, would pull some families with two wage earners above the poverty line even though the present minimum of $1.25 an hour works out to only $2,600 a year. The pitfall in this argument is a good example of the damage that can be done by oversimplified remedies. Many people are poor simply because their unskilled services are not worth much in the labor market. Tampering with the market mechanism by raising their wages might merely speed up the replacement of unskilled labor by machines. Thus, extending the coverage or raising the floor of minimum wages might spread poverty rather than reduce it.

Finally, education: More than anything else, a look at the poor argues for more spending on public education. It is distressing enough that the average migratory farmworker earns less than $1,000 a year from all sources. But is the berrypicker's son to be condemned to a similar earning level? The long-range hope of drastically reducing poverty can be expressed by saying that extraordinary efforts should be made to see to it that the children of the poor get much better educations than their parents. Thinking along this line, some observers argue that more should be spent per pupil in poor communities than in the rich suburbs—the reverse of the present situation—to lift the horizons of poor children and enable them to compete on a less unequal footing. Given the decentralized character of U.S. public education, economic inequality is compounded by geographic inequality. Many poor children are concentrated in school districts with a low tax base, and many of the poor school districts, in turn, are in States that cannot afford to give these communities enough aid to overcome this handicap. Federal aid to education is a major proposal in the Johnson administration's antipoverty program, but most Federal programs proposed in recent years call for aid to all schools. It would be politically difficult to induce Congress to concentrate Federal funds for education in the 648 U.S. counties where the median family income is under $3,000 a year.

Whatever the answers, it is clear that stamping out poverty is not a simple matter. The country cannot, for example, merely allocate $11 billion a year, the sum now needed to raise every family's income to $3,000. Even if the funds could be distributed equitably, they would not enable poor families to work their way out of poverty, and thus to contribute to the national economy by their increased productivity.

THE 50-CENT DIET

The prospect, nevertheless, is that poverty will continue to decline, though perhaps at a slower rate than in the past. The millennium, when nobody is defined as poor, may never be reached however, for society will continue to upgrade its definition of poverty. Back in 1909 the BLS figured out a "minimum standard of living" for a cotton mill worker's family in Fall River, Mass. In today's prices, it works out to about $1,000 a year. By 1923 the "poverty level" for a five-person family was estimated by the same agency at about $1,900 a year—also in today's prices. The 1964 poverty line, as defined by the Johnson administration, is about the same as the "deprivation" line of 40 years ago. And the deprivation line is moving up, too. The BLS boosted its "modest but adequate" budget for a New York family by 28 percent, in constant dollars, between 1947 and 1959. It is still possible to construct a budget like the 1909 one. The Department of Agriculture, for example, figures that an adult male can get a balanced diet for only 50 cents a day by eating mainly dried beans, reconstituted dried milk, and potatoes. But nobody today would consider such a budget adequate—and this is perhaps just as well.

If things have improved so greatly, why did the United States recently become excited about poverty, even before Lyndon Johnson declared war on it? One reason is that poverty is now seen as a "problem"—i.e., something that can be solved, rather than an ineradicable condition of human life. "Suddenly," says Herman Miller, "we seem to have it within our means to eliminate it completely."

TECHNICAL ERRORS IN FARM BILL

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of many reasons why the House should have the opportunity to debate and amend the wheat-cotton bill, scheduled for consideration the week of April 6, is the need to correct technical errors in the language of the bill.

Unfortunately, the House will not have the opportunity for amendment, due to the restrictive character of the rule on the bill. Therefore, the only wise course of action is to reject the resolution, in the hope that this action will result in a rule permitting amendment of the wheat title.

On page 44 of the Senate report, section 379B, italic language after brackets, provides the formula for determining wheat marketing allocation for each farm. This provides basis for determining eligibility for the certificates.

The formula is made effective for the 1964 and 1965 crops.

The formula uses the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1964 crop for both 1964 and 1965.

Defect No. 1: No provision is made in the bill to adjust the national marketing quota for the 1965 crop. So far as I can determine, no other provision of law would permit the Secretary to issue a new national marketing quota. As the bill is now written, the Secretary would be obligated to use the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1964 crop as the basis for administering both years. Obviously this is an oversight and should be corrected in the bill. The rule granted for this bill should permit an amendment to correct this error.

Defect No. 2: As the bill is now written, farmers could get an unintended windfall, at taxpayers' expense, amounting to 10 percent or more of the value of the certificates. Here too, I believe this is an oversight. It should be corrected by amendment, and the rule should permit a corrective amendment to be offered on the House floor.

Here is how this windfall could occur.

Under section 379B, the Secretary must establish the wheat marketing allocation for each year on this formula: The wheat used for food products for consumption in the United States plus that portion of the wheat exported as wheat or wheat products on which certificates are to be issued:

[In million bushels]

A fair figure for food products for consumption in the United States	500
A fair figure for certificate wheat and certificate wheat products for export	600
Total	1,100

The Secretary is then to establish the national allocation percentage for such year by dividing the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1964 crop—which is 1.22 billion bushels—by the national marketing allocation—above, less the expected production on noncompliance acres:

[In million bushels]

National marketing figure	1,220
Less noncompliance production (a low estimate, actually)	220
Total	1,000

The 1.1 billion bushels is 110 percent of 1 billion bushels.

Therefore, each farmer in this case would be entitled to certificates amounting to 110 percent of his normal wheat production.

Here is how this would work on a typical farm:

[In bushels]

Acres allotted	100
Times average yield per acre	25
Total	2,500

The law says multiply this by the national allocation percentage for such year. If it comes out 110 percent, as it very likely would, then this farmer would get a 10 percent bonus, or 2,750 certificates, despite the fact that he produced only 2,500 bushels.

This formula was not in the certificate plan rejected last May by the farmers. Why was it put in this time? Is it a technical error?

It may possibly have been put in intentionally to leave room for windfall payments—reminiscent of the phantom acres involved in the 1961 feed grains program. These phantom acres were expensive for the taxpayers. They came about because the Department of Agriculture, under an administrative regulation, decided not to squeeze all the water out of the base acre figures for 1959 and 1960, but simply to squeeze the water out down to the 105-percent level.

If this fancy formula is intended to permit a windfall, it at least should have a ceiling written into the bill. As it stands now, the formula could easily result in a 120 percent figure, or even higher.

Definitely, this section needs corrective amendments.

FREEDOM COMMISSION AND ACADEMY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, is an international authority on communism and devotes a major share of his time to leading a crusade against Communist imperialism. Dr. Dobriansky, as chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, has been in the forefront in an effort to alert the citizens of the United States to the growing danger of the international Communist conspiracy.

Recently, he appeared before one of our distinguished committees—the House Committee on Un-American Activities—to testify in favor of the creation of a Freedom Commission and the establishment of a Freedom Academy.

Since Dr. Dobriansky holds a preeminent position in the ranks of anti-Communist, pro-free-world leaders, I believe his remarks take on special significance:

TESTIMONY ON FREEDOM COMMISSION AND ACADEMY

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members, my name is Lev E. Dobriansky. I am a professor of economics at Georgetown University and am also privileged to serve as the president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee. I was formerly a faculty member of the National War College and have been a lecturer at many of our service schools.

At the outset of my formal statement I express my deepest appreciation for this opportunity to testify on the five resolutions calling for the creation of a Freedom Commission and the establishment of a Freedom Academy. Both for the organizations I head and for myself, we are in complete favor of the passage of this extremely important measure that all five resolutions substantially embrace. The tremendous and pressing need for this independent agency and the special educational institution cannot be too strongly emphasized.

In order not to duplicate some of the thoughts and ideas of other proponents of the measure I should like to develop somewhat unfamiliar avenues of reasoning that justify the existence of a Freedom Commission and Academy. For your studied consideration and also in rational support of the affirmative position taken by us on this far-seeing measure, we offer the following concise observations, all of which can be readily and extensively documented:

THE PERMANENT COLD WAR

1. The necessity for the passage of this measure is inextricably tied up with the basic issue of the very survival of our Nation. This statement is no exaggeration. When one soberly considers how much has been lost since World War II, he can with considerable validity caption his thoughts with the constant and foreboding question "Who's next in the long string of captive nations—South Vietnam, Laos, Venezuela, Zanzibar?" The pessimistic overtones of this gnawing question, which will be answered in the latest chapter of our cold war failures, particularly with regard to the Russian base of global cold war operations, need not, of course, be accepted for the long future. But in our present state of free world cold war disintegration who can reasonably deny that it rests on firm grounds of near probability?

Had we over 10 years ago in operating existence what is sensibly designed in these five resolutions, we as a nation would have maintained our clear-cut superiority in world leadership without the phantasms of a Soviet Russian contender. Lest we be mistaken, this is not entirely an observation from hindsight, even though such an observation should in itself draw respectful attention. The plain fact is that the fundamental nature of the imperialist Soviet Russian enemy had been clearly revealed many, many years before the outbreak of hostilities in 1939. Those of us who understood this and advocated a policy of liberation at the beginning of the 1950's, were in truth proposing the development of a cold war strategy to defeat the Russian enemy in the only area he's capable of winning, that of paramilitary conquest. Regrettably, even those who gave official lipservice to the policy of liberation failed to understand what it meant in essence and content.

Hampered by all the trimmings of a cultural lag, over 10 years later this measure still points to the most essential course open to us in combating successfully and decisively the propagandistic, psychopolitical, conspiratorial, and subversive inroads made by Moscow in the free world. In fact, it is hyperessential today; more than it was over a decade ago when we enjoyed complete military superiority, air supremacy, and atomic monopoly power. With the relatively declining long-run importance of military might and power as our chief source of deterrence against both the further expansion of Moscow's empire and the horrendous outbreak of a global hot war, the critical area of the foreseeable future will be that of vigorous and imaginative cold war activity. The sheer adequacy of imperial Russian arms and industrial capacity has produced a formidable power of influence that shifts the points of comparative advantage to operations within the cold war area.

Vested with complete futural significance of the most crucial sort, the measure under consideration here aims to equip us with the necessary means of coping adequately with the devious cold war operations of Moscow and now also Peiping, twin sisters in established imperio-colonial practices. These practices include a whole range of psycho-political infiltration and subversion, from which no sphere of human existence is excluded, even entailing "peace," "peaceful coexistence," "disarmament," "lessening of tensions," "coexistence or codestruction," and other Russian cold war shibboleths. In short, it is an illusion to believe that so long as the Russian and Chinese imperial systems continue to exist, the cold war could be terminated by trade, appeasement, wishful thinking about "mellowing processes" and even the self-disintegration of the captive world. The long truth is that the cold war is an institutional coefficient of these systems. The sooner we come to grips with this fundamental truth, the sooner we'll be contributing to our own survival.

THE ENEMY IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

2. The passage of this measure and its full realization would at long last make possible concentrated studies of Russian cold war operations in terms of indispensable historical perspectives which would deepen our insights into the basic nature of the enemy. Careful analyses along these and primarily substantive lines would reveal that what we classify today as Moscow's cold war techniques and methods are essentially traditional to totalitarian Russian empire-building. Contrary to general opinion, they are not the created products of so-called Communist ideology and tactics. Except for accidental refinements and considerable technologic improvements, many of the techniques manipulated by the rulers of the present Russian Empire, and also applied by their Red Chinese competitors, can be systematically traced as far back as the 16th century. Indeed, over a half century before Marx, the Russian ambassadors of Catherine the Great utilized class division techniques to prepare for the partitions of Poland. Countless other examples of striking comparative worth and value can be cited.

In a real sense, such specialized studies conducted by an independent agency set up to concentrate on political warfare stand to have more comparative value for our national security and defense than literally the billions spent on military hardware and economic foreign aid.

These fashioned techniques and methods of Moscow are relatively new to us because of our historical unfamiliarity with them. Yet, significantly, they are old and tried to all the captive nations in Eastern Europe, in the U.S.S.R., in and about the Caucasus, and central Asia. In sharp contrast to the ways and means of past Western imperialism and colonialism that throve on oversea possessions, the methods of Russian imperio-colonialism were forged to extend an overland empire, with all their borderland implications. By these methods and techniques an unprecedented empire was built over the centuries and revived and enormously expanded by the present Soviet Russian rulers.

Of conspicuous note concerning the past as well as contemporary Russian expansion in power, control, and influence is the outstanding fact that the polyglot, multinational military forces under Moscow played essentially a secondary role. With patience and in time, the primary role has consistently been played by Russian conspiracy, propaganda, and subversion. And this includes our latest period, from World War II to the present, with Khrushchev as the master player in this. Our understanding of these Russian cold war operations as pursued by tyrannical Russian rulers over the centuries is indispensable to adequate preparations and ability on our part to cope with phenomena of intensive revolutions and conquests from within in independent and also emerging states and nations of the free world. Here, too, in short, we are confronted by a cumulative experience not of only 47 years but rather of centuries, and the Soviet Russian heirs of this experience possess an enormous advantage that few of their predecessors had—that of technology and science. The objectives envisaged by the five resolutions point in the direction of such major study. Along these lines there is a terrible gap in our knowledge, both in the official and private sector; indeed, even rudimentary facts about the chief enemy are not properly understood or even known—again, in many official and private quarters. This is of obvious, gratuitous advantage to Moscow's pol-war experts.

SOME CONCRETE CASES OF WON OR LOST OPPORTUNITIES

3. In the light of swift-moving developments in the past decade and more, this measure and its passage are actually long overdue. The essential ideas of this measure were approvingly considered by the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression some 10 years ago. It is noteworthy that through this committee Congress made its substantial contribution to our developing knowledge of the imperialist Soviet Russian menace. It was at the initiative and by the vision of Congress that this tremendous stride was made.

Now, the present resolutions in more elaborate and adequate form crystallize the thoughts and vision of the many who have given serious consideration and study to the nature and scope of cold war operations under the contrived conditions of neither peace nor war. Based on much precedent thought and the intensive investigations of previous congressional committees, the embraced measure promises to lay the necessary foundations for us to meet intelligently and competently the cold war thrusts and maneuvers of Moscow and Peiping.

The spectrum of cold war ideas and engagement is a most extensive one. However, let me briefly cite a few concrete examples in which congressional initiative, as against routine executive inertia or myopia, contributed to our cold war posture. One, in 1958, if Congress hadn't acted in time, the vital VOA non-Russian language broadcasts into the Soviet Union would have been systematically eliminated, much to the satisfaction of Moscow. Two, the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 demonstrated to the world how deeply vulnerable Moscow is with regard to the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union alone. The typical, mythical image that millions throughout the world have of the Soviet Union could be easily transformed if we even began to implement that resolution. On this I should like to submit as part of my statement an article on "The Next Move" which appeared in the January 6, 1964, issue of the American Security Council Washington Report.

A third example, which most of our people are unfamiliar with, concerns Congress passage of legislation in 1960, providing for the erection in our Capital of a statue of Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter. The ramifications of this action would amaze any close student of cold war operations: In 1961 we thwarted Moscow's perversion of this historic figure and just a few months ago, given what they considered an opening wedge provided by several obtuse editorials of a local newspaper, Moscow and its puppets slickly attempted to destroy the project here. On this seemingly minor action I should also like to submit as part of the record this recently published booklet, "Shevchenko: A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of All Captive Nations," and a most interesting document distributed by the Russian Embassy to our wire services and newspapers.

Congress cannot, of course, be expected to take such initiative continually along the entire spectrum of commonsense cold war challenge. Some opportunities, as those cited, have been won; there are many that have been lost. In the area of the Olympic games, for instance, which also has cold war significance with the emerging myth of the physically supreme "Soviet man," we again have lost the opportunity of smashing this myth by not insisting that non-Russian participants from the U.S.S.R. be properly identified as representatives of their respective national republics. By no means are all the medal victors Russians. However, as in the last decade, so in this one, Congress can make a monumental contribution to our eventual victory in the cold war by passing this freedom legislation in this session. In brief, it would be creating a sorely needed generator of ideas and proposals along the entire spectrum of the titanic cold war challenge.

INSTITUTIONAL INSTRUMENTS OF ENLIGHTENMENT AND STABILITY

4. Without perhaps incurring the wrath of one of your colleagues, I would say that by analogy the existence of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy is as necessary to our national being today as is the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In like manner that the latter is purposed to achieve stability and balanced development in our economy, the former would strive to accomplish the same in our undertakings under the indefinite conditions of "neither peace nor war." It is safe to say that because our people have not, by and large, understood the nature, scope, and depth of Moscow's cold war operations, they have been constantly subjected to wide fluctuations of mood and sentiment, giving way at times to dangerous complacency and even seeming indifference toward the vital force of their treasured heritage and values and at other times to near hysteria.

Dispersed and much frittered thinking, as now exists, in cold war dimensions will guarantee a continued instability in popular reactions and a safe passivity in official determinations. With the Russians and Chinese operating in virtually every quarter of the free world, even endemic developments rapidly assume a broad cold war stigma. They require continuous, studied assessment leading to recommendations for not only adequate counteraction but also an effective offensive, and this in the one place that the Russians are most vulnerable; namely, the captive non-Russian majority in the U.S.S.R. itself. The only practical apparatus for this type of concentrated and totalistic thinking is the proposed Commission and Academy, which veritably will become institutional instruments of enlightenment and stability.

ARGUMENT AND COUNTERARGUMENT

5. The argument and counterargument on this most vital issue should receive the most

exacting and scrutinous type of internal analysis. I submit that upon such analysis the negative and inconsistent responses from certain executive agencies to the measure at hand constitute in themselves a negative support of the proposals. Behind the usual verbally graced generalities they reflect an uncertainty of position, misstatement of facts, and an apparent incapacity to grasp the structure of cold war thought, which finds easy confirmation in our record of the past 20 years.

Viewing first the concise positive arguments on the measure, I repeat that to meet satisfactorily the tasks and requirements indicated above, an independent agency devoted exclusively to the content of cold war operation is indispensable. There is no existing agency or department in our Government that is equipped by intent or resources to meet these tasks. No existing governmental body is designed to treat and study Russian cold war phenomena in all their interrelated aspects. Administratively, there is no principle of coordination and integration represented by any body in this intricate and complex field. More, there is no principle of crystallization and conservation of thought represented, as one department vies with another in a "play it by ear" mood to determine whether even food has a cold war weight.

The creation of a Freedom Commission would correct these grave defects and fill in the gaps that currently exist. It would, at long last, provide us with a functioning apparatus, free of the routinous day-to-day operational responsibilities in the existing agencies, to deal with a foremost challenge in a totalistic, continuous, and coordinated way, rather than the piecemeal, sporadic, and essentially defensive ways that have prevailed up to the present. Similarly, there is no educational institution maintained by our Government or any private body that is capable of conducting these necessary and continuous studies and instruction on this new plane of comprehensive cold war thought. The intended Freedom Academy would satisfy this basic need.

Now for the few negative arguments. Over the years we have been told (1) that confusion with and a duplication of work of existing agencies would occur; (2) that the Foreign Service Institute, the National War College, and other public and private institutions already furnish instruction on Communist strategy; (3) that a formulation of cold war strategy and tactics into an "operational science" is a delusion; (4) that training of operational elements (perhaps a dynamic Freedom Corps as against our essentially defensive Peace Corps) should not be publicized; (5) that the Russians would perhaps be disconcerted by what they may regard as a cold war institute and a training course for espionage; (6) that educational pluralism must be upheld; and (7) that we are already making positive progress in economic buildups in the underdeveloped countries and, in the fashion of a passive model, in self-improvement at home.

Taking these major counterarguments in toto, it is evident that their proponents either have no conception of total cold war or, if they do, are desperately seeking any rationalization to safeguard the sanctity of their respective jurisdictions against an inevitable subsumption to the totality of cold war thought and performance. Their first argument is specious because there is much confusion and frittered thought that require integration and rounded consolidation. The second fallaciously magnifies a dearth of study and instruction and indicates in itself a dearth of understanding of what is involved in the freedom proposal. The third argument reinforces this comment. The fourth one is strange for an open society that should never cease in espousing and working for universal freedom. The fifth borders on stupidity. The sixth partakes of philosophical sophistication but, aside from our perilous gap in cold war education, one wonders what happened to pluralism with the new proposal last year of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, which from all indications would be an egregious and wasteful duplication of existing educational institutions. The seventh point can best be answered by just observing the slow collapse of our policy of patched-up containment as evidenced today in Cuba, tomorrow perhaps in Venezuela, South Vietnam, Laos, or some other point on the terrain of the free world. We have a greater breed of economic determinists in Washington than one could possibly find in Moscow.

In conclusion, the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy would become valuable and highly effective media for both our public and private institutions as concerns a general enlightenment and understanding of the constant, dangerous threat that has penetrated the free world. Their very existence and work would bar indifference, complacency, naivete or even hysteria toward this persistent totalitarian peril which is centered in Moscow. Total cold war thought, in our case necessarily oriented toward universal freedom, instrumentalizes everything—diplomacy, economics, science, culture, propaganda (in which we are next to pitiful), the military, even, among many other things in life, athletics—in an integrated, aggregative whole for positive action and successful performance. Moscow has schools for this, and they have not been established for reasons of eternal contemplation. We have no such schools, and to refer to any in this country as comparable to theirs is the height of either ignorance or reckless foolery. In short, the service of the freedom institutions in this specialized, macro-psycho-political field would be in fundamental service to our own survival as an independent nation. On grounds of national survival, we cannot afford to risk the prospects of psychopolitical attrition or isolation as the dikes of patched-up containment begin to fall about the world, not to mention other paramilitary avenues of national reduction.

"NEUTRALITY" AGAINST RELIGION

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1920 the voters of Michigan overwhelmingly defeated, in public referendum, a proposed State constitutional amendment which would in effect have abolished all private and parochial schools by making attendance at public schools compulsory.

Two years later, a similar constitutional amendment was adopted in Oregon and subsequently was held unconstitutional by a unanimous, historic decision of the U.S. Supreme Court—as, indeed, it should have been.

As a youth of 15, I attended a public meeting sponsored by opponents of the Michigan proposal. A prominent, brilliant and eloquent hometown attorney from Battle Creek was the principal speaker in opposition. He was the late Hon. Joseph L. Hooper who subsequently served several terms in this House from the Third District of Michigan, which I now have the honor to represent.

I have always remembered a story he told during this address—and I recall it now in connection with the current controversy over the Supreme Court decisions holding prayer and Bible reading in the public schools unconstitutional.

I interject the comment that I am gratified by the recent announcement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that full committee hearings on proposals to amend the Constitution to offset these decisions will begin April 22. I hope these hearings will be exhaustive, that they will evoke the ablest possible presentation of the issues, and that the result will be a proposed constitutional amendment which preserves both our religious freedom and our religious heritage.

According to the story told by my distinguished predecessor so many years ago, it seems there was a man walking down the street carrying a ladder. As he passed another man on the sidewalk he accidentally hit him in the nose with the end of the ladder.

Quite understandably, the man with the nose protested angrily. The man with the ladder said:

> This is a free country, and I have a perfect right to carry a ladder down the street.

The man with the nose replied:

> You are quite right. This is a free country, and you do have a right to carry a ladder down the street. But, let me tell you one thing, my friend: Your freedom ends where my nose begins.

I have recited this personal narrative as a reminder that the struggle for preservation of our religious heritage and freedom is by no means a new one.

And I repeat this simple but pointed story because today, as always, freedom and justice involve the difficult and delicate art of balancing—both in law, in judicial interpretation, and in human conduct—the legitimate but often sharply competing constitutional rights and freedoms of all citizens, of the diverse elements in our pluralistic society, and of majorities and minorities alike.

The matter of prayer and Bible reading in the schools involves not only the proper relationship of government and citizen in the area of religion under our Constitution, but also the protection of the individual, mutual interests and rights of the ladder carriers and the nose wearers.

And let me point out that sometimes it is an aggressive minority which carries the ladder recklessly down the street. Sometimes it is the majority's nose that is the victim of this minority recklessness. We make a mistake if we assume it is always the other way around.

The problem we face today, the concern reflected by many public meetings and by the hundreds upon hundreds of letters I have received, and the mounting national controversy—all are primarily the result of two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court—one rendered in 1962, the other in 1963.

I want to keep technical details to the minimum so I will simply say that in the first decision the Court held that a prayer recommended by the New York

State Board of Regents and ordered said in a particular school was unconstitutional and banned by the first amendment.

This prayer is as follows:

Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country.

The second case in 1963 involved a Pennsylvania statute requiring the reading of at least 10 verses from the Holy Bible, without comment, at the opening of public school each day.

In both cases, pupil participation or attendance was voluntary in accordance with wishes of the parents.

In both cases, Mr. Justice Stewart vigorously dissented.

I believe the majority of the Court was wrong in both instances. I concur with the dissenting views of Justice Stewart in these cases. I believe corrective action can and should be taken by constitutional amendment. I propose to discuss the "why" and the "how" of these matters.

Before I proceed to that, however, let me state my position with regard to the Supreme Court.

I profoundly respect the proper constitutional role of the U.S. Supreme Court in our Federal Government.

I agree, however, with certain dissenting members of that very Court that there have been recent instances in which the majority of the Court has exceeded its proper constitutional role and authority.

I believe that in considering needed corrective action, attention should be given not only to possible amendment of the Constitution but also to possible exercise by the Congress of its constitutional authority to limit and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. This congressional authority is clearly provided in article III, section 2, of the Constitution.

Finally, I agree with the view expressed by President Lincoln in his first inaugural address:

The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

Now I propose to state as briefly as possible three principal reasons why I believe the Supreme Court decisions in the two cases cited were wrong.

First. I believe these decisions involve a distorted interpretation of the first amendment with the result that the Government is made neutral against the free exercise of religion.

Let me read the two, pertinent opening clauses of this first amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

There are two prohibitions contained in this language. They are two sides of the same coin. The first forbids the Government to establish religion—this is the establishment clause. The second forbids the Government to prohibit the free exercise of religion—this is the free exercise clause.

In the simplest terms the Court held that the action of the States of New York and Pennsylvania, respectively, involved Government establishment of religion.

I think this is an exaggerated, tortured application of the establishment clause. I agree with Mr. Justice Stewart when he said:

I cannot see how an "official religion" is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it.

In the Bible reading case, Mr. Justice Stewart also said—and I agree:

In the absence of coercion upon those who do not wish to participate—because they hold less strong beliefs, other beliefs, or no beliefs at all—such provisions cannot, in my view, be held to represent the type of support of religion barred by the establishment clause.

The effect of the Court decision, in my judgment, is to pit the establishment clause against the free exercise clause—with fatal consequences to the latter.

These two provisions, these two prohibitions, were meant to live together, to complement each other. It was not the purpose that one should liquidate or invalidate the other and that, it seems to me, is exactly what these two decisions do.

I differ with the National Council of Churches on many counts, but I heartily concur with one statement in the general findings of last month's First National Conference on Church and State sponsored by that organization:

The clause of the first amendment prohibiting an establishment of religion must be balanced against the clause prohibiting interference with the free exercise of religion. Any concept of "neutrality" must take into account the proper balancing of the establishment and free exercise limitations.

The effect of the two Supreme Court decisions is, as I say, to make the Government neutral against the free exercise of religion.

I believe these decisions in effect give the establishment clause license to recklessly swing its ladder and hit the free exercise clause in the nose.

I believe these decisions in effect give a protection to secularism, nonreligion, or irreligion which they deny to the free exercise of religion.

To this extent, I believe they disregard the ruling of an earlier Supreme Court decision that—

State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them.

And I believe they disregard the warning given by a distinguished clergyman at the conference I referred to previously:

The minority must be defended but it can also practice coercion in reverse.

Finally, I believe, to paraphrase another statement of Mr. Justice Stewart, that there is sufficient "inventiveness and good will" to reconcile these two clauses—as they have been reconciled throughout our history prior to these two decisions—and I believe constitutional means can be devised to aid this "inventiveness and good will."

Second, I believe these decisions involve a totally unrealistic, revolutionary, and dangerous disregard of our religious heritage and repudiation of countless practices of the institutions and officials of our Government of a religious character.

Time permits citing only a few examples:

The authors of the Declaration of Independence based the claim to independence itself on religious grounds:

To assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them.

That was the definition of independence proclaimed July 4, 1776.

As for human rights—civil rights, if you please—it was asserted as a basic premise that these rights derived, not from government, not from the state, not from the actions of man, but from God himself:

All men are created equal (and) endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

And then as a final invocation this last sentence from that great document:

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

It was in this same spirit of "firm reliance on divine providence" that Dr. Benjamin Franklin rose, during what seemed to be a hopeless and fatal impasse in the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, to propose a resort to prayer for the guidance of divine wisdom.

The Northwest Ordinance provided—and these words have traditionally been repeated in the constitution of Michigan:

Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The very First Congress which wrote the First amendment provided for Chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services. The President issues religious proclamations. The Bible is used for the administration of oaths. We still have—for a while at least—the official avowal, "In God We Trust." The words "under God" were added to the Pledge of Allegiance, by act of Congress.

As Mr. Justice Stewart noted, the Marshal of the Supreme Court:

Has from the beginning announced the convening of the Court and then added "God save the United States and this honorable Court."

The national anthem—until or unless expurgated by judicial decree—still contains the words:

Blest with vict'ry and peace may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation.

And also the line:

And this be our motto—"In God is our trust."

I could add much to these illustrations of the historic intermingling of religion—in our great documents, in official acts and institutions, and in the traditions of our people. But I think I have made my point.

The two Supreme Court decisions, I repeat, have recklessly disregarded this heritage. That, I hold, is completely wrong.

Third. I believe these decisions, if permitted to stand uncorrected, make inevitable far more radical, revolutionary, and disastrous violation of our religious heritage and reversal of our religious traditions.

Already there exists militant and well-publicized advocacy, agitation, and litigation, demanding vastly expanded application of these Court decisions and the principles implicit in them.

Under fire of pending or threatened litigation is our national anthem, the pledge of allegiance, the conduct of school baccalaureate services, religious services at military academies, use of certain historical documents in the schools because of their references to religion or reliance upon God, Easter and Christmas programs in the schools or Christmas displays on the grounds of public buildings, gift distribution of Bibles to schoolchildren, the motto "In God We Trust"—and so on and so on.

New victories for these advocates of the extirpation of religion will undoubtedly bring new and greater demands.

And all, basically, on the grounds cited by Mr. Justice Douglas, that they directly or indirectly involve Government financing of religious exercises.

Enormous aid and encouragement was given to this campaign by the statement of Mr. Justice Douglas in the New York school case:

> The point for decision is whether the Government can constitutionally finance a religious exercise. Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with such financing. Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes.

If I may put it simply, and in view of the subject matter under discussion a bit indelicately, this is a proposal and an effort to unscramble scrambled eggs and to totally extract all religion therefrom.

Unfortunately, this is one case in which I believe the effort could be successful and will be successful if not halted by corrective procedures.

One further word. I believe many people support this move under the mistaken impression that they are merely extending and applying the establishment clause of the first amendment.

I think they are wrong, but I respect their sincerity.

But, I believe, there are others—a vicious and dangerous minority—who promote this effort deliberately and maliciously to divide our people, to disrupt mutual tolerance, and to eliminate religious influences and destroy our religious heritage.

There are such people in the world and in this country, as I am sure most Americans are well aware.

What can be done about this whole problem, and what chance is there that something will be done?

I do not propose at this point to suggest the wording of the needed constitutional amendment.

I do suggest that its basic purpose must be to declare and define the right of individuals to participate or to refrain from participation in prayer and Bible reading in public institutions and the right to make reference to Almighty God in public governmental documents, institutions, and affairs.

I have been flooded in recent months with mail requesting that I sign the discharge petition for the so-called Becker amendment.

This I have not done—and for two compelling reasons:

I am well aware of the deep and sincere interest in this problem on the part of our able colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. It is therefore, no reflection upon him or his earnest efforts when I say that I am fearful that his proposed amendment is inadequate in its use of the key word "voluntary." I am concerned that his amendment, if adopted in its present form, could lead to Supreme Court decisions little different than those rulings we seek and need to correct.

It is for this reason that I have preferred the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman WYMAN, over that of Congressman BECKER—although I do not claim, and neither, I am sure, does the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN], that his version is the final word.

There is a further, and far more important, reason for my not signing the discharge petition.

I believe a matter as important and complex as a proposed constitutional amendment—and particularly one in this delicate and difficult area—should receive full committee hearings and consideration. This would not be possible if the resolution were brought directly to the House floor by a discharge petition.

As I have said, I was greatly pleased with the recent announcement by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], that hearings on this subject will start before the full committee on April 22.

It is also gratifying that in anticipation of these hearings, Chairman CELLER has ordered and there has now been completed a thorough staff documentation of the constitutional, legislative, and judicial history of matters relating to the first amendment and to the subject matter of the currently proposed amendments.

I believe we are now, at long last, on the right track.

I believe we would not have reached that point as soon—if ever—without the dedicated efforts of many deeply concerned citizens.

Naturally, I cannot predict the outcome. But I believe that if the American people continue to express their concern and, more specifically, if they marshal the ablest witnesses and testimony in support of a corrective amendment, success will crown the effort.

Let me not be thought irreverent if I say that it is not Almighty God but we, the people, who stand in need of a champion and of corrective action in the courts and in Congress in this matter.

I am reminded of the delegation of clergymen who called on President Lincoln. As they were leaving, one of their number expressed to the President the hope that the Lord was on his side and on the side of the North. Lincoln replied:

> I am not concerned that the Lord be on our side. My concern is that we are on the Lord's side.

I suggest that Lincoln's words give us the right perspective in this instant matter.

WHEAT-COTTON AND TOBACCO RESEARCH LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House begins tomorrow, on Good Friday, its Easter recess, and many of us will avail ourselves of this opportunity to visit back home with our people, with our constituents who sent us here. We shall be asked many questions about what we are doing in Washington—about matters pending in the Congress. Our people will be giving us their views on these matters.

No doubt the questions and expressions will center upon the three pieces of legislation which are foremost in the public mind, and which will be voted upon immediately after our return from the Easter Holiday.

These measures deal with:

First. Food stamps.

Second. Wheat and cotton.

Third. Research in the area of smoking and health.

All these measures are within the jurisdiction of and have been approved by the House Committee on Agriculture, which it is my responsibility and my privilege to serve as chairman.

Therefore, I feel an obligation today to place at the disposal of my colleagues a concise presentation of the facts about these important pieces of legislation which will be useful in your discussions with your people back home. I shall do this in the order I have listed above, which is the order in which this legislation is likely to be voted upon when we return in the legislative week of April 6.

FOOD STAMPS

H.R. 10222, the food stamp bill, is an essential instrument in the war on poverty.

It improves, expands and makes permanent the food stamp program that now is operating successfully on a pilot and experimental basis in 43 areas in 22 States, covering some 380,000 persons.

There now are on file in the Department of Agriculture 234 requests for the program from other localities in many States.

The food stamp program, through the pilot operations, has proved to be the most effective method yet devised to insure that all Americans have the opportunity for an adequate diet.

For many years surplus commodities have been distributed by the Government directly to needy persons. The food stamp program operates through the regular food marketing system.

H.R. 10222 establishes a national policy that, in order to promote the general welfare, the Nation's abundance of food shall be utilized cooperatively by the States, the Federal Government, and local governmental units to the maximum extent practicable to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's population and raise levels of nutrition among economically needy households.

Moreover, through this legislation, the Congress finds that increased utilization of foods in establishing and maintaining adequate national levels of nutrition will tend to cause the distribution in a beneficial manner of our agricultural abundance and will strengthen our agricultural economy, as well as result in more orderly marketing and distribution of food.

Therefore, H.R. 10222 will permit those households in economic need to receive a greater share of the Nation's food abundance.

House approval will send this legislation on to the Senate for consideration.

I am inserting in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a more complete résumé of the food stamp bill.

WHEAT AND COTTON

The House on last December 4 passed H.R. 6196, the bill to forestall the ruin of the American cotton industry and to revitalize this industry on which millions of our citizens depend for their livelihood.

Subsequently, the Senate passed this bill, after modifying the cotton provisions and adding a section embracing a voluntary marketing certificate program for wheat.

H.R. 6196 is back before the House, for action upon the Senate amendments.

Upon returning from the Easter holiday the House, after debate, we will vote upon a resolution by which this body would concur in the Senate amendments. A majority vote will send the legislation—H.R. 6196—to the White House whereupon the President will sign it into law in time to be beneficial to wheat farmers in 1964 and to get on immediately with the revitalization of the American cotton industry.

WHEAT

The new wheat program in H.R. 6196 will forestall, without any appreciable cost to taxpayers, a loss of $500 to $700 million to wheat producers in 1964. Such a loss, if not prevented, would be felt throughout the Nation's business community, in terms of income and jobs.

This program will maintain the price of wheat at a level which will not increase the price of bread to consumers.

It will avoid increases in budgetary costs.

It will enable the United States to discharge its responsibilities and realize the benefits of the International Wheat Agreement.

In all respects this wheat program embraced in H.R. 6196 conforms to the recommendations of the President in his message on agriculture, delivered to the Congress on January 31, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of this legislation is that it forestalls a disaster to wheat farmers, while protecting consumers against any rise in bread costs that may be based on the price of wheat.

The cry of the opposition that this bill levies a "bread tax" is irresponsible and utterly ridiculous. The support for wheat in this bill is about $2 per bushel in 1964 and 1965. The average price support for wheat from 1950 through 1963 has been $1.99. Thus no increase in the price of flour or of bread can be justified by the wheat support provided in this legislation.

When city families purchase bread or prepared cereal products, they pay mostly for processing, packaging, and distributing the product. Very little goes to the farmer for wheat. The pound loaf of bread that sold at retail for an average price of 21.6 cents in 1963 contained wheat having a farm value of only 2.5 cents. Thus an increase of 65 cents a bushel in the farm price of wheat would be required to reflect a 1-cent increase in the cost of a loaf of bread.

Since 1947 the farm price of wheat has dropped 9 percent, while the retail prices of bread, other bakery products, and cereals have increased by 44 percent. In 1947 the farm price of wheat was $2.35 a bushel, and the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread throughout the Nation was 12.5 cents; in 1963 the farm price of wheat was $1.94, and the average price of a loaf of bread, 21.6 cents.

A more extensive discussion of the wheat program in H.R. 6196 will be inserted later in these remarks.

COTTON

H.R. 6196 will end the two-price system for cotton, in a way that will greatly benefit American consumers, as well as serving to revitalize the cotton industry.

Domestic mills will be able to buy cotton at the world price. They now must pay approximately 8½ cents a pound more than the world price for the cotton that goes into goods sold in the United States.

Cotton again will compete fairly with synthetic fibers.

The competitive position of our domestic mills, against imports of cheap foreign cotton goods, will be vastly improved.

U.S. consumers will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings amounting to more than $500 million a year, according to competent estimates.

Farm prices will remain stabilized and protected. Farmers will benefit from an expanding use of cotton.

The legislation will protect the livelihood of millions of workers associated with cotton. It will encourage a healthy cotton trade and merchandising system. It will assist and promote an efficient, growing, and prosperous world cotton market.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the biggest business in America, in dollar value involved and people employed, and the cotton industry perhaps is the greatest segment of American agriculture, in terms of people. More than 10 million persons are associated with the production of cotton, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods. Many others gain their livelihood by supplying the production materials for cotton farmers and the industry generally.

No one crop has a more intimate relationship to the well-being of so many Americans. Moreover, cotton is exceedingly important in this Nation's economic relationship with the rest of the world.

Cotton maintained the financial integrity of the United States among the nations of the world for a century or more prior to World War I. It once accounted for approximately one-third of all U.S. exports, of crops and industrial products combined. It now comprises about 20 percent of all our agricultural exports.

This American fiber now relates directly, through exports, to the flow of dollars back to the United States, amounting in years past to around $1 billion annually—dollars returning home to maintain our Nation's balance of payments and the stability of our gold supplies.

The American cotton industry now is in jeopardy, brought on by a flood of low-priced textiles flowing in from abroad and by the inroads of synthetic fibers. In the best interest of all Americans, the Congress must act to stabilize and revitalize the cotton industry generally.

I am inserting at the end of my remarks a comparison of the House and Senate versions of H.R. 6196 as they relate to cotton.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing strange, nothing outrageous, about the parliamentary procedure which we will follow in presenting the cotton-wheat bill (H.R. 6196) to the House when we come back after the Easter recess.

The cotton section passed this body in December after a great debate. The voluntary wheat certificate plan has been discussed in Congress for more than 30 years. I remember when I first came here 30 years ago, the wheat certificate plan was then under consideration. That plan has passed this House on at least two or three occasions. It has passed both Houses of the Congress on at least one occasion. It went to the White House as part of another bill which was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

The House is thoroughly familiar with the program involved in the wheat section of H.R. 6196.

SMOKING AND HEALTH RESEARCH

House Joint Resolution 915 calls for a crash program of research into the production, handling, manufacture, and use of tobacco designed to ascertain and preserve the desirable quality factors and characteristics of tobacco products and to eliminate therefrom factors, properties, or substances which may be detrimental to health.

This resolution has been approved unanimously by the House Committee on Agriculture. It now is in the Rules Committee.

On January 11, 1964, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service issued a report, "Smoking and Health," presenting statistical studies from which an advisory committee formed the judgment that "cigarette smoking contributes substantially to mortality from certain specific diseases and to the overall death rate."

Cigarette smoking—

The report said:

is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action.

Seventy million persons in the United States smoke cigarettes.

House Joint Resolution 915 recognizes that, notwithstanding the report issued by the Surgeon General and irrespective of any repressive measures that might ensue, many millions of people will continue to smoke cigarettes. It acknowledges and accepts a Government interest and responsibility in the health of these people. It is appropriate remedial action.

In public hearings before the Tobacco Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture the purposes and objectives of the resolution were supported by the Surgeon General, by the Associate Director of the National Cancer Institute, by the Director of Research and Education of the Department of Agriculture, the Governors and heads of departments of agriculture of the tobacco-producing States, by the spokesmen for general farm organizations, tobacco producers, and the industry entirely, by Members of Congress, and others. The hearings were open to anyone who desired to make a statement and no person opposed the resolution.

House Joint Resolution 915 authorizes appropriation of such sums as Congress from time to time determines to be necessary to carry forward such research. No limitation is placed upon this authority, but actual expenditures will be determined by the Congress through the control of appropriations. Discussions during the committee's studies have indicated that the crash program can be launched effectively by an expenditure of $5 to $10 million.

The Committee on Agriculture, in its report on this resolution, directs the attention of the House to the fact that the Federal Government now collects annually more than $2 billion in taxes upon tobacco products, and State bodies collect another $1 billion in taxes, so that the taxes upon tobacco yield to Federal and other public bodies twice the money each year as our farmers receive from the production of tobacco.

It is the judgment of the Committee on Agriculture that the Federal Government which profits so richly from tobacco could use a very small part, a very infinitesimal portion, of its tobacco revenues to no better purpose than in a program, as embraced in this resolution, to protect the health of those who use tobacco.

AGRICULTURE AND ALL AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is America's greatest success story, before a hungry world. Our farmers have made us the best fed Nation on the face of the earth. Americans pay less for food in relation to their family income than any other people anywhere. In 1963 food costs represented only 18.8 percent of the average family's income, after taxes. This 18.8 percent contrasts sharply with food costs in other parts of the world. By the latest figures available to the United Nations, consumers in the United Kingdom spend 29.5 percent of their income for food; in Russia, 53 percent; in France, 30.6; Greece, 46.3; Italy, 44.7; Yugoslavia, 46.5; Ecuador, 43.8; Japan, 46.9.

The great efficiency of our agriculture, our vast food superiority over the rest of the world, has developed in the years during which the farm program has been in operation.

The American consumer has been the greatest beneficiary of this efficiency and this food superiority.

The farm program, now for a decade, has been under severe attack. The motives behind this assault defy plausible explanation. Nevertheless, the farm program has suffered and now is in jeopardy.

In these circumstances, our farmers now are the least rewarded of all our people by the wealth of abundance they have created. Their income is just a little more than half that of citizens in other pursuits. Many operate on the edge of insolvency and bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I plead especially for understanding throughout the Nation that in the cotton-wheat bill we seek to save and revitalize the general farm program, which has meant so much to all America. I salute, Mr. Speaker, the honorable JOHN McCORMACK, for his long record of support in all legislation and in all matters in the best interests of agriculture, and with his help I predict this House will pass immediately upon reconvening from the Easter holiday the cotton-wheat bill, the food stamp bill, and the resolution for vital research into smoking and health. And now, I wish for all the Members of this body a happy Easter holiday.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM—RÉSUMÉ OF H.R. 10222

NATURE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to bring under congressional control and enact into law the rules under which food stamp programs are to be conducted in local areas throughout the country. Since May 1961 food stamp programs have been in operation in several local areas (now numbering 43) under regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the general authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. It would be legally possible to continue the food stamp program under this general authority, at the complete discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, but the committee believes the better course is to enact H.R. 10222 and provide congressional direction and specific legal authorities for the program. It does not believe that a program of the scope contemplated in this bill should be carried out without specific statutory guidelines and authority. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked for such legislation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM

Under the provisions of the bill, the initiative and the request for establishment of a food stamp program in any area must come from the agency responsible for administering public assistance programs in the State in which the area is located. That application must include a plan of operation specifying the manner in which the program will be conducted and other relevant data.

Each State is responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision, the costs of administering the food stamp program in the local area. These include: Costs of certifying participant households, including interviews and investigations; the handling, storage, and protection of coupons after their delivery to receiving points within the States; the issuance of coupons to eligible households; and the control, accounting, and reporting involved in operation of the program. In order to maintain close supervision over the certifying of households which are not on public assistance rolls, the Federal Government will pay part of the cost of this certification.

The experience of most areas in which food stamp programs are now operating is that the administrative costs to the State and local areas are considerably higher than under a direct distribution program.

The Secretary of Agriculture is the judge as to whether or not the State's proposed plan of operations, conditions of eligibility, etc., are satisfactory. If he finds that they are, he is required to establish the requested program in the designated area if funds are available to do so.

PARTICIPATION

The bill provides that households eligible to participate in the food stamp program "shall be those whose economic status is such as to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet." Participants are not restricted to those on public assistance rolls and, in fact, in some areas as many as 60 percent of the households participating are not receiving public assistance.

Each State is responsible for the establishment of standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households. These standards are subject to the approval of the Secretary when the area makes its application for a program.

FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE CONCERNS

When a food stamp program has been approved for an area, retail and wholesale food dealers operating in the area may participate in the program by filing an application with the Department of Agriculture. If the application is denied, the applicant has the right of administrative appeal in the Department and then to either a State or Federal court at the applicant's option.

ELIGIBLE FOODS

Eligible foods are any food products for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and foods identified as being imported from foreign sources. The bill was amended by the committee to exclude also soft drinks, luxury foods, and luxury frozen foods as defined by the Secretary, as well as imported foods that are identified as such on the package received by the retailer.

HOW THE PROGRAM OPERATES

A member of an eligible household, as defined in the act, applies to his local welfare agency for the right to participate in the food stamp program. The welfare agency determines the percentage of the household's income which would normally be spent for food which can be purchased with food stamps. If the applicant is approved he takes his authorization and the amount of money allocated from his budget for food purchases, and buys his allotment of food stamps at the issuing agency, usually a local bank. An adult member of the household is then authorized to purchase the eligible foods from a participating retail store. The retail merchant deposits the foods stamps in his bank along with his other current receipts and they are credited to his account as a Government check would be, and redeemed through the Federal Reserve System. The merchant may also use the stamps to pay a bill he may owe a wholesaler, if the wholesaler is a participant in the program. The wholesaler would then redeem the coupons through the banking system.

COST OF THE PROGRAM

A comprehensive study conducted by the Department of Agriculture estimated the cost of a national food stamp program reaching about 4 million needy persons, such as is contemplated in this bill, to be about $360 million a year. Discontinuation of the direct distribution of surplus commodities to needy persons covered by the food stamp program would result in a net savings to the Federal Government of at least $185 million, or as much as $280 million a year. The difference in the estimate of savings represents different valuations of surplus commodities owned by the Government. The lower figure assumes no salvage value for surplus commodities; the higher figure values surplus commodities at acquisition cost.

The net additional Federal expenditures required to operate a national food stamp program, therefore, would be at most, approximately $175 million, or as little as $80 million, depending on the valuation placed on surplus commodities now being distributed.

In arriving at its estimates of the cost of the food stamp program proposed in this bill, the Department assumed that the program would be requested by and established in all of the approximately 1,500 counties now receiving foods under the direct distribution program.

HISTORY OF H.R. 10222

H.R. 5733, the original food stamp bill, was introduced on April 22, 1963. Hearings were held on the legislation by the House Committee on Agriculture on June 10, 11, and 12. About 35 of the 40 witnesses, including 15 Members of Congress representing both parties, testified in favor of the food stamp program. At the conclusion of the hearings, it was apparent that there were a number of problems in connection with this legislation and the chairman appointed a special subcommittee headed by Hon. HARLAN HAGEN to redraft the bill. This subcommittee held hearings on August 7, 8, and 15, 1963. Members of the subcommittee also made an on-the-spot inspection trip to Uniontown, Pa., to get a firsthand look at the program in operation. The subcommittee, after making several amendments, voted to report a new bill to the full committee. H.R. 8107, a clean bill, incorporating the subcommittee amendments, was introduced on August 15, 1963. The House Committee on Agriculture held executive meetings on October 30, 1963, and on February 4, 1964, and on that date voted to table H.R. 8107. After further consideration of the food stamp program, amendments were suggested to the bill to further clarify the committee intent and H.R. 10222 was introduced as a clean bill on March 3, 1964. The House Committee on Agriculture met in executive session on March 4, and voted to report the bill, as amended, to the House.

WHEAT

On March 17, 1964, the Committee on Agriculture reported favorably to the House the wheat certificate plan embodied in the Senate amendment to H.R. 6196. Such a plan has a long history of consideration and favorable action by the House and the Congress. Following is a description of the Senate wheat provisions as embodied in the committee amendment to H.R. 9780, the wheat bill reported to the House.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

H.R. 9780 is identical with the wheat section of H.R. 6196 as approved by the Senate.

Following are the major provisions: Voluntary program for 1964 and 1965 crops; use of certificates, to be purchased by domestic millers and exporters, as a means of supplementing the market or loan price received by farmers; no farm marketing quotas or marketing quota penalties and no referendum for 1965; for 1964 producers who voluntary sign up to divert 10 percent below 55-million-acre allotment would receive—

First. Price support loans at level based upon feed value of wheat and world price—about $1.30;

Second. Domestic marketing certificates valued at 70 cents per bushel on their proportion of wheat crop used domestically for food, giving them a total return of about $2 on wheat for domestic food use;

Third. Export marketing certificates valued at 25 cents per bushel on that portion of wheat crop to be exported, giving them a total return of about $1.55 on this portion of their crop; and

Fourth. Diversion payments on 10 percent of 55-million acre allotment. Rate at discretion of Secretary, but likely to be 20 percent of normal yield as in feed grains. Additional diversion up to 20 percent—or acreage to bring total diverted to 15 acres—permissible.

For 1965, the support level and certificate values will be established on the basis of standards in the bill, but would be close to those set for 1964. There also will be the right of substitution of wheat and feed grain acres subject to voluntary participation in each program. This provision could not be put into effect for the 1964 crop due to lack of time.

Nonparticipating farmers free to overplant as they desire. No restrictions, no penalties, no marketing quotas, no price support, no diversion payments, no certificates, and no restrictions on marketings.

All wheat, cooperators and noncooperators, will move freely from producer to user through the normal commercial channels, plus quality premiums, based on a loan of $1.30 per bushel. A cooperator will, in addition, be eligible for certificates as indicated above. USDA will assist producers in marketing certificates required for domestic milling and export wheat.

Basic wheat law remains in effect after the special 1964–65 program except that the referendum for the 1966 and subsequent crops is deferred until August.

THE NATURE AND HISTORY OF THE WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

The basic objective of the wheat certificate plan embodied in H.R. 9780 is to afford farmers an opportunity to receive a fair return for wheat which moves into primary uses—domestic food uses and export—and, at the same time, permit all wheat to move freely on the open commercial market at the secondary use—feed—price.

The basic principles of the plan are not new. They were first introduced in Congress in 1932, were in successful operation for about 3 years in the 1930's, have been embodied in numerous bills in both Houses of Congress since 1950, have been approved by the House and Senate seperately on two occasions, and have been embodied in two bills passed by Congress.

HISTORY

In testifying before the committee in favor of the bill herewith reported, former Congressman Clifford R. Hope, of Kansas, who was twice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and is recognized as one of the outstanding agricultural statesmen of the Nation, recalled that he had introduced the first such bill in 1932. The bill was introduced at the request of a committee composed of representatives of agricultural colleges in the grain belt and the grain trade.

The principle of domestic allotments was embodied in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, Mr. Hope recalled, and operated successfully on wheat for about 3 years.

The 1933 act was replaced by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which embodied the principle of marketing quotas and commodity loans to support farm prices.

The provisions of this legislation were largely suspended during the 1940's because of World War II and not until 1948 was there need for, and serious consideration of, farm legislation to continue or replace the programs which had existed prior to the war.

The first postwar wheat certificate program introduced in the House was H.R. 7245, by Congressman Lowell Stockman, of Oregon, on February 9, 1950. Congressman Stockman reintroduced his bill in the 82d Congress on January 29, 1951—H.R. 2150.

On June 24, 1954, Congressman Hope introduced H.R. 9680, 83d Congress, which became the Agricultural Act of 1954. It included a domestic certificate plan for wheat almost identical with the bill reported herewith except that certificates were based only on domestic food consumption of wheat—instead of on domestic food consumption and exports at different certificate levels, as in the present bill—and the domestic certificate was calculated to return the farmer full parity for the wheat consumed domestically for food purposes—instead of 80 percent of parity on domestic consumption in the present bill. This bill passed the House on July 2, 1954, but the wheat provision was eliminated in conference because the Senate had not had an opportunity to give full consideration to the domestic certificate plan for wheat, the conference report stated.

On January 20, 1955, Congressman Hope again introduced the domestic certificate plan for wheat in H.R. 2598, 84th Congress. The wheat program was included in H.R. 12 as reported to the House by the Committee on Agriculture on March 10, 1955. It was eliminated from the bill on the floor of the House but was included by the Senate in its amendment to the bill and was retained in the conference report approved by the House April 11, 1956. H.R. 12 was vetoed by President Eisenhower on April 18, 1956.

Immediately thereafter, the wheat provisions of H.R. 12 were reintroduced in the House by Congressmen Hope, Horan, Miller of Nebraska, and Berry.

In the 85th Congress, bills providing the certificate plan for wheat were introduced by Congressmen Berry, Horan, Ullman, Smith of Kansas, Breeding, George, and Albert. The plan was included in H.R. 12954 which was reported by the Committee on Agriculture on June 19, 1958, and which the House refused to consider by rejecting the rule on June 26, 1958.

In the 86th Congress, wheat marketing certificate bills were introduced by Congressmen Berry, Horan, Albert, Breeding, Johnson of Colorado, McGinley, Mrs. May, Ullman, Weaver, Cannon, and Smith of Kansas. By this time although it was apparent both to farmers and to the Congress that the old provisions of the 1938 act were no longer satisfactory for wheat, it had become impossible to consider a long-range wheat program on its merits so that the temporary palliatives of emergency acreage-retirement programs were adopted.

In the 87th Congress again, numerous bills embodying the domestic certificate program for wheat were introduced in both Houses of Congress. The program was included in the Agricultural Act of 1962, but it was on a mandatory basis, with marketing quotas and penalties for overplanting carried over from the 1938 act tied in with the voluntary certificate features of the domestic allotment plan. In the referendum conducted in May 1963, farmers rejected the marketing quota provisions of the 1962 act.

FARMERS DID NOT REJECT CERTIFICATE PLAN

In the May 1963 referendum wheat farmers did not reject the certificate plan. They rejected the marketing quotas which had been carried over from the 1938 act to accompany the certificate plan. It has always been held by proponents of the certificate plan for wheat that marketing quotas are not necessary for its successful operation.

ONE PRICE FOR ALL WHEAT

Those who opposed the certificate plan seek to confuse the issue by calling it a two-price or three-price plan for wheat. This is not true. All wheat produced under the certificate plan will be sold at the same free market price, which will probably be approximately the loan level of about $1.30. Farmers who are participating in the program and farmers who are not participating in the program will take their wheat to the same elevator and will receive from the elevator exactly the same price.

The only difference is that farmers who are cooperating in the certificate program will be eligible to obtain a CCC loan on their wheat at the $1.30 level if the market price happens to be substantially below that and will receive domestic and export marketing certificates. These certificates have no influence, whatever, on the price the farmer receives from the elevator for his wheat. He will receive the same price that the noncooperator receives for his wheat and all wheat, whether grown by cooperators or noncooperators, will move thereafter through commercial channels at the price level established by the commercial market.

The farmer cooperating in the program will receive domestic certificates valued at 70 cents per bushel for his share of the domestic food market and export certificates valued at 25 cents for his share of the export market. The certificates he will either sell at face value to the elevator operator or will turn over to the local ASC office to be marketed for him at their face value. They do not affect the price he receives for the wheat at the elevator in any manner.

THIS IS A VOLUNTARY PROGRAM

If the wheat certificates plan proposed in H.R. 9780 is not a voluntary program, then it is impossible to formulate a voluntary farm program. Under this bill a farmer has three clear choices: (1) He may comply with the minimum provisions of the program, retire 10 percent of his acreage and receive payment therefor, and become eligible for both domestic and export marketing certificates and a price-support loan at the $1.30 level; (2) he may elect to stay out of the program, plant every acre he owns in wheat, and sell it at the local elevator for the same price that cooperators will get for their wheat; (3) he may elect to retire more—up to 20 percent or 15 acres—than 10 percent of his allotment and receive augmented payments for such land retirement. If he is a farmer with less than 15 acres of allotment, he may choose to produce no wheat at all and receive an augmented payment for this land retirement. If this is not a voluntary program then the words "voluntary" and "compulsory" have lost their accepted meanings and no agricultural program which offers a fair incentive to the farmer to cooperate in sound production planning can be considered voluntary.

PROGRAM WILL ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION OF QUALITY WHEAT

The charge that the certificate program will discourage the production of good milling quality wheat—that which is most in demand for flour—is completely untrue. On the contrary, it will do far more than the marketing quota program of the 1938 act, or the present program of no marketing quotas, to stimulate the production of good milling quality wheat. All farmers, both cooperators and noncooperators with the certificate plan, will sell their wheat at the local elevator for whatever the market will pay. For the first time in many years, the price the farmer will receive for his particular outturn of wheat will not be based upon loan levels and quality premiums and discounts determined by the Department of Agriculture, but by the demands of flour millers for various types and qualities of wheat. The farmer, whether he is a cooperator or not, who produces wheat of superior milling quality, will receive a price premium above the $1.30 support level at the elevator and the farmer who produces a low quality wheat will suffer a discount. For the first time in many years, the certificate plan will give full play to the price factors associated with miller demand for quality wheat and premium prices will be reflected, without any Government price-support intervention, directly down to the farmer who grows the grain.

WHAT ALTERNATIVES

H.R. 9780 offers a plan for providing farmers with a fair return for wheat which is consumed for food in the United States without 1 cent of additional cost to consumers or to taxpayers. It is a plan which has been advocated by the outstanding agricultural statesmen of this country for many years, which was once in successful operation but which has been sidetracked while various unsatisfactory alternatives have been tried.

There are two present alternatives. One is to do nothing, pass no legislation. In this event the income of wheat farmers will be reduced in 1964 by an estimated $500 to $700 million under 1963. The only other practical alternative is to adopt the proposal of the chief opponent of the certificate plan, the American Farm Bureau Federation. The essence of the Farm Bureau's proposal is that the Government should rent out of production enough farms—probably as much as 80 or 100 million acres—that farmers would not be able to produce on their remaining acres enough wheat and feed grains to amount to a surplus. This plan would cost the Federal Treasury as much as $2 billion per year. It would bring ruin and desolation to many small towns and rural communities. And there is no assurance whatever that it would work. If the Government rental payments did not remove quite enough land, the price of wheat would remain at a disastrously low level, and farmers would lose $500 million a year in income in spite of billions in Federal subsidy. If it did work, the price of wheat would, presumably, skyrocket to a level usually associated with a commodity in shortage supply and consumers would pay the bill both in income taxes and in the price of bread and wheat products at their grocery stores.

COTTON

Following is a comparison of the House and Senate provisions relating to cotton in H.R. 6196:

HOUSE	SENATE
1. Estimated expenditures	
$696 million (without Jones amendment). $614 million (with Jones amendment).	$448 million.
2. Domestic allotment choice plan—1964–65	
Not included.	Farmers who choose to plant only for domestic consumption (about two-thirds of their regular allotment) would receive up to 15 percent higher price support. Such support would likely be effected by making payments-in-kind on normal yield of planted acreage for farmers who did not exceed their domestic acreage allotment.
3. Domestic equalization payment	
Between date of enactment and July 31, 1967, payments-in-kind would be made to persons other than producers in an amount determined by the Secretary to eliminate the inequity of the two-price cotton system. (Jones amendment)	Between August 1, 1964, and July 31, 1966, payments-in-kind would be made to persons other than producers so that American mills could buy cotton at the same price it is sold for export to foreign mills. Between date of enactment and August 1, 1964, payment rate would be determined by Secretary. (Jones amendment eliminated)
4. Payment on inventory	
Payment will be made on raw cotton in inventory on date of enactment.	Same as in House.
5. Base price support	
(a) 1964—30 cents per pound for Middling 1-inch. (b) 1964 and thereafter—support price would be level for previous year adjusted to reflect reductions in the cost of growing cotton except that the maximum for 1965 would be 29½ cents per pound and for 1966 and thereafter, 29 cents.	(a) 1964—same as House. (b) 1965 and thereafter—Secretary would have full authority to set price support at any level between 65 and 90 percent of parity; the same as under current law.
6. Price support for small farmer	
Farmers would receive up to 10 percent higher price support on up to the first 15 bales of each farmer's production.	Under the domestic allotment choice plan farmers would not have to reduce below the smaller of 15 acres or the base allotment in order to receive the higher price support.
7. Cost-cutting research	
Secretary is directed to conduct a special cotton research program to reduce production costs as soon as practicable. For this program, an appropriation of up to $10 million annually is authorized.	Same as House.
8. CCC resale price	
Beginning August 1, 1964, CCC may sell upland cotton at not less than 105 percent of the "basic" loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges, instead of 115 percent of the loan, as presently required.	Same as House.
9. Export market acreage	
In any year through the 1967 crop in which the national acreage allotment exceeds 17 million acres, Secretary would be authorized to allot one-half of such excess to farmers who would receive world market prices for the production from the excess acres.	If the Secretary determined that the carryover would be reduced by 1 million bales or that the carryover would be less than 8 million bales (including the production from the export market acreage): (a) In 1964 the Secretary would be authorized to increase the allotment for any farm up to 10 percent with the farmer receiving world market prices for the production from the increased acreage. (b) In 1965 the Secretary would be authorized to allot export market acreage to the States which would in turn be allotted to farmers upon request filed with their county committees.

THE SONIC BOOM TESTS AT OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] be permitted to address the House at this time and my special order be immediately after his.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, responsible foreign policy spokesmen publicly identified with the administration have a special duty to consider the impact which both the content and the timing of their remarks might have on our foreign relations.

Regarding Castro's Cuba, the United States is committed to the position, enunciated by President Kennedy, that communism in this hemisphere is not negotiable. We are also currently engaged in a critical test of policy regarding our relations with the Government of Panama.

Criticism and debate of issues, domestic and foreign, are fundamental to our system. But when rearguard attacks are launched by high-ranking spokesmen against our own Government's foreign policy positions, a false and potentially dangerous picture of national division is conveyed throughout the world.

This is not to say that foreign policy issues are beyond the bounds of responsible criticism and debate.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have never hesitated to speak out against Latin American general policies which in my opinion do not serve the national interest.

At the same time, I believe that like the general legal doctrine of free speech, the exercise of free speech in foreign policy matters has its proper limitations. There is such a thing as shouting "fire" in the theater of foreign relations. I am afraid that certain of our high-ranking spokesmen, in their recent public utterances, have been guilty of just that.

It was the distinguished former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Tom Connally, who laid down the dictum that partisan criticism stops at the water's edge. I do not believe that Senator Connally meant to say that foreign policy issues were immune from free debate. I believe that he did mean that there are proper times and proper methods for foreign policy critics to make their views known without creating an international impression of national disunity and weakness. And I am certain that Senator Connally meant for this rule of restraint to apply to himself, the country's highest ranking congressional foreign policy spokesman, as well as to others.

Nebulous discourse about foreign policy myths and realities, in my opinion, offers no useful guideposts for this country's continuing search for answers to problems in Cuba, Panama, and throughout Latin America.

Is the threat of Castro Cuba to our national security and to the hemisphere indeed a myth? The missile crisis of October 1962 is history, not mythology. As a national experience I believe it will be remembered as something more than a mere distasteful nuisance, as some have termed the Castro regime.

The Cuban confrontation came about precisely because of this country's underestimating the danger of a Communist island base in the heart of the Americas. Those who now would warn of the dread risk of nuclear war might well recall that the Cuban missile crisis came about because of our vacillation and indecisiveness in meeting a very real challenge to our hemispheric security. That challenge still exists, and those who would trust in Premier Khrushchev's or Fidel Castro's drawing back from aggressive policies are dealing in the purest of myths.

The historic lesson of October 1962 is clear to all except those who would make even the simplest lesson seem complex. The lesson was that trying to sweep the Castro menace under a foreign policy rug resulted in a major power crisis. Only firmness on the part of the United States dispelled that crisis and thwarted a Soviet effort to turn the balance of international power in its favor.

Now a fresh effort is underway to sweep aside and belittle the Castro menace. The concern of the American people over the existence of a Caribbean base for Communist aggression and subversion is scorned as unrealistic, irrelevant, and irrational. Now the selfsame experts who in the past argued against effective, full-scale efforts to deal with Castro are advising that we must accept the "reality" of his regime.

How often do those who underestimate the Castro threat make a similar error by lightly regarding the good sense, not to mention the good memory, of the American people. The truth of the matter is that the American people have been more correct in their assessment of the Castro threat over the years than most of our so-called foreign relations experts. Had these experts not ignored the popular demand for a firm and active policy directed against Castro's Cuba, the grave risks of the October 1962 confrontation would have been avoided. It was the purported experts, with their counsel of timidity, who helped create a vacuous policy which Khrushchev and his Cuban satellite so dangerously misconstrued.

No, the American people have been ahead of their leaders in correctly assessing the dangers of Castro communism to the hemisphere. As a matter of fact, it might be said, to paraphrase Clemenceau, that the security of our hemisphere might be too important a matter to be left in the hands of our foreign relations experts. A good case can be made for trusting the sound instincts of an American public that was right rather than the sonorous erudition of foreign relations authorities who have been so often wrong.

What is meant when we are told to accept the "reality" of the Castro regime? Shorn of its linguistic refinement, this means simply that we should begin negotiating with communism in this hemisphere. A tortured line of reasoning seems to hold that because we are a great Nation we ought to be able to tolerate a small menace. But the menace is not Castro—it is Moscow. If we come to accept the "reality" of Soviet influence in Cuba, we inevitably will end by accepting it throughout the Americas.

Are we prepared to extend air surveillance against the clandestine emplacement of Soviet long-range missiles from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn? For that is the only result foreseeable from a policy of coming to terms with communism in the Americas.

What then should be our policy regarding Castro's Cuba? I consider shallow and shortsighted the argument that we should recognize Cuba and join an economic race for Cuban markets. Those who urge extension of trade with communism on the basis of its "good business" aspects are either forgetful of pre-Pearl Harbor history or oblivious to its lessons. We cannot do business with Castro, and it is truly a myth to believe otherwise.

In the alternative, I submit that a great nation committed to stand firm against communism in Berlin, in Vietnam and in other distant areas, should have a policy in its own hemisphere consistent with these worldwide goals. We have told the Communists that we intend to risk war if necessary in defense of free world interests at the Brandenburg Gate and in the Mekong Delta. Are our adversaries to regard these declared intentions as "real" or "mythical?" Surely, if we mean to hold a line against communism abroad, we must pursue a similar policy of firmness and action in our own neighborhood. And to say, as have some regarding our hemisphere's danger, that the poison is not so bad since it has not yet killed the patient, is a degree of aloof disregard for realities unparalleled since the London Times was rationalizing the Hitler menace for Englishmen in the 1930's.

The same detached view of this country's vital interests characterizes recent criticism of our Government's policy toward Panama. This criticism is aimed at our refusal to accede to Panamanian demands that we agree—prior to their resumption of diplomatic relations—to "renegotiate" our treaty with Panama rather than "discuss" all areas of disagreement.

The critics seemingly argue that in this instance a great nation ought not to be too insistent that smaller nations live up to their treaty obligations.

Are we then to operate on a double standard of treaty relations, insisting that larger nations abide by their word, but smaller countries are not to be held strictly accountable for their international contracts? By this reasoning, all a smaller nation need do to renege on its unwanted treaty obligations is plead duress, then riot and renegotiate.

That is the thesis of certain opportunistic Panamanian politicians today. Fortunately, Assistant Secretary Thomas Mann recognized the dangerous repercussions were we to agree to Panamanian demands to "negotiate" the treaty. Mr. Mann to date, with the full support of President Johnson, has held firm against agreeing to such a double standard in our international dealings. Clearly, the battle over terminology goes beyond simple semantics. Larger stakes are involved, for if it is once established that the United States will retreat from its international rights when confronted with irresponsible mob action, no U.S. treaty position in the hemisphere will be secure.

Assistant Secretary Mann understands this, and has held firm. As a result, there can be little doubt that the outbreak of homefront criticism regarding our country's Panamanian position is a direct effort to weaken Mr. Mann's hand in policymaking. He is the target of the same experts who have been urging a soft Latin American policy over the years, with disastrous consequences for our national and hemispheric security.

It is shocking—and I use the word advisedly—that certain of Mr. Mann's homefront critics have alined themselves with our most vehement Panamanian critics in interpreting U.S. relations in the Canal Zone. The record of the United States in Panama has been wrongly blackened by those who would sow the seeds of hatred and contempt for our country in Latin America. Yet, this historic record, rather than a stain, is in truth a credit to our national history.

When all is said and done, the United States, under the farsighted executive leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt, did construct the Panama Canal, at a considerable cost and sacrifice of American lives and resources and despite serious obstacles. The canal today represents a living monument to American dedication to the principles of peace and broadened international and hemispheric relations.

For the Panama Canal, lest we forget, is not a natural resource of that country. The United States holds the zone through legal and moral right. Let our Panamanian critics—and our homefront critics as well—conceive if they will how Panama would have fared over the years had the "Colossus of the North" been not the United States but Soviet Russia.

The zone treaty, as should be well known, is not 60 years old, but has been twice renegotiated, in 1936 and again in 1955. The Governments of Panama during those years—freely and without duress—entered into and agreed to renegotiate treaty terms.

The United States rightly lives up to its terms under the treaty and expects the

Government of Panama to do the same. A truly great nation cannot permit a mob to accomplish what we would not allow an army to do—that is, to trample underfoot our international rights.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that these homefront and rearguard critics, especially those who are believed to hold close ties to the administration, will reconsider the serious impact of their divisive public pronouncements on our efforts to maintain a firm and fair Latin American policy serving our national interests.

In conclusion, I have been reminded by this homefront criticism of foreign policy of Winston Churchill's rejoinder to David Lloyd George's criticism of British conduct of the Boer War at the turn of the century.

In a situation not without current parallel, the young Churchill heard Lloyd George, who was a member of the Liberal Opposition, excoriate the British Government's conduct of the war and urge a British retreat from South Africa.

Churchill was—if you will forgive my use of the term—shocked, that at a time when his nation was locked in battle, Britishers would provide propaganda aid and comfort to the enemy. He confronted Lloyd George following the debate and said:

> Sir, you take a singularly detached view of the British Empire.

Thus might I say to certain of our own country's latter-day critics:

> Sir, you may take a singularly detached view of the interests of the United States.

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

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

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has made a very fine pronouncement here today of foreign policy. This is our foreign policy that the gentleman has spoken about today. I can assure him as one member of the minority there will be bipartisan support for what the gentleman is talking about. We can have this as our policy if this is followed. Then we can strengthen America and our country. If we vacillate, if we do what other people are talking about, I think it will do us great harm in the foreign relations of our country.

I congratulate the gentleman for a very fine pronouncement of foreign policy.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman, and concur in his views.

STRENGTH NOT WEAKNESS MUST BE AMERICA'S POLICY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House on Latin America, for his very penetrating analysis and for the very fine job he has done in helping to firm up a stronger policy for our Government.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in one of the most amazing speeches ever delivered, it was suggested that this Government should retreat from its firm foreign policy on almost every front. We are to leave Castro alone to dominate all of Latin America. We are to surrender to Panama in the canal dispute in advance of any "negotiations." We are to soften up our approach in South Vietnam.

It is being suggested that this speech was a "trial balloon," spectacularly headlined by the liberal press. It should be shot down immediately. Fortunately the administration has already denounced this speech of planned retreat.

Only a convivial memory and a distortion of facts could lead one to say the economic blockade of Cuba has not been effective. A few sales do not mean a complete breakdown. The economic blockade against Castro has been so successful he is now talking "coexistence" to try to upgrade his sagging economy. Every major shipping power in the free world except Great Britain has cut its shipping markedly. Our shipping amendment to the foreign-aid bill has produced additional decreases which will effect a major blow to the Castro government in the months ahead. Of the 13 free world nations trading with Cuba during the first half of 1963, 5 have quit altogether and an additional 2 show a substantial decrease. Of the remaining six, at year end Morocco, France, Spain, and Greece were only making an average of two trips a month each and there are indications that France is the only one of these which is increasing, rather than decreasing, its shipping to Castro. Of the remainder, Great Britain and Lebanon show increases and an upward trend into the current year.

These mean, of course, that the economic blockade is working. Only Great Britain, France, and Lebanon show evidence of defiance of U.S. policy. Even in England an effect can be noted at last. Leyland Motors, which sold $10 million in buses to Castro, had to go to East Germany to find ships to carry them to Cuba, since no British merchant ship wanted to risk U.S. censure. Public opinion in Great Britain is changing, as indicated by the remarks of one of Brittain's leading authorities on the Soviet Union, who recently took issue with the thesis that a fat Communist was less dangerous than a lean one. Writing in the London Sunday Times, Prof. Leonard Schapiro said:

> No amount of trade with Cuba is likely to produce the kind of factors which in the case of the Soviet Union "may" in time lead to closer and more harmonious political relations. On the other hand, to ignore the very natural apprehensions of our ally, the United States, about the shoring up of a power which avowedly is dedicated to spreading Communist rule over the American continent, may lose us much more than we should ever gain from the profits of Cuban trade.

Castro is more of a threat to this hemisphere than ever before, not less. While we had just reason to be concerned about Russian troops and missiles in Cuba, we have more reason to be con-concerned about the arms and missiles in Cuba under the command of the Castro brothers, as the Russians withdraw and turn these weapons of war over to complete Cuban authority. There was some small comfort in the fact that Russia, while an extremely dangerous foe, would at least weigh the possibilities of global war. The Castro brothers have no such restraint to hold them back from complete irresponsible acts.

Panama would not exist today if it were not for the treaty of 1903, which we are now told we should negotiate before even hearing the terms of surrender. It has been the might of the United States and the American dollar which has maintained Panama as an independent state. In return, we were given rights to the canal. That canal is vital to the security of this Nation and therefore is not subject to advance commitments of negotiation. The United States is powerful enough to always be willing to discuss disagreements with any other nation. But there cannot be any prior commitments on the part of our Government that we will agree to something which will effect our national security before we even know what demands will be made on us—a reasonable position taken by our President.

The same advocate of complete surrender of U.S. policy around the world is one of the strongest advocates of foreign aid in the Congress. It seems abundantly clear to most people today that we cannot buy friends. Yet this seems to be the policy of the appeasers. We have spent taxpayers' money in Cambodia and told to get out. We have spent it in Indonesia and are now told by Sukarno in his own words to our Ambassador in public, "to hell with your aid."

It is time Americans, particularly those in high places of influence in the Congress, press, and State Department, realize that the only thing our adversaries understand is strength. We cannot buy our security through foreign aid giveaways, and we cannot buy defense by surrender of strategic positions. We can defend our freedoms only by letting it be abundantly clear to all that we are strong and willing to use that strength at anytime, anywhere, in defense of our liberties. President Kennedy showed this proper course in the days of the Cuban missile crisis. President Johnson has repeated several times before the Congress and the world the willingness of the United States to discuss any problem, but to stand firm for our basic interests with strength and determination.

Those who advocate a position of weakness for this Government undermine the unity and strong purpose as called for by President Johnson. This is the time to improve our world position, not destroy it. It is the stated policy of this Government to rid the hemisphere of Castro. Let us finish the job we have begun.

BRITISH EXPERT TERMS FAT-RED THEORY A FALSE BASIS FOR TRADE WITH CUBANS

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON, March 8.—One of Britain's leading authorities on the Soviet Union took issue today with the thesis that a fat Communist was less dangerous than a lean one.

Writing in the London Sunday Times, Prof. Leonard Schapiro castigated both Prime Minister Douglas-Home and the Labor Party leader, Harold Wilson, for seeking to apply what he termed a fallacious argument to trade with Cuba.

To contend that the Soviet Union is more reasonable because it is fatter, Schapiro said, "attaches quite unreal importance to the relationship between what the population of Russia wants and the policy pursued by its leaders."

The overwhelming reason for discernible changes in Soviet policy, he contended, is the existence of nuclear weapons and the inadvisability of actions that might lead to armed conflict with the United States.

"No amount of trade with Cuba," he asserted, "is likely to produce the kind of factors which in the case of the Soviet Union may in time lead to closer and more harmonious political relations.

"On the other hand, to ignore the very natural apprehensions of our ally, the United States, about the shoring up of a power which is avowedly dedicated to spreading Communist rule over the American Continent, may lose us much more than we should ever gain from the profits of Cuban trade."

Schapiro did not exclude trade with Communist countries, but called for the weighing of political factors first. He opposed an economic boycott designed to starve Cuba on moral grounds.

"But quite apart from morals," he added, "the fact that the capitalist powers are repeatedly called upon to feed the socialist countries is a more powerful argument against communism than all the books in the British Museum."

Schapiro's attack was the second made recently on the British fat-versus-lean Communist argument. Writing in the Guardian last week John Grigg, the former Lord Altrincham, took much the same line against what he called wishful thinking.

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

Mr. SELDEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it should be a source of great comfort to all of us in the House on both sides of the aisle to know there are two distinguished Members like the gentlemen who have participated in this discussion, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], both of whom are experts in the field of South American foreign affairs and both of whom are courageous men who have had the courage to stand up today and shoot down the trial balloons which would suggest some sort of retreat or retrenchment in our foreign policy in the two vital areas which affect our security, Cuba and Panama. I congratulate both the gentlemen. I know the American people agree that they have performed a great public service today by not permitting this to go further than it has.

I submit, as these gentlemen have so eloquently stated today, that for anyone to suggest a retrenchment either in Cuba or in Panama is to be completely out of touch with reality. It is surprising that spokesmen one would think would know better would become victims of this fallacious theory that we can negotiate some sort of agreement with Castro or that we can negotiate from a position of weakness in Panama.

It appears to me that there are those who are now beginning to read President Johnson loud and clear. It is eminently clear that Mr. Johnson knows exactly what he wants to do in making sure that freedom survives in this world. The President has followed a strong and determined position in his dealings with the Communist world. There are those who would like to temper his views; but I stand with the President. I calculate that these trial balloons which are sent up will be totally ineffective and will be rejected by the American people. When the smoke clears, President Johnson in his quiet, dignified but determined and unequivocal manner will see to it that our way of life prevails and the principles for which America stands—dignity and freedom—will survive over the tyranny represented by the Communist world.

I congratulate the gentlemen for the truly great contribution they have made today.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank my colleague the gentleman from Illinois.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

DRAKE H. SPARKMAN

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House of the death of a distinguished American, Drake Sparkman. His services to our Nation in war and in peace have been significant and will live on.

Drake Sparkman's contributions to yachting and to America's sportsmanship have been numerous—including his firm's design, by Olin Stephens, of the America's Cup successful defender, *Columbia*.

Above all, Drake Sparkman will be remembered for his warmth of friendship by all those privileged to have known him. I extend to Mrs. Sparkman and to the members of the family, for myself and on behalf of the Members of this House, our deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the Mamaroneck Daily Times of March 21, 1964.

SPARKMAN, YACHT FIRM FOUNDER, DIES

Drake Hoyt Sparkman, 66, of 21 Orsini Drive, Larchmont, founder and president of Sparkman & Stephens, Inc., yacht brokers, naval architects, and marine insurance brokers in New York City, died Friday at Memorial Hospital, New York City. He had been ill for several months.

A native of New Rochelle, he was born February 27, 1898, the son of the late James D. and Edith Hoyt Sparkman. Mr. Sparkman, who has resided in Larchmont since 1926, is a descendant of the Huguenot families of Soulice and Drake. His firm designed the *Columbia*, the defender of the America's Cup in 1958.

Mr. Sparkman, a life member of the Larchmont Yacht Club, belonged to the New York Yacht Club, the Racquet and Tennis Club of New York, and was a trustee and former president of the Marine Museum, New York City. He was a member of Sts. John and Paul Church, Larchmont. A veteran of World War I, he served as an ensign on the U.S.S. *Montana*, an armored cruiser.

Mr. Sparkman was prominent in International class yachting for many years and won the Astor Cup with the 12-meter *Iris* in 1933. He was chairman of the Coast Guard Committee for the enrollment of yachts and personnel during World War II.

Mr. Sparkman headed the largest business of its kind in the world. A blond, personable man, he would say, "No deal is too small."

Once he sold a sailboat for $750. The following year the same man bought a $7,500 boat from him. Two years later, the man was sold a $15,000 yacht.

In his early years around New Rochelle, Mr. Sparkman learned to sail on Long Island Sound and in the summers got a job in a yacht brokerage office on City Island, the Gerald W. Ford Yachts.

He was in the Navy during the First World War and later worked for naval architect, Roger Haddock, in New York.

In 1927, Mr. Haddock retired and Mr. Sparkman started his own business. The following year, Olin Stephens, the brilliant yacht designer came in with him, after a conference, closing the partnership at Larchmont Yacht Club.

Mr. Sparkman was a fine sailor but never designed yachts. He won three Long Island Sound Victory class champions in his yacht *Blue Jacket*. Besides the *Columbia*, the company not only has been responsible for the best designs in racing yachts, but in the planning and sales of naval vessels, cruising yachts and commercial boats, such as ferryboats.

The 12-meter racer *Vim* was a longtime winner in America's Cup competition and considered a forerunner of the *Columbia*. The Sparkman firm designed the *Vim*.

Surviving him are his wife, the former Margaret Mulhall; three sons, Drake H., Junior, of Setauket, N.Y., John C. of Bronxville, and Robert J. of Syosset, Long Island; four stepchildren, Stephen, Timothy, Cornelia, and Kent Huff, all of the home address; a brother, James D. of 75 Eastchester Road, and nine grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held Monday at 9:45 a.m. at SS. John and Paul Church, Larchmont. He is presently reposing at the George T. Davis Memorial, 14 LeCount Place, New Rochelle. Friends may call from 3 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m., today and Sunday. Interment will be private.

Mr. Sparkman sold the *Lyndonia*, the steam yacht, to Cyrus Curtis, publisher of the Saturday Evening Post.

SELECT COMMISSION ON MARKET POWER IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, since World War II we have witnessed two notable revolutions in our Nation's economy—the unprecedented rise in farm productivity and the equally rapid growth of food distribution techniques. Taken in combination these developments have been perhaps the major factor in making the American public a people of plenty without parallel in recorded history.

Yet these miracles have not been unmixed blessings. Despite our efforts to achieve workable supply management, farm production continuously threatens to exceed foreseeable demand. And the resulting decline in farm prices, even when precipitous, is seldom, if ever, adequately reflected in lower consumer prices.

The statistics demonstrating this are striking. In the decade from 1954 through 1963, the consumer price index for food rose from 95.4 to 105.1. In the same period, agricultural producers saw their share of the consumer dollar decline from 44 to 37 cents. This widening margin between producer receipts and consumer prices was, and is being absorbed by the food processing and distribution industries. Some of this margin is attributable to added costs. Still, there has been growing concern that much of it represents above-normal returns to the food chainstores which have so enormously expanded their market power through vertical and horizontal integration.

The recent drop in prices received by meat producers has dramatically underscored the seriousness of this problem. According to the latest Department of Agriculture analysis, published in February's Marketing and Transportation Situation, the net farm value of beef fell 6.5 cents per pound during the first 11 months of 1963 while the retail prices dropped only 1.4 cents.

In the wave of this punishing blow to cattle and hog raisers, the President has called for a bipartisan study of chainstore market power to fill the great gaps in our knowledge about this burgeoning economic phenomenon.

Today I have introduced a joint resolution to establish such a commission, called the Select Commission on Market Power in Agriculture. Modeled after the very successful Temporary National Economic Committee of the 1930's, it would be composed of 15 public officials. The Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate would each appoint five members from their respective bodies, no more than three of whom would belong to the same party. The remaining five members of the Commission would come from the executive branch—the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce, the Attorney General, the Chairman of the FTC, and the President's adviser on consumer affairs.

The Commission's mandate would call for an investigation of those practices by food chainstores in interstate commerce to determine if they violate the antitrust laws. It would have full powers to enlist the aid of other Federal agencies in conducting this investigation, terminating its work by a full report to Congress with recommendations for new legislation if the circumstances require it.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I have introduced today responds to the President's call for a bipartisan study of this problem and also meets the desire of many others to see an FTC investigation of the chainstore practices. I commend it to the attention of all Members who see in the growing concentration of agricultural marketing power a threat to America's farmers, consumers, and small businessmen.

THE SONIC BOOM TESTS AT OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are concerned with excessive noise generated by subsonic commercial jets, and the noises to be generated by the supersonic transports now being considered, have watched with great interest the current series of tests being conducted by the Federal Aviation Agency over Oklahoma City.

I have a particular interest in these tests because my congressional district lies immediately east of O'Hare Field in Chicago and my constituents suffer extreme hardship from noise generated by jets operating to and from O'Hare Field. Someday supersonic jets may operate to and from O'Hare Field.

These tests are designed to test community reaction to sonic booms.

On the basis of the tests so far, the reaction of the population in Oklahoma City has been mixed.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is my fear that the present tests may not tell the full story and may actually be used to, inadvertently, delude the public into thinking that civilization can learn to live with sonic booms.

I am particularly concerned that FAA personnel in charge of these tests in Oklahoma City have reported that out of some 2,000 complaints about the booms by residents of Oklahoma City, only 17 complainants have filled out affidavits of damage on a special form required by the FAA.

In a recent dispatch to the Chicago Sun-Times, that newspaper's editor, Mr. Richard Lewis, who had visited Oklahoma City for a personal observation, quoted Mr. J. Kenneth Power, chief of operations for the FAA at Oklahoma City, as stating that:

> Not a single instance of structural damage resulting from booms has been found.

Mr. Speaker, while I am fully aware of the fact that the FAA has to somewhat "back in" into this whole problem of sonic booms, I have some strong reservations about the nature of the tests now being conducted over Oklahoma City.

The first 20 days of Operation Bongo, as it is officially known within aviation circles, consisted of producing sonic boom overpressures of 1 to 1½ pounds per square foot at ground level.

No one questions the fact that this low overpressure creates no damage to ground structures and no significant adverse public reactions day or night.

Significantly, however, even at these low pressures, there have been vast complaints made by the people in Oklahoma City, and there is even a movement to compel the local government to take steps to halt the tests.

Assuming that the current objections have little basis, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that they are an indication of public reaction to sonic booms.

It is my understanding the FAA intends to raise the overpressure to 2 full pounds very shortly. Understandably, the booms will be louder and there will be more jarring of the people in the test area, but even here, Mr. Speaker, it is safe to predict that any sonic boom with an overpressure of up to 2 pounds per square foot will most probably cause no serious damage to ground structures even though significant adverse public reaction both day and night will occur.

The point I am trying to make here today, Mr. Speaker, is that we will witness several months of testing by the FAA and then, if these Government agencies run true to form, the conclusion will be drawn that while there is some negative public reaction there is no substantial damage to property and therefore, the plans to build a huge supersonic transport at a cost of $1 billion to the American taxpayer are justified.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this whole project must be held in a state of abeyance until after the FAA has had the courage to generate sonic boom overpressures in excess of 2 pounds per square foot.

Mr. Power himself in 1961 told an Institute of Navigation seminar in Fort Worth, Tex., that sonic booms of 2 to 3 pounds overpressure per square foot would cause damage to glass and plaster in isolated cases and widespread adverse public reaction day and night.

He further stated that sonic booms causing overpressure of 3 to 5 pounds per square foot would cause widespread window and plaster damage, possible minor structural damage to frames and walls of some buildings of marginal construction or of poor repair, possible indirect effects due to falling objects and debris.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 8104, an act to establish minimum standards for operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States. Under any proposal, it would be unlawful to operate any civil supersonic aircraft in air transportation through the navigable air space of the United States which would generate sonic boom overpressures exceeding 1½ pounds per square foot on the ground directly beneath the flight path.

The purpose of my legislation was to serve notice on the developers of this new and uncharted method of transportation that before they pour billions of dollars into the production of such aircraft, they will have to design them in such a way that they will not cause serious hardship to the people of the United States.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Department of the Air Force, and the Bureau of the Budget have all stated their strong opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I dare the FAA to produce sonic booms substantially in excess of 2 pounds overpressure in Operation Bongo over Oklahoma City and then let the people of that city demonstrate how they feel about proposals to limit the scope of sonic booms in this country.

By Mr. Power's own statement, describing the reaction of people to sonic booms in excess of 2 pounds, it is safe to presume that the populace of Oklahoma City would probably run the whole operation out of the city if they generated overpressures in excess of 2 pounds.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we already know that the supersonic transport being developed jointly by the British and the French—the Concord—will generate sonic booms with overpressures in excess of 2 pounds per square foot when it becomes operational.

I am aware of the fact that all of these agencies involved in the development of an American supersonic transport have indicated a concern about noise and have stated that any design of such aircraft by the United States must take into consideration the problem of sonic booms. But these statements are so nebulous that we know from past experience that the public will be the last to be considered.

We need only look at the scandalous situation that exists at every major airport in America today where the lives of perhaps as many as 1 million Americans who live near major airports have been seriously affected by noise being generated by the conventional subsonic jets. All protests to the FAA bring a rejoinder that you cannot stop progress.

Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that the powerplants of today's subsonic jets were developed only with the consideration of thrust, and no concern was given to the problem of noise over vast communities surrounding America's airports.

It is my fear that unless Congress writes into law specific criteria controlling sonic booms over the United States, millions of dollars will be expended both by the Government and the industry in the development of all the other factors affecting supersonic transports and when this money has been spent, they will again tell us that to try to alter the design could lead to bankruptcy for the developers of these planes.

We have had too much experience in seeing how thoroughly airplane builders, the carriers, and other special interests control this entire field of flight regulation to be foolish enough to trust this whole program to the future with no limitations established by the Congress.

Out here in the shadow of the Nation's Capital, there are two monuments in front of the National Archives Building. One of them has inscribed on its base: "What is past is prologue." The other states: "Study the past."

Mr. Speaker, the gravity of this entire subject can be fully appreciated when we look to what is happening today in Chicago, in New York, in Miami, in Los Angeles, in Denver, in Houston, in all the other American cities which have airports handling conventional subsonic jet transports.

Absolutely no consideration was given to the noise factor and even today when the industry has developed a fan jet engine with added thrust, still no consideration has been given to the jet noise factor.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall include the letters written to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by the FAA, the CAB, the Department of the Air Force, and the Bureau of the Budget regarding the proposals contained in H.R. 8104 to establish minimum criteria for sonic booms.

These letters clearly demonstrate that these agencies are more concerned in developing the supersonic transport than they are in controlling any sonic booms that it may generate.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are references made of concern about noise but if the present standards adopted by the FAA in controlling noise at major airfields created by subsonic jets is any indicator, then let us not delude ourselves into thinking that any one of these agencies would hold up the expenditure of millions upon millions of dollars to develop a supersonic jet until such time as science has found an answer to the sonic boom.

One would have to be extremely naive to think that the FAA would take a position that the first order of business before any research money is spent on the development of airframe and powerplants for the supersonic jet of the future, research must demonstrate that sonic booms can be held to the acceptable overpressures established by the FAA itself.

I have watched this Agency operate too long to have any confidence that sonic booms and excessive noise on landings and departures will receive anything more than just lipservice from all of those directly or indirectly involved in the development of this new mode of transportation.

What possible objection could anyone have to an establishment of minimum criteria for sonic booms? Why would the FAA oppose this legislation if it indeed did plan to make sonic booms and noise one of the most important considerations in the development of this aircraft.

It is my hope that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will exercise its own individual judgment and not be guided by the recommendations of these agencies.

I have already indicated that I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment to H.R. 8104 which would permit sonic booms of up to 2 pounds overpressure per square foot under certain conditions.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to impede or obstruct this Nation's desire to participate in the development of a supersonic jet. I am aware of the economic benefits that can ensue to our country if we are able to capture the imagination of the world's air carriers with an effective supersonic transport. I am aware of the jobs that production of such aircraft will create in this country. But by the same token, Mr. Speaker, as only one Member of the Congress, I would not be fair to my constituents if I did not challenge the wisdom of all of this until an adequate system is devised to protect the people on the ground against the ravages of excessive sonic booms.

Mr. Halaby has an opportunity to prove me right or wrong. Let him instruct the people in charge of Operation Bongo to produce overpressures similar to those which will be produced by the Concord over Oklahoma City.

I am firmly convinced that the 2,000 complaints now on record with the FAA in Oklahoma City as a result of the tests so far would skyrocket if the FAA produced sonic booms approaching 3 pounds or more overpressure per square foot.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that legislation is necessary because in reviewing the correspondence of the agencies commenting on H.R. 8104, it is clearly apparent that the respective agencies within our own Government are not agreed on the results and damages caused by sonic booms.

The FAA admits that sonic booms from 2 to 3 pounds overpressure per square foot will do damage to glass and plaster in isolated cases and that sonic booms creating overpressure of 3 to 5 pounds per square foot will cause widespread window and plaster damage. But the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in its statement to the committee in commenting on H.R. 8104, states that tests carried out by NASA in cooperation with the U.S. Air Force show that the lowest overpressure at which house windows were broken was 23 pounds per square foot, and most of the windows tested survived pressures exceeding 56 pounds per square foot.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me incredible that these two responsible agencies of government could have such divergent views on a single subject. It appears further, on the basis of all the research that I have done on this subject, that NASA is way off the pad in its analysis.

But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that here we have so vital an issue as the health and welfare of millions of Americans and the safety of property throughout the country involved and yet these two agencies can not agree on standards for damage due to sonic booms.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Bo Lundberg, director of Sweden's Aeronautical Research Institute, and one of the world's truly great authorities on this whole subject of sonic booms, stated the case clearly when he said recently:

> Progress should imply the greatest possible gain in time forward, greatest possible number of passengers with the least possible disadvantage to the people on the ground.

If I had any confidence that the agencies in charge of policing the aviation industry in this industry have any serious concern for the plight of the people on the ground, Mr. Speaker, I would not be introducing H.R. 8104.

But experience has shown us repeatedly that the considerations of those on the ground must repeatedly give way to the desire to haul passengers in the air at a degree of convenience most acceptable to the air passengers and industry.

I do not believe that millions of Americans, including a substantial segment of my own constituency, should be exposed to the ravages of uncontrolled sonic booms merely to trim the flying time of anyone from New York to Los Angeles by perhaps only 40 to 50 minutes. They can now make this trip in slightly more than 3 hours and in my judgment until the American people can be convinced that a supersonic jet can be developed which will not produce excessive sonic booms, this whole program of development of supersonic jets will have to remain on the shelf.

I grow impatient with those who would accuse me of impeding progress. On the contrary, I am trying to demonstrate here today a degree of foresight in the protection of our people that unfortunately, too often escapes those who have the greatest degree of responsibility in this field.

I have no intention of seeing the people of Chicago subject to a shower of falling glass in those big beautiful glass enclosed skyscrapers that we are building in Chicago because of an excessive sonic boom caused by a supersonic jet trying to get a load of passengers from New York to Los Angeles in 40 minutes less flying time.

The tests in Oklahoma City can indeed be a big help in this whole subject, but only if the FAA has the courage to increase the booms to the overpressures which we know the supersonic jets will have to produce to be efficiently and economically operational.

Mr. Speaker, I find great comfort in the fact that my own position has been fortified by the Airport Operators Club which the other day informed FAA Administrator Halaby that the noise from supersonic transports proposed by competing manufacturers must be "substantially reduced if they are to be acceptable at U.S. airports."

Following is the complete story from the wires of United Press International regarding the Airport Operators Club position.

It is my hope that this statement will be seriously considered by Congress in evaluating the merits of H.R. 8104.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks an excellent article in the Oklahoma City sonic boom experiment which was written by Mr. Richard Lewis, science editor of the Chicago Sun Times, which appeared in that publication, and I also ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the correspondence I referred to earlier:

A UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL DISPATCH

WASHINGTON.—Major airport operators told the FAA today that present supersonic airliner designs call for planes which are too noisy.

Emory L. Cox, president of the Airport Operators Club, informed FAA Administrator Najeeb E. Halaby that the noise from supersonic transports proposed by competing manufacturers must be "substantially reduced if they are to be acceptable at U.S. airports."

Cox and other airport executives were briefed recently by FAA officials on the SST design submitted by three airframe and three engine manufacturers. Cox said not a single design appeared to be acceptable from the standpoint of noise suppression.

Even though FAA has said it would not award a contract for any SST that produced noise levels greater than current subsonic jets, "the strong impression gained by our members attending your briefing is that the full extent of neither the requirements of persons on the ground nor the economic ramifications with respects to costs by airports are being considered by the FAA," Cox said in a letter to Halaby.

The airport official said if the SST noise levels are not reduced, "the resulting land acquisition and other costs around U.S. airports to be served by the SST can add billions to the national cost of the SST."

Cox reminded Halaby that many lawsuits have been filed against airport owners resulting from noises produced by present jets. He added:

"Now, while the SST is in the design stage, is the time to provide manufacturers with noise criteria tolerable to the communities adjacent to airports instead of waiting as was done with subsonic planes, until the aircraft is built and ready to go into service before the noise suppression and noise abatement steps are taken."

Cox said an overnoisy SST would require acquisition of a "buffer" zone that would cost a minimum of $350 million at a major airport. He also said the FAA has not taken into consideration the cost of providing runways and taxiways sufficient to accommodate the heavier SST's.

Representatives of 10 major U.S. airlines meet with the FAA Wednesday and Thursday to discuss evaluation of SST designs.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1964.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of this Agency with respect to H.R. 8104, a bill "To amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish minimum standards for operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States."

This bill will prohibit the operation in the U.S. navigable airspace of any civil supersonic aircraft generating sonic boom overpressures above 1.5 pounds per square foot. Additionally, the bill will prohibit the operation of supersonic aircraft which produce a ground noise level not substantially lower than that produced by subsonic jet aircraft.

While we share very deeply the concern behind this bill, we must oppose its enactment both on principle and in detail. Specifically, the limitation of permissible overpressures to 1.5 pounds per square foot will, we believe, critically affect the SST development program. While available scientific evidence indicates that such a minimum overpressure may be maintained during supersonic flight, moving across the barrier from subsonic to supersonic speed is expected to create brief (10–15 minutes) overpressures in the order of 2 pounds per square foot. These will occur approximately 150 miles from the departure airport. Limiting overpressures to 1.5 pounds per square foot will as a practical matter, restrict supersonic aircraft to overwater routes. The loss of market potential due to such a restriction would probably be so severe as to make commercial production of the SST economically unfeasible.

The limitations proposed on the aircraft's "ground noise level" are also open to objection. Actual runway noise levels during the takeoff of a supersonic transport cannot be expected to be substantially lower than those generated by today's jets, although we believe they can be kept within tolerable limits. Noise generated along the approach and departure paths by the takeoff and landing of supersonic aircraft will, we believe, be equal to or less than that produced by current aircraft. We do not think it wise, however, to be committed at this point to a legislative requirement that supersonic noise levels will be substantially lower.

What is, in fact, possible in meeting the changing needs of the public with the means provided by an expanding technology is not fully knowable in advance. For this reason, we have considerable doubt about the principle of legislating specific scientific objectives. Objectives, of course must be set. We believe, however, that it is much too early in the development of the SST embryo to begin imposing rigid technical standards in permanent legislative form. More helpful at this point is a firm desire to produce an acceptable aircraft translated into useful standards to guide the development process.

Such a set of design objectives is spelled out in the enclosed "Request for Proposals for the Development of a Commercial Supersonic Transport." It is our belief that noise should be one primary design parameter in the development of this aircraft. You will note that the goals in the areas of sonic boom overpressures (sec. 2.5) and ground noise levels (sec. 2.6) are as close to the recommendations of H.R. 8104 as is possible, given the current state of the art. As is made clear in section 1.7.5 and elsewhere, we intend to insist on these general requirements. This insistence, unencumbered by any frozen legislative imperatives, will allow the effective direction and channeling of the scientific and engineering effort necessary to insure that the supersonic transport will be in all respects a good neighbor.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1964.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of August 19, 1963, requesting the Board's comments with respect to H.R. 8104, a bill to amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish minimum standards for operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States.

H.R. 8104 would prohibit the operation of any civil supersonic aircraft in air transportation through the navigable airspace of the United States which would generate sonic boom overpressures exceeding 1.5 pounds per square foot on the ground directly beneath the flight path, and would make it unlawful to operate any such aircraft into or out of U.S. airports unless it can be demonstrated that ground noise level generated by such aircraft is substantially lower than that generated by long-range subsonic jet aircraft.

The Board favors action designed to encourage the development of supersonic aircraft which gives consideration to the noise abatement problem. At the same time, the Board believes, as pointed out in your committee's report on Investigation and Study of Aircraft Noise Problems (H. Rept. No. 36, 88th Cong.), that the physical creation of aircraft noise should be recognized as a scientific problem which cannot be resolved by legislative action. Moreover, as your committee also indicated, the primary responsibility for research and development of noise suppression in the design of aircraft and powerplants should continue to rest with the airframe manufacturers and the powerplant manufacturers.

The imposition of specific limits of tolerance on the operation of supersonic aircraft without giving regard to the research and development now being conducted in this area by various private agencies and several governmental institutions could not only result in excessive costs in the development of such aircraft, but also constitute a serious deterrent to such development.

The Board believes, therefore, that the development of supersonic airframes and powerplants meeting the standards of noise abatement can be better promoted by continuation of the research presently being conducted by both industry and the Government, and by effective agency action implementing the results of such research, than by the proposed legislation.

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD,
Acting Chairman.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 9, 1964.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for comments of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and report on H.R. 8104, a bill to amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish minimum standards for operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States.

The legislation would amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1430) by adding a new subsection entitled "Prohibitions Regarding Sonic Booms and Excessive Noise in Civil Supersonic Aircraft Operations."

The provisions of subsection (c) of section 610 would make it unlawful to operate civilian supersonic aircraft in air transportation through the navigable airspace of the United States when such operation would generate sonic boom overpressures exceeding 1.5 pounds per square foot on the ground directly beneath the flight path.

In subsection (d) the legislation would make it unlawful to operate any civil supersonic aircraft into or out of U.S. airports unless it can be demonstrated that the ground noise level generated is substantially lower than that generated by long-range subsonic jet aircraft. The exemptions provided in section 610(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1421(c)) could not be applied to the proposed section 610 (c) and (d).

It is the view of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that, as is indicated below, the severe restrictions set forth in the proposed legislation would in effect prohibit the research necessary to the development of a U.S. supersonic transport. At the same time, these limitations would seriously hamper the research and the technological development necessary to the solution of the sonic boom problem.

On the basis of currently available knowledge, it would be premature to place an arbitrary restriction on the magnitude of sonic booms which may be generated by supersonic commercial aircraft. The tolerable levels for sonic boom overpressures have not been established. Results from research indicate that public reaction to booms creating pressures of the order of 2 to 2.5 pounds per square foot is the same as the public reaction to booms which create pressures of 1.5 pounds per square foot. Moreover, the damage caused by such pressures should not be exaggerated. In tests carried out by NASA, in cooperation with the USAF, the lowest overpressure at which house windows were broken was 23 pounds per square foot and most of the windows tested survived pressures exceeding 56 pounds per square foot.

The proposed legislation would seriously hamper the development of the U.S. supersonic transport. In order to assure that a sonic boom overpressure will not exceed an overpressure of 1.5 pounds per square foot on the ground, it would be necessary to design the aircraft so that the average overpressure created during cruise would not exceed 1.15 pounds per square foot. This reduction for design purposes to 1.15 pounds per square foot is necessary because of deviation of boom overpressures due to variable atmospheric conditions. The deviation has been observed to run about 30 percent from the mean. Preliminary design estimates indicate that the supersonic transport must weigh at least 400,000 pounds. Only an aircraft whose weight does not exceed 200,000 pounds can operate at supersonic cruise conditions without exceeding 1.15 pounds per square foot ground overpressures. On the basis of present technology, the preliminary analyses reveal that in order to limit the mean overpressure to 1.5 pounds per square foot in the supersonic climb, which is required for transition to cruise flight, the aircraft takeoff weight of 400,000 pounds would be excessive.

With respect to the ground noise limitations set forth in subsection (d), NASA is of the opinion that at this stage of engine development for the supersonic transport it is too restrictive to require that the on-ground noise level be substantially lower than that of long-range subsonic jet aircraft.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration recommends strongly against the enactment of H.R. 8104.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. CALLAGHAN,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 8, 1964.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Defense for the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H.R. 8104, 88th Congress, a bill "To amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish minimum standards for operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States." The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Air Force the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

The purpose of H.R. 8104 is to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish minimum noise level and sonic boom standards for the operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States. While the bill refers specifically to civil aircraft, it must be recognized that the Department of Defense also operates supersonic aircraft and that any limitations imposed upon civil supersonic aircraft constitute a basis for possible future limitations on military aircraft.

In the area of noise suppression, as in other technical aspects of the development of supersonic transport aircraft, it is not possible to know fully in advance what goals can be achieved by an expanding technology. For this reason we consider it inadvisable to seek to establish specific scientific objectives by statute. Design objectives should, of course, be set by the responsible agencies to guide the development process, but the imposition of rigid technical standards, even by regulation, should be limited to standards which have already been demonstrated by the development process to be definitely attainable. Consequently, while we understand the concern behind H.R. 8104, the Department of Defense must oppose its enactment on principle. Since the development of a supersonic transport aircraft is of primary concern to the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Defense defers to that Agency for detailed comments on the technical aspects of the bill.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. CHARLES,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

EXECUTIVE ORDER OF THE
PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1964.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 8104, a bill "to amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish minimum standards for operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States."

In their reports to you on this bill the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense all oppose enactment of this legislation for the reasons stated therein. The Bureau of the Budget agrees generally with the views presented by these agencies and does not, therefore, recommend enactment of H.R. 8104.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 22, 1964]

OKLAHOMA BOOMING IN JET NOISE TESTS ON CITY

(By Richard Lewis)

OKLAHOMA CITY.—Capt. James E. Short, zoomed up from Tinker Air Force Base and put his F-104 fighter into a steep climb over the eroded peaks of the Wichita Mountains.

He turned sharply into the northeast. Ahead, in the sunrise, was his target. The towers of downtown Oklahoma City gleamed like tiny golden pins in the olive drab plains.

BLIP ON RADAR

"This is Bongo Operations," said Lt. Col. David Lillard. "You are 5 miles off track."

He spoke conversationally into a microphone at the Federal Aviation Agency's Aeronautical Center here.

"Roger," said the pilot. "Coming up on track."

The chief of Operation Bongo, J. Kenneth Power of the FAA, picked up his microphone. "Start your recorders," he said.

Tiny red and green lights gleamed in banks of amplifiers and tape recorders in the living room of a three-bedroom, frame house at 919 Kenilworth Drive.

Ready in the air. Ready on the ground. A chime announced the hour of 7 a.m.

Then a sharp, harsh crack of thunder rolled out of the sky. In a downtown restaurant, it whoomed against a plate glass window like a giant basketball.

THOSE CRAZY BOOMS

"Those crazy booms," said the waitress, setting down her tray. "They like to make a person jump right out of her skin."

Many Americans have heard occasional sonic booms—perhaps suspecting a nearby explosion—but with regularly scheduled supersonic transport aircraft just around the corner, how will the populace react to regular, dish-rattling booms?

Should air traffic be allowed to fly supersonic over centers of population? Will people stand for it? Will booms damage property—breaking glass, shattering china, and cracking plaster? Will they damage health by unduly startling people with heart or neurological ailments?

Or can most people become accustomed to sonic booms?

Captain Short's sonic boom over Oklahoma City was designed to supply some of the answers.

REASON FOR TESTS

It was the first of eight sonic booms scheduled for the 20th day of Operation Bongo, the most extensive experiment in aviation history—and probably the most irritating.

Through this unprecedented test, the FAA and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are trying to determine the effects of repeated sonic booms on people, animals, and buildings.

On the data obtained from this experiment may depend the design and flight patterns of tomorrow's supersonic jet transports—the SST aircraft now being developed by Great Britain and France, the United States and the Soviet Union.

Operation Bongo started here February 3. It will continue until July 4 unless it is stopped by a court injunction or by political pressure.

One suit to halt the experiment is pending in the U.S. district court here. Another is threatened. So far, most Oklahoma Cityans and suburban dwellers in range of the booms accept them with good-natured resignation.

THEY'RE EXCITING

"Oh, they're exciting," said a pretty secretary. "I get up with the first boom (at 7 a.m.) and I'm out of the shower with the second (at 7:30 a.m.). That's how I know when I'm late."

"I think this will put Oklahoma City on the map," said a real estate agent. "We need some kind of boom around here."

But there is a rising tide of opposition—based mainly on annoyance. Much of it stems from citizens' resentment that they were made guinea pigs in the experiment without being consulted.

FAA has received about 2,000 complaints about the booms. They are alleged to have broken windows, cracked plaster walls, stopped hens from laying eggs, frightened children, and, in one case, prevented a lady from being able to tune in channel 5 on her television set.

However, only 17 complainants have filled out affidavits of damage on the form 95, which the FAA supplies for that purpose.

ANIMALS JUMPY

At the city's Lincoln Park Zoo, Director Warren Thomas said the booms made the animals jumpy. A farmer at El Reno, a nearby town, said he observed a tom turkey chasing a hen when a boom struck. The tom never broke stride, he said.

"I think it's a disgrace we don't have a chance to vote on this question," said a housewife in a newspaper letter.

FAA officials don't quite know what to make out of the mixed bag of complaints. Project Chief Power stated that not a single instance of structural damage resulting from booms has been found.

Sonic boom is a law of nature and the inevitable consequence of supersonic flight in the atmosphere. It is produced by an airplane flying at or faster than mach 1, the speed of sound.

At sea level when the temperature is 59° F., mach 1 is 770 miles an hour. This varies with altitude and air temperature. At 65,000 feet, where the Anglo-French SST, the Concorde, will fly, mach 1 is only 660 miles an hour.

WHY IT BOOMS

The boom effect is caused by an aircraft pushing air molecules out of its way faster than they can disperse through other air molecules.

The molecules being pushed bunch up or compress in a wave, which is at higher pressure than the surrounding air.

It is called a wave of overpressure, and it resembles water waves flowing out from the bow of a ship.

The waves flow slantwise to the ground from the aircraft in widening cones.

At ground level, the overpressure is heard as a sharp detonation.

CAN'T PREVENT IT

There is no way of preventing sonic boom by an aircraft flying at or above mach 1. But the loudness of the boom can be controlled by keeping the pressure down to 2 pounds or less.

This can be done by the design of the aircraft, its "angle of attack" or position in which it flies, the manner in which it is piloted, and by adjusting the speed to atmospheric conditions.

Since the boom is heard usually within an area of 10 to 15 miles on either side of the flight path, the route of a supersonic transport becomes a principal factor in control.

In the $16,000 bungalow at 919 Kenilworth Drive in Oklahoma City, 15 strain gages and 15 accelerometers measure the impact of the booms on the sheetrock wallboard and 2-by-4 studs. Windows, mirrors, fancy glass, radios, and television are checked daily.

In 20 days of booms at overpressures of 1 and 1½ pounds per square foot, no damage has been detected here or in three other houses similarly "bugged" by the FAA and NASA.

The next step is to raise the overpressure to 2 full pounds. Booms will be louder, more jarring.

The people of the Oklahoma City metropolitan area are not simply guinea pigs. They are judges, for their response in Operation Bongo will define in large measure the boundaries of commercial flight in the supersonic age ahead.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE WHEAT-COTTON BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as I announced under the 1-minute rule this morning, I take the floor to discuss some aspects of the procedures of the House under which we are going to consider after the Easter recess what is known as the cotton-wheat bill.

I was quite interested to note that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] took the floor of the House under special order to discuss the wheat-cotton bill. I was glad he did. But it clearly demonstrated in the process the inadequacy of the procedures that are gonig to be utilized by this House to consider and discuss this very important measure that will be before us.

I regret the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is not on the floor at the present time, and did not have time to yield to me. He stated in the process of his remarks that he hoped I, the gentleman from Missouri, would utilize some time during the Easter recess to study the wheat bill. I shall do so. I have studied it to some degree, and I hope the rest of the Members of the House will too, but I point out again the fact that under the rule that would be proposed this House would not have the opportunity in the well of the House to exchange views. That is the purpose of debate and discussion, and that is the purpose of the entire congressional system.

Here is the point I was making to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. I regret I do not see him present, although I asked him if he would be present when I took this 10 minutes, because twice when I sought to interrogate him on the floor and engage in colloquy on this point, he refused to yield. That is no way to exchange viewpoints. I can be in error on my point of view, but the way to hammer these things out is to have an open exchange of views. That is the purpose of the well of the House, that is the purpose of the congressional system.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the majority leader and I must say the leadership of the House, falls back as a defense for this procedure under which we will debate the wheat-cotton bill, that the will of the majority should prevail. There is no question about our complete agreement on that point in the House. I more so probably than many of my colleagues feel, some of the procedures we have established in the House to preserve the process of debate and discussion perhaps have been unwieldly and have to some degree undoubtedly delayed the majority in reaching a determination on some of these matters. So there is no question about the agreement that the function of the House and indeed the Congress is to have the majority work its will. The whole question, though, is: How does the majority work its will?

Under our traditions, under our rules, indeed, under our Constitution, the idea is to reach these decisions of the majority after full discussion, after full study, after debate, and that debate usually, I suggest, does include the right to amend. Our rules of the House are written to make these provisions.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has pointed out that this procedure under which we will debate the wheat-cotton bill is provided in the rules of the House itself and therefore he uses that as an argument for justifying it. Yes, the majority in the House can work its will at any time and it can, if the majority decides, ride roughshod over the minority. But I might say that is clear proof that the arguments that I have heard so often from the majority leadership in the House that matters have been held up in the Rules Committee preventing the majority from working its will were without foundation. The truth is that the things that were held up in the Rules Committee were things that the majority leadership either knew they did not have the majority vote for or, for various reasons, decided they did not want it on the floor of the House for debate and discussion.

Back in the days when we had this debate over the enlargement of the Rules Committee, as many will recall, I was one on our side of the aisle who said that if the majority leadership wanted to enlarge the Rules Committee on the ground that they could not work their will in the Rules Committee, I for one would recommend to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle to go along, not that I agreed with them; quite the contrary. I felt it was a specious argument. I felt that the Rules Committee never had the power and does not have the power today to block legislation from coming on the floor of the House, because we have had procedures clearly set out under the Calendar Wednesday Rule so that this can be done and the majority can work its will.

But I said:

> OK; let them have the enlarged Rules Committee, and then let them explain to the people of this country why matters remain held up in the Rules Committee.

This did prevail and, I might say, it did prevail because I was able to persuade enough of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to give the necessary votes so that the Rules Committee was enlarged. But at the time I was debating this matter in the well of the House I said I was really concerned about what might be the real purpose in mind behind the enlargement of the Rules Committee. Far from trying to help the House of Representatives work the will of the majority, it looked to me as if this might be an attempt to gain power to abuse this principle of representative government of adequate debate and discussion before the majority should work its will.

I referred back to the New Deal days, in the first 100 days of the New Deal, when the Rules Committee was used as a technique to bring out gag rules so that the House was unable to fully debate and discuss and amend these important measures, so that the executive branch of the Government was able to whip up a propaganda campaign around the country, going directly to the people in disregard of the theory of debates and the congressional process. I said that maybe was in the minds of these people who claim that their idea is to let the will of the majority prevail; maybe what we are going to see coming out of the Rules Committee is more of these gag rules. And I say today it is very obvious that this power has been used for this purpose.

The only defense that can possibly be made for bringing the wheat-cotton bill out on the floor of the House under this rule is not that the House does not have time to debate the matter.

But here we are the day before the official Easter recess doing nothing but going through special orders and we have a whole week of recess. So it is obviously not a lack of time but a lack of desire of the leadership of the House to bring this matter up so that it can be adequately and fully debated, and with the possibility of amendment so that we could get proper legislation.

Yes, there is a practical political matter and this is a real contrast because in the other body we have just the opposite going on where under the rules of the other body a real filibuster can be conducted and a willful minority can prevent or hold up the actions of the majority on legislation. That is the reason behind hampering the House of Representatives from debating at all a matter that has nothing to do with this subject. It is a very poor reason I suggest for the political party that is in dominance of both these Houses of Congress and the executive branch of the Government. Yes, indeed, I feel deeply that this rule that is coming out hits at the very heart of representative government and will destroy it.

REPORT ON CIVIL DEFENSE MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my deep concern about the failure of the Federal Government to set a clear course for an effective civil defense program is well known to the Members of the House. I will not now repeat the reasons for my concern because I have done so on many other occasions.

Last September, the House had an opportunity to work its will and to record its endorsement of a national fallout shelter program when it passed H.R. 8200. It followed the wise counsel of the Armed Services Committee, under the distinguished leadership of its chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and his able deputy in charge of the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. Unfortunately the other body has deferred action on H.R. 8200. The decision to defer was made by the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, announced in a letter dated March 4, 1964, and made public shortly thereafter.

The failure of the Senate to act on this important civil defense legislation and the departure of the Honorable Steuart L. Pittman from his post as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense are two events closely related in time and subject to possible misunderstanding. I want to give this House my view of the situation, because I do not believe that it signifies defeat for a Federal civil defense program. I have examined into the background of these events, and I shall make certain observations both about the legislative situation and about Mr. Pittman's decision to leave the Government.

First of all, the chairman of the Senate subcommittee which considered H.R. 8200 made it clear in his letter of March 4 to Secretary Pittman that action was being deferred on the civil defense bill only "for the present" and on the basis of "several factors not necessarily related to the substance of the bill."

The chairman of the Senate subcommittee took the position in his letter that ballistic missile defense and the shelter program were closely tied together and that decisions affecting both defense areas "should be similarly related."

In one sense, this statement can be construed as an affirmation of the significant interrelationships of civil defense and other defense programs in the total defense posture of the Nation. Certainly there should be no disagreement with that. On the other hand, if the sense of this statement is to tie the future of civil defense to highly costly and complex defense systems which may never get beyond the research and development stage, then I believe we are making a fatal mistake.

The testimony of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees describing the defense outlook for the next 5 years and the budgetary requirements for fiscal year 1965, throws light on this whole subject. Secretary McNamara devoted one whole section of his lengthy presentation to civil defense. He gave a status report on the civil defense program and emphasized that it was an integral and essential part of the total defense posture. It was his considered judgment that a well planned and executed nationwide civil defense program centered around fallout shelters could contribute much more, dollar for dollar, toward the saving of lives in the event of a nuclear attack upon the United States than could either the strategic striking forces or the continental air and missile defense programs. This is not to say that civil defense is more important than our striking forces as a deterrent to nuclear war. The point of the statement is that for a given number of dollars, civil defense buys many more lives than other defense systems. This is indeed an important finding, to be kept constantly in mind; and it suggests at once that civil defense deserves priority attention, not postponement until a whole range of other costly and complicated decisions are made.

In the part of his testimony dealing with antimissile defense, Secretary McNamara pointed to the heavy costs of research, development, production, and deployment under the Nike X program, which is still in the R. & D. stage. His conservative estimate was $16 billion for putting down one possible Nike X system, and substantial additional amounts each year for operation and maintenance. Far more important than the heavy costs, Secretary McNamara added, was the fact that the effectiveness of a ballistic missile defense system for saving lives depended to a large part upon an adequate civil defense system. Without adequate fallout shelters, the enemy could target its missiles at points outside the defended areas and kill the people by fallout.

For this reason, Secretary McNamara said in his testimony, and here I am quoting:

For this reason, the very austere civil defense program recommended by the President * * * should be given priority over procurement and deployment of any major additions to the active defenses.

You will note here what I have already suggested, that civil defense deserves priority. Civil defense is requisite to expansion of antimissile defense. But civil defense is valuable and necessary in its own right. Civil defense is a far more economical lifesaving measure than equivalent dollar additions to strategic retaliatory or active defense systems. Civil defense, that much scorned and derided activity, is a good buy, a good bargain, if we may use these words in talking of such precious commodities as the lives of the people, the life of the Nation.

I dare to hope, therefore, that civil defense will not be relegated to the heap of unsolved problems and deferred until such time as every vexing defense problem is ready for solution. Civil defense should be first in time and is, in fact, least in cost. It is the quickest and best lifesaving defense system we have for the immediate future. I trust that the committee of jurisdiction in the other body will consider the matter in this light, and that the Secretary of Defense will make it crystal clear in his next posture and budget presentation to the Congress that action on civil defense is imperative.

We can take a note of encouragement from a public statement Secretary McNamara issued a few days ago in which he said:

I foresee a firm and high priority for civil defense as an integral part of our national security effort.

He went on to say that the administration would press its civil defense program as the lowest cost possibility for saving lives under nuclear attack, whether the strategic forces package to be presented next year is large or small.

Referring again to the March 4 letter of the Senate subcommittee chairman, I am pleased to note that he has described the current civil defense effort under Mr. Pittman's leadership as "well managed," with "well defined and practical objectives." A similar conclusion was reached after hearings by the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in 1962 and by the House Armed Services Committee last summer.

I have talked with Steuart Pittman about his resignation and there is no question about his motives. He was able to undertake the assignment only on the understanding that he could return to his law practice after 2 years, and he has overstayed by 6 months because the shelter bill was pending. He tells me that the only reason that would have led him to change his plans would have been failure to bring the civil defense program out of the woods. His cautious optimism that a new civil defense program has been firmly launched appears to me to be justified. A shelter system for 70 million people is in the advanced stage of preparation and has made possible a new realism in civil defense organization, training, and planning. Civil defense planning has been effectively tied in to military planning.

Military operations and organization are taking on a capacity to supplement and support civil defense. State and local civil defense has adjusted successfully to a more unified and coherent national effort. These achievements are the direct result of a new professional competence in the management and leadership of civil defense. This change has been brought about by Secretary Pittman and the able staff which he has assembled.

I want to say a word about Steuart Pittman, whom I have come to know well both personally and professionally during his 2½ years in office. During the House debate on the shelter bill, this man was given his due by unusually laudatory comments from many Members of the House. So what I have to say is not new to you. I can think of no more difficult and lonely high post in Government than heading civil defense. It requires a selfless man who is not discouraged by the difficulty of communicating with the public, with Congress, and even with his colleagues in Government who are on a different wavelength, which does not readily admit the possibility of disaster. It also requires exceptional management ability and imaginative programing to get things done under the kind of loose civil defense organization which we now have in the United States.

Steuart Pittman leaves his post with the high regard of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the key people in this administration. He is widely respected by the Congress as a uniquely able public servant, who has changed many minds about the need for civil defense. While the newpapers and columnists of the country have done their share of ridiculing and doubting civil defense, they have consistently recognized Steuart Pittman as the kind of man who contributes more than he gets from public service.

For my part, I think it is one of our great problems that the Government does not offer a career which brings men of this kind of integrity and ability to higher responsibility and keeps them there. However, I am confident that Steuart Pittman will be persuaded to participate again in a vital way in public affairs and I am glad his law practice is in Washington where his advice and experience will be readily available to the Government.

Finally, I want to say that I hope and expect that Secretary McNamara will see the high priority for civil defense, which he has publicly predicted, translated into action on a nationwide shelter system, backed by firm Federal leadership and support. Evidence of the priority for civil defense at the point of critical action on legislation and appropriations has not been entirely convincing to date. Congress will do its part when the President and the Defense Establishment make it clear that this program is vital and can be delayed no longer.

THE GOLENIEWSKI CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was present on the floor today when our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], my friend, delivered his remarks in defense of CIA. I listened with great interest to his analysis of the Michal Goleniewski case, his charge of irresponsible journalism placed against the New York Journal American for its series of articles on this case, and his statement that the CIA Subcommittee of which he is a member went into every aspect of this case.

I want to make it clear I have no intention to enter into the dispute between my colleague from Illinois and my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], over the article by the latter on CIA which appeared in Esquire magazine, which I have not had an opportunity to read. Nor do I desire at this time to engage in the issue over the necessity of a joint committee for the oversight of CIA, the case stated by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

What I am concerned about is the blanket statement made by my colleague from Illinois concerning the Michal Goleniewski case as reported in the New York Journal American. Let me quote the particular statements in my colleague's remarks which give me concern:

I might add that the CIA Subcommittee of which I am a member, went into every aspect of this case. I am personally satisfied that the publicized statements purported to come from Michal Goleniewski are not correct. The information as reported in the press is not in agreement with the information Michal Goleniewski has made available to many departments of Government.

Stories such as have been circulated on this case display a reckless regard for the truth. They can be harmful, and those who circulate them do a great disservice to maintaining public confidence in the CIA.

By his statements the impression is created that my colleague and other members of the CIA Subcommittee are completely informed on all the facets and implications of the Goleniewski case. I question the accuracy of that statement, not because I question the integrity of my colleague and friend, but because I am convinced that if he and the other members of his subcommittee were completely informed on all the facets and implications of this case he would not have delivered the remarks he has made today. I say this because I have confidence in the gentleman from Illinois and all the members of the Subcommittee on CIA, of which he is a member. That confidence is based upon the hard road of experience and the proven integrity and dedication of all the members of the subcommittee. That is not the issue in the Goleniewski case. To raise that issue or to have it interjected by others can serve no other purpose but to confuse the real issue which goes to the heart of the safety, the security, and the future happiness of all the people who elect their Representatives to Congress.

A great and dedicated American, Al Smith, used to say, "Let's look at the record"—or at least part of the RECORD today.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], discusses the Goleniewski case, but what he leaves out is far more important than what he has said.

In an earnest effort to assist him and the other members of the House CIA Subcommittee, I present the following questions for consideration by the members of that subcommittee.

First. Have the members of the subcommittee personally interviewed Michal Goleniewski and if they have had that opportunity, how much time was spent with him and to what extent was he questioned with respect to political intelligence and Russian KGB agent infiltration into the vital organs of our Government?

Second. If the members of the House CIA Subcommittee have probed deeply into KGB agent penetration of the vital organs of our Government, are the members satisfied that everything that needs to be done has been done by the security arms of our Government to ferret out and prosecute the guilty?

Presuming the members of the House CIA Subcommittee have interrogated Mr. Goleniewski in depth, which I sincerely hope is the case, I raise these additional questions:

First. Is it not true that Goleniewski, who defected to the United States in 1961, had revealed deep penetration into the CIA by Russian KGB agents?

Second. Is it not true that Goleniewski has told how over $1 million of CIA funds fell into the hands of the Russian KGB and about $400,000 of this money was pumped back into the Communist Party, U.S.A., to pay for their operations to destroy our country?

Third. Is it not true that Michal Goleniewski has been discouraged by certain CIA officials in his efforts to present what he calls political intelligence and which he regards as essential to the defeat of international communism?

Fourth. Did Goleniewski name Russian KGB agents in both the State Department and CIA and state that to date none of these agents have been arrested or prosecuted?

I regret exceedingly that limitation of time under the special order permitted to my good friend, the able and distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], did not afford any time for me to ask him questions and to hear his response. After his remarks I spoke to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and advised him that I would request time to address the House to raise a number of questions concerning the Goleniewski case. I have raised those questions. They are serious questions. The American people have a right to hear forthright answers to those questions. I hope they will be answered.

There is no question about CIA being one of the most important agencies of our Government, particularly during this period of international uncertainties and anxieties.

The CIA can be used for immense good or terrible evil. The CIA can be used to save this country from the tyranny of communism or it can be used to deliver this Nation into the bonds of communism.

The CIA can be used to waste millions of dollars of taxpayers money and lose countless millions of lives, or it can be used to save nations and this country from the dread yoke of communism.

The CIA can be useful through good and accurate intelligence estimates to guide U.S. policy decisions to victories over communism or, through slanted intelligence estimates, to take this country down a road of appeasement until there is no other choice but all-out nuclear war or surrender.

These are not only critical times, but these times are decisive for our country, for the cause of universal freedom, for the cause of a just and lasting world peace.

It is time that Congress faces up to its responsibility and obtains the answers—the full story of Russian agent penetration of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, as a man who believes in the message of Holy Week, I am an optimist. But I also believe it is high time we weeded out of our Government all those who wear the cloak of Judas so that we can freely spread the great message of American liberties, freedoms, and individual dignity throughout the world.

THE CONSUMER AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, believing that widespread citizen involvement in public affairs is essential in today's world, I have said often that Members of Congress have a special responsibility to bring substantive issues to their communities for discussion. Every effort must be made to encourage the individual citizen to participate in government and to make his voice heard.

Since my election to Congress, together with the Reform Democratic Clubs of Manhattan's West Side, I have sponsored an annual all-day community conference. Our nonpartisan conferences provide a unique opportunity for a sharing of knowledge and ideas on major issues.

On February 1, 1964, we sponsored our fourth annual all-day conference. This year's topic, "The Consumer and the Economy," attracted more than 1,000 concerned citizens who attended the 6 panels and the plenary session at International House. As in past years, the enthusiastic response demonstrated that this effort to bring together citizens, Government officials, labor and business representatives, university professors, and other experts produces a stimulating forum. The cross-fertilization engenders new thinking and fresh approaches which are vital in a democratic society.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a deep debt of appreciation to Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, our former Ambassador to India, and George Collins, acting secretary-treasurer of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, for their contributions to the plenary session and to the experts who participated in the panels. Among the outstanding panelists were: Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; George P. Larrick, Commissioner, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; William Capron, President's Council of Economic Advisers; and J. A. Stockfisch, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Treasury Department.

The participating clubs were: Ansonia Independent Democrats, F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democrats, Fort Washington-Manhattanville Reform Democrats, Heights Reform Democrats, J.F.K. Midcity Democrats, New Chelsea Reform Democrats, Reform Independent Democrats, Riverside Democrats, West Side Democratic Club, and Columbia-Barnard Democratic Club.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and congratulate Hermine Brucker and Daniel J. Nelson, cochairmen, whose tireless efforts and leadership made the conference such a success. I also want to express my appreciation to all those who worked along with them, including Janet F. Schmidt, secretary; Ira Zimmerman, treasurer; Susan Cohn, club coordinator; Judith Charles and Carmen Pertierra, publicity; Sara Silon, arrangements director; Robert V. Engle, program design; the club representatives: Frank Baraff, Barbara Blake, Daniel Chill, Robert Clampitt, Gerald Duffy, Daniel Livingston, Eileen Lottman, Leonard Plato, and Emil Schattner; the panel chairmen: Max Dombrow, Noel Ellison, Andrew Goldman, Marvin Lieberman, Kurt Salzinger, Morton Schiff, and Irving Wolfson.

I would also like to note the valuable services of the West Side public officials who acted as moderators of the various panels: State Senator Manfred Ohrenstein, State Assemblymen Albert Blumenthal and Jerome Kretchmer, and City Councilmen Theodore Weiss and Paul O'Dwyer. Mrs. Matilda De Silva of the Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, also served as a panel moderator.

In order to make sure that the program would be open to the public without charge, a large number of community sponsors generously responded, indicating that the people of the West Side are proud to support the annual conferences.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to mention all of the individuals who have worked to make our conferences possible. However, I know that without the incredible energy, devotion, and commitment of the late Gertrude Miller who pioneered the earlier conferences, this year's forum would not have been so successful.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an article reporting the address of Senator HART and Professor Galbraith at the plenary session which appeared on February 6, 1964, in the Morningsider, the weekly community newspaper published in the Morningside Heights area:

[From the Morningsider, Feb. 6, 1964]

GALBRAITH URGES BATTLE AGAINST "HUMBUG"

John Kenneth Galbraith, the Canadian-born Harvard economist who has written, talked, or provoked much of the liberal dialog in America during the past 25 years, agitated Saturday in a talk at International House for a "revolution against humbug" in American life, intellect, politics, and foreign policy.

Professor Galbraith and Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, addressed an all-day public conference on "The Consumer and the Economy," sponsored by Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN, the Riverside Democrats, and nine other West Side Democratic clubs.

Congressman RYAN, who was scheduled to address the conference, stayed in Washington Saturday to participate in House debate on pending civil rights legislation. His wife, Priscilla, delivered his speech for him.

Professor Galbraith, who returned to Cambridge last year after serving 3 years as U.S. Ambassador to India, spoke despite an attack of influenza and a stuffed nose.

Hardly referring to his prepared text (which was on The Problem of Poverty), the 55-year-old author of "The Affluent Society" and former Fortune magazine editor, spoke to a standing-room-only assemblage of over 850 in the International House auditorium. A total of nearly 1,100 people turned out for the conference.

Professor Galbraith said that liberals and sensible people must wage a never-ending battle against humbug and profiteering in the political and economic establishments. He said he was delighted that a new generation of muckrakers led by such writers as Rachel Carson and Jessica Mitford were publishing disagreeable books.

"These people name names," he said. They are not afraid, he continued, to offend "General Motors, General Sarnoff, General Clay, or any of the other generals."

"We must show that horrid noises will come from sensible people * * * when concessions are made to the cave dwellers."

In a rambling talk, Professor Galbraith evoked laughter and applause with digressions on Panama ("we try to merchandise our errors and omissions as the machinations of the Communists. Castro has been responsible for everything that happens"), Goldwater ("poverty it would seem is caused by ignorance, lack of ambition, and failure to own a department store"), Rockefeller ("I have great sympathy for Nelson * * * 4 or 5 years ago he was for everything the establishment was for * * * now he's being advised (not even) to talk about home and mother"), and Members of the U.S. Senate ("I would like to see a study made of the effect of age on legislative performance.")

"Tokenism," Professor Galbraith said, "is an extension of humbug. (We cannot) close our eyes to * * * the bypassed people, the people who have been left in poverty."

In the past, we have hoped that a general increase in economic activity—a stepping up of the growth rate—would solve the problem. We have come now to realize that people can benefit from improved economic conditions only if they are able to participate in the economy. This means that they must be physically and mentally prepared. They must be in communities where there are job opportunities and they must not be denied opportunities because of race.

"The attack on poverty must be part of a new and enlarged concern for the quality of our public services. * * * It is the poor who need parks and whose children need swimming pools. Only the poor live in the slums and require the myriad of services that, we may hope, will one day mitigate urban congestion and public squalor * * * it is the schools of slum dwellers and wage and salary workers which would be principally improved by Federal aid to education. * * * It is the poor children who play in dirty streets. It is their fathers who get laid off when public works are suddenly cut back.

"Public services have, to use the economists word, a strong redistribution effect. And this effect is strongly in favor of those with lower incomes. Those who clamor the "loudest for public economy are," Professor Galbraith continued, "those for whom public services do the least. It is evident that tax reduction that affects public services has a double effect in comforting the comfortable and afflicting the poor."

Senator HART said that free competitive enterprise was present in the United States "more in theory than in practice."

"Advertising, promotional efforts, gimmickry and adherence to costly systems of distribution offer the consumer no substitute for price competition. The consumer must ultimately bear and pay for these costs.

"In the pharmaceutical industry, for example, it has been estimated that the $750 million for promotion to doctors alone ultimately may add more than a billion dollars to consumers' bills.

"One physician who appeared as a witness in the hearings of (my) Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly stated that the postage bill alone for the material mailed to physicians would build at least three large hospitals a year, and the annual cost of the advertising which went into physicians' wastebaskets could probably build and equip five hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will be interested in reading the excellent speech of Senator PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, in which he discusses the effects of nonprice competition in today's economy:

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, DEMOCRAT, OF MICHIGAN, TO THE FOURTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, N.Y., FEBRUARY 1, 1964

Nearly 200 years ago an English economist, Adam Smith, propounded a then revolutionary doctrine that the "Wealth of Nations" is best advanced through the operation of a system of free, private enterprise, in which prices are arrived at through vigorous competition among rival producers.

From that seed our own complex economic system has developed with its emphasis on vigorous price competition in free and open markets. The concept was enshrined in our antitrust laws which attempt to insure that prices will be freely arrived at without unreasonable restraint either by way of unfair trade practices, the exercise of monopoly power or combinations or agreements having as their object the placing of chains on an open market.

Yet today this foundation upon which our free enterprise economy is based may be sinking—although slowly—into a quagmire of nonprice competition.

Many forms of nonprice competition perform a useful role in our economy, but they should not become or be considered an acceptable substitute for price competition. For instance, advertising and packaging of consumer goods, when utilized for socially useful purposes, perform vital functions.

But my concern over nonprice competition stems from the fact that it may, on occasion, prevent the price system from performing its traditional and essential functions in our free enterprise economy. In many instances nonprice forms of competition tend to strike at the rational basis for consumer choice. The buyer many times is required to make his choices only on the grounds which the sellers permit—alternatives in physical appearance, packaging, service contracts, or advertising claims and other forms of sales promotion. Thus, in the packaging hearings I held for the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I was struck again and again by the roadblocks placed in the path of anyone who tries to buy the simplest forms of consumer goods on the basis of price. The American housewife is an intelligent woman, but this isn't enough when she walks into the supermarket today. Without an engineering degree and a slide rule in her pocketbook, often she simply cannot determine how much she is paying, per ounce or per pound, for anything from cereals to soap flakes. The consumer is faced with a bewildering array of packages in such a variety of sizes, shapes, weights, and possibly degrees of "slack filling" that accurate price comparisons become difficult, if not impossible—particularly if compounded by a net weight designation which can't be found. In this way consumers are forced to rely upon the nonprice competitive efforts of manufacturers who seek to avoid even the appearance of price competition.

In a recent Federal Trade Commission case which involved the packaging methods of a manufacturer of gift-wrapped material, Commissioner Elman had this to say:

"For a seller to package goods in containers which—unknown to the consumer—are appreciably oversized or in containers so shaped as to create the optical illusion of being larger than conventionally shaped containers of equal or greater capacity, is as much a deceptive practice and an unfair method of competition, as if the seller were to make an explicit false statement of the quantity or dimensions of his goods."

Even where there is an appearance of price competition, the appearance itself may be deceptive. One of the charges against the manufacturer in this same case was that he had preticketed his merchandise with fictitious prices so that retailers could have sales which supposedly offered great bargains to the consumer. The manufacturer made no effort to deny the charge; instead he contended that, since practically every company in the industry engages in the same misleading practice, it was unfair to single him out for complaint. These forms of nonprice competition serve only the sharpshooting manufacturer or producer at, literally, the expense of the consumer.

Another adverse characteristic of nonprice competition from the standpoint of the consumer can be its great cost for which the consumer, not the seller, must pay. The most dramatic examples of this cost were found in the course of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee's hearings on the prescription drug industry, in which the manufacturer's selling efforts are directed toward inducing the physician to prescribe by his particular trade name. Twenty-two of the largest drug companies provided data on their 1958 operations to the subcommittee. In that year their combined total of advertising and promotional expenses came to nearly $600 million. It was estimated that the total for the whole industry would have been at least $750 million in 1958, and probably the figure has risen substantially since then.

One physician who appeared as a witness in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly stated that the postage bill alone for the material mailed to physicians would build at least three large hospitals a year, and the annual cost of the advertising which went into physicians' wastebaskets could probably build and equip 50 hospitals. He suggested that: "It would take two railroad mailcars, 110 large mailtrucks, and 800 postmen to deliever the daily load of drug circulars and samples to doctors if mailed to one single city. Then after being delivered, it would take over 25 trash trucks to haul it away, to be burned on a dump pile whose blaze would be seen for 50 miles around."

Another physician pointed out that the amount the industry spent to persuade doctors to prescribe its products was nearly four times the combined operating budgets of all of the medical schools in the country.

The cost of nonprice competition to the consumer is sometimes staggering. Everyone recognizes the producer's need for advertising and marketing the sale of his products. But advertising, promotional efforts, gimmickry, and adherence to costly systems of distribution offer the consumer no substitute for price competition. The consumer must ultimately bear and pay for these costs. In the pharmaceutical industry, for example, it has been estimated that the $750 million for promotion to doctors alone ultimately may add more than a billion dollars to the consumers' bills as the specific markups over cost are added at the various levels of distribution. And if we follow this chain of reasoning through industry after industry, it becomes clear that much of the increase in the cost of living might well be caused by the increased cost of nonprice competition.

As indicated, the reason is that this is a form of competition in which the consumer reaps few benefits when compared to the in-pocket savings which price competition would provide. Nonprice competition also frequently works to the disadvantage of the small competitor, no matter how efficient he may be. Victory in some forms of nonprice competition may go not to the firm with the lower costs or the best product, but to the company which can spend the most on advertising, sales promotion, model changes, etc. In this kind of race the smaller competitive producer can seldom win. And as the smaller competitor loses his share of the market, another element tending to keep prices down disappears. The threat of market entry by new firms, the spur to keeping prices down where many independents are vying for a share of the market, diminishes as concentration in a given product market grows. And concentrated industries, in turn, can use their monopoly power to take even larger shares of the market through nonprice competitive techniques.

In fact, by your purchases you may be subsidizing a rise in your own cost of living.

Contributing to the decline of price competition and the emphasis on nonprice forms of competition is a practice called price leadership. It occurs, most often, in highly concentrated industries or in industries where one firm occupies a dominant position.

The leading firm establishes a price for the product which may or may not have a relationship to supply or demand, the classical regulators of the market. The other firms follow suit. The prospective buyer is faced with a single price for the product or finding a substitute. When this occurs in basic industries, the latter choice is not always readily available.

In this situation, rather than market forces controlling competition, the competitors are controlling the market.

Reference to the subcommittee hearings on administered prices in the steel industry may help to illustrate this problem.

As brought out in the hearings, before the formation of United States Steel in 1901, price competition in steel was the rule rather than the exception. Although efforts were sometimes made to control the market through loose pools or gentlemen's agreements, they generally broke down when demand fell off. It is true that prices rose when the steel business was booming, but it is equally true that prices would fall sharply whenever the demand for steel dropped much below the industry's production capacity.

The reasons for this were clearly stated by the U.S. Commissioner of Corporations in 1911: "In 1890 there were scarcely any consolidations of the modern type in the steel industry. [The industry] was characterized by the competition of a large number of independent concerns * * *. These concerns were distinct entities with respect to ownership."

The formation of the United States Steel Corp. in 1901 changed the industry's structure. Here, for the first time, was a company which—through control of ore and coal supplies, transportation facilities, pig iron, ingot, semifinished and finished steel capacity—was able to dominate the whole industry.

Since that time United States Steel's ability to "set the pace" has remained unchallenged. In 1936 the president of United States Steel could say, with great confidence, to Senator Burton K. Wheeler: "I would say we generally make the prices."

The bout between the late President Kennedy and the steel industry rather dramatically highlighted what I am talking about. At that time the forcefulness of a strong President caused the steel industry to backtrack. Since that time, however, selective price increases have been quietly at work.

Let me emphasize that there is nothing illegal involved in price leadership in and of itself. Nor do I intend these remarks to be a condemnation of the steel industry. So long as others are doing the same thing and the method of pricing does not violate the law, a good argument could be made out for this form of pricing by industry leaders.

The point is that our free enterprise economy does not work according to the classical model on which it is based. If the standard of price-leadership dominates pricing in basic materials, it can result in the consumer paying more for the finished product and lead to even greater reliance on nonprice forms of competition.

It is important that we be aware of these competitive forces at work in our economy and how they reach into the pocketbook of the consumer. It is important that we not close our eyes to economic reality and assume that the market is regulated in all cases by forces that, in fact, do not exist. It is important that we realize that the theoretical foundation of our free enterprise system may be present more in theory than in practice.

Having said this, I confess that I do not have the answers. But as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I can assure you that we will search assiduously for answers consistent with economic freedom. Certainly recognition of reality is the first step to finding solutions.

And I hope that I have also indicated that the antitrust laws are not a vague collection of rules about which only manufacturers and businessmen need be concerned.

The form of our antitrust laws and their administration directly affect every consumer. And the effect is concrete, not theoretical. The effect determines to a great extent how much your dollar will buy. And the buying power of the consumer dollar is in the long run what the antitrust laws are all about.

If I have confused rather than enlightened, let me say that this entire sphere of economic activity has sometimes been confused because of the darkness surrounding much of its operation. Hopefully, our Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in the years ahead can throw light in a way that will benefit both business and the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a summary of the morning panel on "Health Care: Cost and Quality" which was prepared by a reporter of the Morningsider:

Speakers: Dr. George Baehr, chairman, New York State Public Health Council; Mr. Edward J. Carroll, director of economic research, Merck & Co.; Miss Evelyn Dubrow, chairman, AFL-CIO Committee on Consumer Legislation; Dr. Gerald Dorman, member, board of trustees, AMA.

Dr. Baer said that the overall cost of drugs in the United States has decreased in the past decade because the consumption has increased. Each person now purchases 5½ prescriptions per year, he noted; the greater use of drugs arises from new medical discoveries. A few years ago, he said, a patient with pneumonia spent 2 weeks in the hospital and had only a fifty-fifty chance of recovering his health. Now, a patient spends 4 days in the hospital, is treated with antibiotics, and has a hundred percent chance of recovering, he continued. The treatment with antibiotics is costly, and individual patients find their care and drug costs expensive, yet, all in all, drug costs have decreased, he said.

Miss Dubrow spoke on the unions and medical care. She said that the unions were among the first to take out health insurance policies for their workers. In another vein, she said that production in factories and in other jobs fell off because workers avoid going to the doctor until they are seriously ill. If they could go when they are simply feeling "out of sorts" and receive a checkup and advice, they would have satisfaction and help, and would not lose worktime. The workers avoid doctors because of the high costs of office visits, but in so doing, they inflict upon themselves the even higher costs of medical care which they require later, when they are seriously ill.

There are many "drug" frauds against the American public, she said. Numerous television programs, she noted, advertise drugs that people can take for deficiencies or illnesses. Most of these drugs are nonessential to a person's health, but the television commercials make them sound absolutely essential, she said. Her answer to the medical problem in America was "cradle to grave" compulsory health programs, sponsored by the Government.

Dr. Dorman said that drugs purchased under their basic names are less expensive than the same drugs purchased under a brand name. As an example he cited aspirin, which is cheaper than aspirin preparations such as Anacin or Bufferin. Doctors are brainwashed by salesmen to purchase drugs under brand names, he said.

Dr. Dorman criticized the union health centers, which labor unions establish throughout the various cities in the United States. He believes that they are not centrally located for their workers' convenience. He also believes that the various unions should consolidate their medical care. Each union has a center of its own for its own workers and the various unions will not "get together" on handling each other's patients, he said.

Mr. Speaker, there follows a summary of the morning panel on "Automation, Unemployment and Poverty" which was prepared by a reporter of the Morningsider:

Speakers: William Capron, President's Council of Economic Advisers; Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America"; George Collins, acting secretary-treasurer, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers; Robert Lekachman, professor of economics, Barnard College.

Mr. Capron led off the discussion. He said, "there's a danger of making this interrelationship too simple (automation to unemployment to poverty). It misses the mark rather widely, and it can lead us down policy paths that we would not want to follow."

"The Government," he said, "has the responsibility to aid technological change, as long as it's discharging its responsibility for the adjustment that's going to be necessary."

In another point, the economist said that unemployment is the result of "inadequate total demand for goods and services," and he noted that the tax cut was instituted to get at the demand problem. It will release billions of dollars of purchasing power into the economy, he said, and that that in turn would increase the demand for labor. Stressing that "it's not a quick cure," Mr. Capron said, "I'm convinced that by the end of this year we'll have an economy that's moving up to total employment."

He continued, "We could cure poverty almost overnight. We could bring every American family up to $3,000 a year. But that would not cure poverty. Its roots lie deep. The lack of income is a symptom of poverty, not its cause. Real poverty lasts not only a lifetime but too frequently passes from one generation to another. For a whole segment of the population, relief has become a way of life."

We must approach poverty, he said, as a longer range problem, to get at its roots rather than eliminate some of its symptoms. The focus, he believes, should be on the younger people. As far as the older people are concerned, he said, it's difficult for them to escape a condition in which they've lived all their lives.

Michael Harrington, whose book is widely credited for having awakened the country to the widespread poverty that exists, spoke next. He suggested three steps that must be taken in a broad attack on poverty: first, that we must know its dimensions; second, that we must realize that what we have is a political problem that must be solved by political means; and third, that there must be Federal planning. The President's war on poverty, he said, "is only the merest beginning * * *. It is, thank God, a beginning."

On the dimensions of the problem of poverty, he said, "the actual number of poor is open to argument: According to President Johnson, there are 35 million, or one-fifth of the population; other estimates range higher. My own, he said, is 40 to 50 million. Leon Keyserling, he pointed out, has estimated that 40 percent of the population—or about 77 million persons—are either impoverished or deprived. We now know, he continued, that at least one-half of the people over 65 are "condemned to a lonely, bitter, impoverished old age"; we know that racial impoverishment is an added problem; we know that rural poverty is enormous; and we know that among the poor the largest age group is under 18. There's a grave danger, he said, of "hereditary poverty," the communication of poverty from one generation to another. We also know, he continued, that poor people get sick more often, that they have a higher incidence of neuroses and psychoses. The poor are the least educated in society, he said, and finally, they are ill housed.

On the war on poverty as a political problem, Mr. Harrington said, "The spending of money always involves politics." He called the $200 to $600 million that is going to be spent in Johnson's program "the barest, most impoverished beginning," and he quoted the New York Times as saying that it is hardly enough for a skirmish much less total war. The Dixiecrats, he pointed out, do not want to solve the problem of poverty; as long as they continue to dominate Congress, we are not going to approach the problem as massively as is necessary. We must, he said, have a new alinement. Later, during the question period, he said that the Democratic Party must become truly the liberal party; the Republican, truly the conservative. He said, "The AMA is for the maintenance of poverty," as far as Medicare is concerned; the farm bureaucracy is for the maintenance of poverty, when it comes to the question of the migrant farmworker; the racists are for the maintenance of poverty, as long as the alternative means uplifting the Negro; and the chief city planners—the real estate speculators—are for the maintenance of poverty.

His third point was that "any serious war on poverty has to have Federal norms." He disagreed with Mr. Capron. It is not, he said, simply a matter of increasing aggregate demand. In the next 5 years, he pointed out, an additional 16.1 million jobs will be needed just to maintain the level of unemployment that now exists. If we fail to provide these jobs, unemployment will leap to 8, 9, 10 percent of the working force, he said. The total problem, he stressed, is so massive—housing, education, jobs and many related problems—that there must be a "coordinated approach" to them, and that means Federal planning on a grand scale.

George Collins was the next speaker. The rediscovery of poverty, he said, is "long overdue * * *. The unhappy fact is that we have not achieved one of F.D.R.'s goals."

Each week, he said, 25,000 young people are entering the labor market; while 40,000 jobs a week are being lost through automation. The Nation is without a plan to deal with automation, he said, and "big business and industry show complete indifference." Big business and industry say, "no one knows the extent of the problem," which is a statement designed to delay the solution, he said.

He warned that we cannot continue the excuse "no one knows what to do about the problem" before attacking it. For the worker out of a job, he said, the important thing is that the bills are due, his wife needs medical care, his kids need clothes.

Robert Lekachman then spoke. He said that he was "more inclined to quarrel" with Mr. Capron, an economist. He called Mr. Capron's position (which is also the position of the Council of Economic Advisers) "a cheerful view." If we have unemployment, this view runs, it's the result of "deficient demand," and we "dump money in the right places" so that it will flow throughout the economy, he said. "We tried this recently," he pointed out, "in the bad old Eisenhower days. Remember?" In 1954, he said, "that far-reaching radical GEORGE HUMPHREY" supported a tax cut; the economy's upward turn was undoubtedly the result. "But why," he asked, "has the problem returned?" He said that this consideration led him to an alliance with the other two speakers (Collins and Harrington). "We have never really solved the problem of integrating the bottom segment of our population into the whole society," he said.

He pointed out that the number of jobs with small skill requirements are rapidly diminishing, and the jobs that are becoming available require greater and greater skills. Declaring that there's "a changing shape" to the demands upon labor, he foresaw a future in which machine tenders are going to become fewer and fewer, and it will be necessary for workers to shift occupations two or three times during their lifetimes. This, he said, suggests "a substantial shift not only in the amount spent on education but in the way we approach it." It will be necessary to make education a continuous process, he said. "General education, in other words, should last throughout life."

What we have achieved so far, he pointed out, is a middle-class welfare state; what we should be seeking is a welfare state for the bottom third of our society.

We only "kid ourselves if we believe that a tax cut is a cure-all," he said.

Later, during the rebuttal period, Mr. Capron said that the Council of Economic Advisers has never said that the only problem is aggregate demand and the tax cut the only solution. "We do say," he noted, "that total demand is necessary if we're going to begin to meet the problems of unemployment and poverty." He also said, "sure, skill requirements are on the increase, but they have been for a long time, and the labor force has always been able (to accommodate itself)."

During the question period he was asked why so little—$500 million or one-half of 1 percent—of the total budget, is to be spent on the war on poverty. He answered that substantial funds in the educational and housing budgets are earmarked for the problem of poverty and that this was only a beginning. "We have a tremendous job getting off the ground," he said, "It's not simply a matter of turning on the faucet and water pouring out smoothly. A lot of plumbing has to be done (for the future)."

Mr. Speaker, those who participated in the morning panel on "Advertising and the Public Interest" were fortunate in having the benefit of the views of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Paul Rand Dixon. I am including excerpts from the remarks of the panelists:

Speakers: Paul R. Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Sidney W. Dean, Jr., president, Ventures Development Corp.; Stephen Dietz, executive vice president, Kenyon & Eckhardt, Inc.; Mildred E. Brady, assistant director, Consumers Union.

From the remarks of Paul Rand Dixon:

It is in connection with the maintenance and strengthening of the competitive framework for economic growth that the Federal Trade Commission has, by virtue of the mandates of the statutes it administers, a responsibility in the scheme of our national life that is exceeded by few if any other agencies.

Recent growth of our economy has been phenomenal. Advertising of the proper kind can contribute mightily to this prospective growth and to the more abundant satisfaction of the consumer needs of all Americans which will result from such growth.

And I reaffirm here and now, without equivocation, my long-held position that advertising which helps consumers make intelligent choices is the kind which stimulates growth—without such advertising, we probably could never have achieved our present state of well-being; without it we likely can never substantially improve our position.

Yet, like most good things, advertising has been wrongly used—used in a way that was not in the public interest. For it has been employed, not to help consumers make intelligent choices, but sometimes as a monopolistic weapon to destroy competition and frequently as a deceptive one to corrupt it.

In meeting its obligation to maintain and strengthen our free competitive enterprise system, within the framework of which our growth must occur, the Commission acts not only to eliminate monopolistic practices, but also to remove those that are false or deceptive.

From the remarks of Mr. Stephen Dietz:

Advertising is a means of communication and persuasion. As is oratory.

While its primary use in this country is for the advocacy of the purchase of material things, it is also used by political parties, educational institutions, museums, art galleries, philanthropic and charitable organizations, churches, and various governmental bodies.

What is advertising's economic contribution to the growth of our free society? It is a means available to all of entry into a market. Given a new and superior product, advertising facilitates its entry into the market and its growth.

Advertising promotes growth because it speeds the acceptance of innovation.

The ethics of advertising, as of any public activity, are legitimate matters of public concern. Truth in advertising would seem to be a minimal standard of conduct to which we would all agree. But when we try to define truth, we have difficulty and disagreement, not because one side is good and the other bad, but because truth is not always an easy concept to deal with.

Much criticism of advertising stems from the belief that "persuasion" is necessarily unethical. I cannot agree. It seems to me that persuasion is the very stuff of life, of change, of movement. There are, of course, limits to the kinds of persuasion which are acceptable in the public interest, and these limits are violated in many walks of life. Perhaps the greatest violation, in my opinion, is failure to disclose the self-interest of the individual doing the persuading. Advertising is the most open persuasion there is—for the self-interest of the advertiser is plain for all to see.

From the remarks of Mrs. Mildred E. Brady:

There is no escaping the conclusion that advertising, taken as a total impact on today's living, has simply grown out of hand. Instead of serving the consumer, it abuses him. The most obvious thing about advertising as we experience it in 1964 is that it is excessive—excessive in its amount, excessive in its insistence, excessive in its blatancy.

Advertising expenditures are estimated to be $13 billion a year. And that's a conservative estimate—3.2 percent of disposable income—an increase of 16 percent from 1950 when the percentage was 2.7 percent. It is nearly double the amount we spend for medical and dental services; it is 2½ times what we spend for private education at all levels; it is more than we spend for all the gas and oil to operate the 60 million passenger cars on the road, and it is more than all Americans pay for rental housing.

This is not to say that the use of today's remarkable communications media to convey information about today's highly processed goods is an undesirable activity. On the contrary. Never before have we needed product information so sorely * * *. Advertising as we know it, however, does not measure up to this need and the need is growing geometrically as products multiply and become more complex. Without useful, truthful information about the products we buy, consumer choice on a free market becomes a mockery.

In order to fill the need for product information that modern technology and modern distribution facilities has rendered essential, advertising will have to change its ways.

Recently, and at long last, President Johnson created a consumer post in the White House, appointed Esther Peterson to that office, and also established a President's Consumer Interests Committee to which he appointed a number of private citizens especially qualified to speak for the consumer. Thus, for the first time the unorganized and heretofore voiceless consumer has been granted a small start along the road to a redress of the balance between the pressures for private ends and those for the public good. But, believe it or not, advertisers are already insisting that the consumer representative posts be turned over to advertising and marketing men * * *.

Surely those of us who hold that the public welfare should be the primary focus of government, and those in the Congress who speak for us, should take whatever steps may be necessary to guard against any attempts of advertising, or other commercial interests, to masquerade as representatives of the consumer.

Summary of remarks of Sidney W. Dean, Jr.:

Advertising is the process of "automated mass selling." As a process, it carries no more responsibility for its human consequences than automated mass production. The human consequences must be dealt with by government acting for all of us.

Advertising, furthermore, is a sanctioned form of special pleading, with the same responsibilities as the lawyer pleading for an imperfect client or a political partisan pleading for an imperfect candidate. Special pleading has an indispensable role in an open society to insure free competition between ideas as well as goods and services. The role of government as umpire is to insure that the rules are adequate and enforced to insure fair competition.

Since fair rules of free competition are as important in advertising as in all other business, it is tragic that our antitrust regulatory legislation covers only interstate commerce in goods and products, and excepts services, such as advertising and editorial services. Thus, the rates and terms of sale of advertising, which is an important component of the price of most consumer products, is largely unregulated.

Similarly, publishers, broadcasters, and networks have taken false shelter under the doctrine of freedom of the press to engage in price fixing and other monopoly practices in the sale of essential news, editorial, and programing services. It is currently reported that the three television networks now own or have profit participations in all but 15 of the hundreds of programs they carry. These participations and "coproduction" concessions have been coerced from independent producers and advertisers in exchange for time clearances and preferences.

The afternoon panel on "Consumer Credit: Truth in Lending" included the following participants: Dr. Warren Banner, Research Director, National Urban League; Professor Persia Campbell, chairman, Department of Economics, Queens College; Louis J. Asterita, deputy manager, American Bankers Association. The following are excerpts from their remarks.

From the remarks of Dr. Warren Banner:

Few will question the purchase of most durable goods on the installment plan. Homes are usually bought this way. However, most of us do not know what is happening not only in the calculations for the costs above the stated price (insurance, taxes, utilities, etc.), but to a greater extent are thrown into confusion about the charges at closing time.

Various reports show that installment credit costs up to 42 percent per year, allowed under State law. Usually stated rates of 5 or 6 percent amount to twice as much where the interest rate is constant even though the outstanding balance is decreasing with each payment. This may sound confusing to some but it is easily understood if review is made of the tables prepared by those who have calculated the actual cost to the consumers of installment buying.

I have always felt that the best deal for all of us of small means is to deposit our funds in a savings bank, where interest is paid each quarter, and make purchases from our cash.

Until there is some assurance that you will not fall prey to the small print of a contract, deal with reputable concerns and there will be less chance that you will be taken advantage of. Buy only what you need and know you can and will pay for it. While lending institutions are anxious to have their money work, you should be just as anxious to have them use some of your money with interest.

From the remarks of Prof. Persia Campbell:

Consumer credit is an advance of purchasing power obtained at a price; it is a commitment of debt on terms. Over the decade the percentage rate of increase for consumer credit (about 110 percent) was almost twice that of disposable income (about 60 percent); from about 13 percent of disposable income, consumer credit has increased to about 17 percent.

Except in particular categories, notably monthly charge accounts, credit is paid for by the borrowers at an estimated average rate of from 14 to 15 percent per year; the strange thing is that the borrowers, now constituting well over half the American families, rarely know what they are paying for it. This strange phenomenon of blind buying has different causes; a significant cause is the fact that credit charges are stated in different ways according to the type and source of credit.

At hearings on the Douglas truth-in-lending bill, Mr. McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, admitted that he himself could not make out the comparative cost of different types of credit under these circumstances, which may all be legal, under the hodge-podge of different laws applying separately to small loan companies, banks, credit unions, pawnshops, and to retail installment sales and revolving credit plans. It was to help the consumer exercise informed choice in the credit market that Senator DOUGLAS and his associates introduced the truth-in-lending bill which requires, in brief, that all types of credit charges be stated both in dollar cost (which enables a quick comparison between cash and time-sale prices) and also with the equivalent annual interest rate (to facilitate comparative shopping between different types and sources of credit). Since the vitality of a competitive market, central to our economic system, depends on informed choice, the Douglas bill has been put under the jurisdiction of a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee; it provides for administration by the Federal Trade Commission as part of its fair-labeling program.

Summary of remarks of Mr. Louis J. Asterita:

Banks have not engaged in the installment loan business at high rates, but rather have sought to extend consumer loans on an ethical basis and at reasonable rates. By following the principle of lending to credit-worthy risks for any useful purpose, banks make direct loans to individuals to buy automobiles at lower rates than those generally associated with dealer-originated business. Moreover, bankers discovered they could loan for business purposes on a term basis by making installment loans to small business and adopting the installment credit method. Other loan areas that have been developed include charge account financing, revolving check credit, on-the-job bank service, financing medical and dental expenses and loans to improve or modernize your home. However, the extension of this credit following World War II, has focussed attention upon practices involved in the extension of consumer credit. Consumer credit has grown from 21,395 million in 1950 to 68 billion year-end 1963. Installment credit, which is the credit under discussion today, rose from 14.7 billion in 1950 to 53 billion in 1963.

The afternoon panel on "Environmental Health: Air, Food, Drugs" included the following participants: George P. Larrick, Commissioner, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Arthur J. Benline, Commissioner of Air Pollution Control, New York City; Ethel L. Ginsberg, Citizens Committee for Children of New York City.

From the remarks of George P. Larrick:

Our food and drug law helps to protect the public health, and this of course has great economic significance. But this law has other benefits. It conserves the consumer's purchasing power. It stimulates technological progress. It fosters fair competitive practices. It is an underlying factor in our free competitive economy, by aiding consumer choice in the marketplace based on reliable product information.

Experience has shown that without laws to protect the consumer many dishonest practices would flourish. Vigorous and continuing control is needed to prevent such practices as short-weight packaging, substitution of cheaper ingredients, and the sale of spoiled or contaminated products.

Most of this food was pure and wholesome, safe to use, and honestly packaged. But if—let us assume—there had been a shortage in the net weight averaging only a quarter of an ounce per pound—it would have cost consumers over a billion dollars a year.

Establishment of food standards helps to protect consumer purchasing power and consumer health. The food standard regulations prevent adulteration—for example by added water. They require food to contain what is expected.

Enrichment of selected foods with vitamins and minerals is carried on through the food standards program. This has helped to reduce or wipe out diseases caused by dietary deficiencies.

Under the law the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to establish a food standard whenever such action is needed to "promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers." Thus food standards are also concerned with promoting fair competition in the production and marketing of foods.

There is no way to measure accurately the cost of misbranding and misinformation in the health field. It has been estimated at more than a billion dollars a year. Vitamin quackery and other food fads are said to cost the public half a billion dollars a year. But the cost would be far more were it not for the protection of our Federal, State, and local laws.

Here it would be appropriate to ask what is the cost of the protection provided by the FDA. In the current fiscal year the appropriation for enforcing the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is $35,800,000, about 18½ cents for each person in the United States. We are sure that this insurance saves the consumer many times its annual cost.

Commissioner Arthur J. Benline:

New York City's Commissioner of Air Pollution Arthur J. Benline told the group that smokestacks and chimneys, residential and industrial incinerators, and car, bus, and truck exhaust fumes are the basic sources of air pollution in the city. More research is needed in purifying auto exhausts and in smoke abatement devices.

Protecting health against air pollution depends on preventing pollutants from entering the air. He explained that litter in the streets up to your knees would not endanger public health as much as the pollutants in the air now do.

The afternoon panel on "Taxation and the Consumer" included the following participants: Prof. Emma C. Llewellyn, Department of Economics, Sarah Lawrence College; Peter Bernstein, author of "Price of Prosperity" and "Primer on Government Spending"; J. A. Stockfisch, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Treasury Department. A summary follows:

Prof. Emma Llewellyn expressed her view that the tax bill did not give adequate recognition for lower income individuals. She took the position that at this time there was a greater need to stimulate consumption rather than investment. Professor Llewellyn stated that the tax bill tended to place too much emphasis on investment.

Peter Bernstein stated that, while he favors a reduction in income taxes as a badly needed stimulant to business expansion, he has reservations on two levels.

First, we have made no real progress on tax reform, he said. We are still allowing too large a portion of high incomes to escape the tax collector's net. Our income tax schedules give an extraordinarily misleading impression of the degree to which our tax structure is progressive: it accomplishes far less in this regard than most people like to believe.

Second, he continued, the tax cut does little or nothing to aid those people who need help most—the families whose incomes are so small that they pay little or no income tax in any case. Indeed, he would far rather that we begin to look at taxes, not as a burden, but as a means of buying the things we so badly need in terms of cleaner, healthier, safer, more comfortable, and better educated communities.

Mr. Stockfisch explained the main features of the tax bill as it was at that time before the Senate Finance Committee. He explained what income classes would get a reduction and indicated that the bill would have some elements of reform, although not as much as had been hoped for in President Kennedy's original proposal.

He also dealt with the question of whether the Congress would accept the important Treasury amendment on capital gains—to maintain the existing tax rates on capital gains. He pointed out the importance of this amendment, and of eliminating the dividend credit provision which would mean a lessening in the present tendency to tax different types of incomes differently. This in itself would be a very healthy step in the right direction and a type of reform.

Mr. Stockfisch stated that he thought the tax bill would make inroads in areas that had never been touched before and that the bill should be given more credit than its critics are willing to admit.

NORTHERN OHIO JUDGESHIPS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, in introducing legislation to make the present temporary judgeship in the northern Ohio Federal Judicial District a permanent one.

Northern Ohio is the only district in the entire Nation with a temporary judge. This means that whenever the first of seven judges now sitting in Cleveland, Toledo, or Youngstown retires or dies, he will not be replaced.

The situation came about in 1961 when President Kennedy signed a bill creating 73 Federal judgeships, a move recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States to relieve serious congestiton in many of the larger districts.

Under that legislation, northern Ohio received two new judgeships, one permanent and one temporary. That increased the district bench from five to seven judges with the proviso that the first vacancy would not be filled, leaving the northern district with a permanent bench of six judges.

The theory behind this was that a temporary judgeship would be needed only long enough to clear up the congestion existing in 1961. It is now a matter of record, however, that the additional judgeships voted for northern Ohio in 1961 have failed to reduce the caseload. Reports of the administrative office of the U.S. courts show that as of June 30, 1962, shortly after the appointment of the two new judges for northern Ohio, there were 1,158 civil cases pending in the northern Ohio district. A year later, on June 30, 1963, the pending caseload had moved to 1,199. In February of this year the administrative office reported that there were 1,280 pending civil cases as of December 31, 1963.

Need for prompt enactment of the legislation proposed by Senator YOUNG and myself is attested to by Warren Olney III, the Director of the Administrative Office of the Federal Courts, in his statement that the growth of the backlog of civil cases has been due more to an increase in the number of filings than to slowness of the court to act.

In the last half of last year, for instance, the northern Ohio bench disposed of a respectable total of 512 cases, only to have 593 new ones filed in the same period.

It thus becomes apparent that the future workload will demand at least as many judges as are presently sitting in the northern Ohio district. The loss of a judgeshhip, which will take place if the temporary judgeship provided in the 1961 act is not converted into a permanent one, will inevitably result in the chaotic situation which existed prior to 1961 and the legislation adopted that year creating additional judgeships throughout the country. In order to prevent the delay and frustration of judicial proceedings, Senator YOUNG and I have offered legislation which I hope will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DOLE (at the request of Mr. BOW), for 1 hour, on Monday, April 6; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. JONAS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURKHALTER and to include extraneous material.

Mr. LINDSAY and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. BOW in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made and to include an article.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOW) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

MR. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE.

Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. GARMATZ.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 962. An act making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO APRIL 6, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 284, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, April 6, 1964.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 284, the House adjourned until Monday, April 6, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1872. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to November 30 and December 24, 1963, when he directed the heads of executive departments and agencies to tighten operations, reduce employment, and effect savings. As a result of the steps being taken pursuant to these instructions, he asked the Congress on March 9 to reduce the 1965 appropriations requested in the budget by $41,927,000. Included are other pertinent facts relating to this subject; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1873. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report that Export-Import Bank of Washington on March 20, 1964, issued its guarantee with respect to a transaction with Hungary relating to the exportation of dry milk, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1964, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1874. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review disclosing that the Federal Aviation Agency has not followed prescribed Government policies in assessing user charges; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1875. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of the semiautomatic flight inspection program of the Federal Aviation Agency has disclosed that additional costs of about $944,000 were incurred because of weaknesses in the planning and contracting for the program and in the administration of the program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1876. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting proposed amendment No. 3 to the concession contract with Best's Studio, Inc., Yosemite National Park, pursuant to 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1877. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report showing grants for basic scientific research made by the Department of Defense to nonprofit institutions in calendar year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1878. A letter from the president, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the 14th Annual Report of the Girls Scouts of the United States of America for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 272, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 287); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1879. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim hurricane survey of middle and lower peninsulas of Virginia, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 288); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1880. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 29, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N.J. (channels to Port Elizabeth), prepared in response to an item in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, approved October 23, 1962 (Public Law 87–874). It is also in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted June 14, 1960, and to resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957, and August 15, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 289); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to an application for a loan by the St. John Irrigating Co. of Malad, Idaho, Oneida County (pursuant to 70 Stat. 1044, as amended by 71 Stat. 48); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9688. A bill to extend the period during which responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children, under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, may be exercised by a public agency other than the agency administering such aid under the State plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10473. A bill to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. Report on right-of-way acquisition practices in West Virginia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10637. A bill to make permanent the district judgeship for the northern district of Ohio created by section 2(e)(2) of the act of May 19, 1961; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 10638. A bill to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 10639. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10640. A bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees transferred in the interest of the Government to a different geographical location and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of civilian employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10641. A bill to adjust the basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 10642. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 10643. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow shall not prevent the payment of benefits if such remarriage is terminated by a decree of divorce and proceedings for the divorce were instituted within 1 year after such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 10644. A bill to impose import limitations on certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 10645. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 10646. A bill to authorize the sale of 58.19 acres of Eastern Shawnee tribal land in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 10647. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10648. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 10649. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10650. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10651. A bill to specify the number of hospital beds that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must maintain and operate at the Veterans' Hospital, East Orange, N.J.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 10652. A bill prohibiting lithographing, engraving, or printing on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 10653. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 10654. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1964, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10655. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10656. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10 percent across-the-board benefit increase; to reduce the retirement age to 62 for payment of full benefits to both men and women; to authorize a 25-percent increase in the minimum benefits payable to workers, raising that minimum from $40 to $50; to increase outside earnings permitted recipients from $1,200 to $2,000 without deductions from benefits; to provide that the Federal Government shall contribute one-third of the additional cost of such changes (reducing the additional contributions required of workers and employers accordingly); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 10657. A bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10658. A bill to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to continue the veterans' hospitals and Armed Forces dairy program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 10659. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests heretofore acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 971. Joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to use full facilities of our Government to make arrangements for and to bring about delivery of an adequate supply of matzoth to key centers of Jewish life in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on an emergency basis, so that the feast of the Passover which begins at sundown Friday, March 27, and ends at sundown Saturday, April 4, may be observed in keeping with 5,724 years of Jewish tradition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 972. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the fifth of April of each year as "Mankind Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 973. Joint resolution to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 974. Joint resolution to create the Select Commission on Market Power in Agriculture to conduct a comprehensive investigation of food chainstore practices which may be in violation of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 667. Resolution creating a select committee to act as observers at the forthcoming trade convention at Geneva, Switzerland; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take certain action in relation to social security benefits, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 10660. A bill for the relief of Matitiau Meilich and Charlotte Meilich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10661. A bill for the relief of Louis L. Repp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 10662. A bill for the relief of Chun Yin So; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 10663. A bill for the relief of George Marer and his wife, Claire Vago Marer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 10664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diruhi Platin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10665. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Arthur A. Ageton, U.S. Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 10666. A bill for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 10667. A bill for the relief of Paul L. Van Moeseke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 975. Joint resolution authorizing the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

815. By Mr. CAMERON: Petition of William M. "Fishbait" Miller, Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

816. Also, petition of W. W. Buck, commander of the Department of California, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

817. Also, petition of the Sentinel of Covina, Calif., urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

818. Also, petition of the Daily Tribune of the San Gabriel Valley of California, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

819. Also, petition of the City Council of Chino, Calif., urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

820. Also, petition of the City Council of Monrovia, Calif., urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

821. Also, petition of Joseph A. Beirne, international president of the Communications Workers of America, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

822. Also, petition of Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers of America, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

823. Also, petition of Gordon M. Freeman, international president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

824. Also, petition of the City Council of Pomona, Calif., urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

825. Also, petition of the State Executive Committee Disabled American Veterans, Department of Idaho, urging Congress to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

826. By Mr. ROOSEVELT: Petition of Lloyd C. Barton, Stockton, Calif., in support of H.R. 8826; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

827. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kihei Shiroma, Iheya-son, Okinawa, relative to an early solution of the problem of pretreaty

claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

828. Also, petition of Chiyokichi Arakaki, Iheya-son, Okinawa, relative to an early solution of the problem of pretreaty claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

829. Also, petition of Junji Nishime, mayor of Naha City, Okinawa, relative to an early solution of the problem of pretreaty claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, March 9, 1964)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we lift up our hearts in prayer to Thee, and invoke Thy divine blessings upon our country, the United States of America. Grant Thy guidance and strength; sustain and illuminate with Thy Holy Spirit the hearts of all the Members of the Senate, this temple of peace, freedom, and justice.

Eternal God and Redeemer, we pray today for Thy divine mercy and judgment for the national welfare of the Byelorussian nation, whose Proclamation of Independence, as the Byelorussian National Republic, was observed 46 years ago, and whose people have striven during these years to free themselves from the tyranny of an atheistic oppression, in the hope of enjoying the liberties and freedom, under God, as is the way in the United States. We pray today that the benefits of freedom granted to democracies all over the world may serve as an infallible encouragement to the people of Byelorussia, for the vision of everlasting freedom is not lost among them, but burns like a torch in the depth of their hearts with the desire to be a member in the family of the free and God-fearing nations of the entire world.

We humbly bow our heads before Thee, our God and Saviour, and faithfully implore Thee: Accept this, our prayer; bless the United States of America and Byelorussia; reign and shine in our hearts; and be blessed, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 25, 1964, was dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MANSFIELD that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no morning business this morning.

What is the pending question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7152, the Civil Rights Act of 1963.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 100 Leg.]

Aiken	Hartke	Morse
Bartlett	Hayden	Morton
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hill	Muskie
Bible	Holland	Neuberger
Boggs	Hruska	Pastore
Brewster	Humphrey	Pell
Burdick	Inouye	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Ribicoff
Cannon	Johnston	Robertson
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Clark	Keating	Scott
Cooper	Kennedy	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith
Dirksen	Lausche	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Dominick	Long, La.	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Mansfield	Thurmond
Edmondson	McCarthy	Walters
Ellender	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Williams, Del.
Fong	McGovern	Yarborough
Fulbright	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Mechem	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Metcalf	
Hart	Miller	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, during the course of the debate on the motion to take up the civil rights bill, there have been a number of allusions to the Myart against Motorola, Inc., case. The significance of this finding of a hearing examiner of the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission has, to say the least, been greatly exaggerated.

In the first place, the decision is merely that of an examiner and, as the chairman of the Illinois Commission made clear in a letter to the New York Times on March 25, the Illinois Commission "has not taken any stand of any kind at any time on the issue of the use of tests in employment."

Even were the Illinois Commission to follow the recommendation of the examiner, an assumption for which there is no basis, the action would have no relevance to the bill now coming before us.

To clear away misconceptions on this whole case, I have had prepared a memorandum which makes clear, I believe, that it would not be possible for a decision such as the finding of the examiner in the Motorola case to be entered by a Federal agency against an employer under title VII.

This is so, first, because the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission established by title VII would have no adjudicative functions and no authority to issue enforcement orders.

Second, title VII clearly would not permit even a Federal court to rule out the use of particular tests by employers because they do not "equate inequalities and environmental factors among the disadvantaged and culturally deprived groups."

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the letter from Charles W. Gray, chairman of the State of Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission, and of the memorandum to which I have referred be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 25, 1964]

ILLINOIS FEPC—COMMISSIONER DONISS TAKING STAND ON USE OF TESTS IN HIRING

TO THE EDITOR:

Arthur Krock, writing in the Times of March 13, states that the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission has ruled on an issue involving the use of preemployment tests by Motorola.

The facts are these. The law establishing the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission provides that in the event a private conciliation conference between a respondent and a complainant fails to produce a mutually acceptable settlement, it shall be set for a public hearing.

The public hearing is conducted by a hearing examiner, who must be a lawyer. The hearing examiner is appointed by the commission, but is in no way an employee of the commission, and, therefore, certainly not a political appointee.

The findings of the hearing examiner are just that—not a ruling of the commission, nor are they necessarily the opinion or judgment of the commission.